Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

Pagination is as follows: [1], [797]-1656, [i]-cviii p.

Pages 992, 1138 & 1302-1303 are incorrectly numbered pages 991, 1183 & 1202-1203.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

SECOND SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

47 VICTORIÆ, 1884.

VOL. XVI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWELFTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE NINETEENTH DAY OF APRIL, 1884.

Edited and Indexed by JNO. CHAS. BOYCE, *Assistant to Chief Reporter.*

OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.
1884.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—47 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISTRIBUTION OF DOMINION STATUTES.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish yearly to the several organized Municipalities a copy of the Dominion Statutes, or at least a copy of the Public Statutes?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am under the impression that all the Municipalities are included in the free list of distribution. However, if the distribution is not done now, I shall see that it be done in future.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. HOLTON enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to improve the post office service in the city of Montreal by keeping the office there open until a later hour each day than at present, and by providing for the immediate delivery of mails arriving there in the evening?

Mr. CARLING. My attention having been called to the inconvenience of the present mail arrangements in the city of Montreal by the representatives of that city some time ago, I instructed the inspector to make enquiries into the matter, and he has made a report, upon which the postmaster has been ordered to keep the post office open until 10 o'clock each night.

THE CHIEF CLERK IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

Mr. CASEY enquired, Who is the chief clerk in the Department of the Secretary of State? On whose recommendation was he appointed? What were the special qualifications which led to his appointment over the heads of others?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is a chief clerk in each of the different branches of the Department. The chief clerk of correspondence, which is the main branch of the Department, is Mr. Henry J. Morgan, who is a chief clerk of the first grade; in the register branch, the chief clerk is Mr. L. A. Catellier, who is a chief clerk of the first grade; the Queen's Printer, Mr. Chamberlin, is a chief clerk of the first grade; Mr. W. Henry Jones is a chief clerk of the second grade; and Mr. Alphonse Audet, the keeper of the records, is a chief clerk of the second grade. Mr. Catellier and Mr. Morgan were appointed on the 1st of January, 1879, Mr. Chamberlin on the 1st of July 1881, Mr. Jones on the 1st of July, 1880, and Mr. Audet on the 7th of June, 1883. Some of them have been a long time in the Civil Service, all of them were formerly either in the Departments or in the House of Commons, and they have been recommended and appointed by Orders in Council generally. The chief clerk of my own branch, (Mr. Morgan) the clerk who represents the Deputy, was appointed in 1853, I do not know under whose recommendation.

Mr. CASEY. I ask leave of the House to explain what I mean by special qualifications. When a man is appointed and not promoted, I understand that the Civil Service Act requires his special qualifications to be stated.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he wants some special information, he might move for some papers. I know what he means. He might better have asked directly what he wanted. If he wants any particular information he may ask, and the answer will be given.

CANAL BETWEEN THE THAMES AND LAKE ERIE.

Mr. CASEY enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to proceed at an early day with the work in connection with the canal between the River Thames and Lake Erie (through the township of Dunwich) for which surveys were made during the past summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To give a full answer to this question, I would have to read a statement which has been given to me in reference to it. I suppose that would not be in order, in which case I may say that the information obtained by these surveys shows that, within the limits of a reasonable expenditure, the scheme may be classed as impracticable.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was known before the surveyors went there.

CLAIM OF MR. GEORGE LAVOIE.

Mr. BILLY enquired, Whether the Government have in their possession an award made by one of the Dominion Arbitrators, in relation to a claim presented by Mr. George Lavoie, asking for an amount sufficient to cover the losses incurred by him in the burning of his barn and its contents, in May, 1872? Does the said award state that the said fire was caused by one of the locomotives of the Government, on the Intercolonial Railway? Is it stated in the said award that, in equity, the Government is bound to pay to the said George Lavoie the amount claimed? Does the award further state that the amount claimed is not too high? Finally, is it the intention of the Government, if the award contains such statements, to reimburse Mr. George Lavoie for the amount of the losses by him incurred on the occasion aforesaid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the Government have a report from one of the arbitrators, but not an award; that this report

states that the fire was caused by a locomotive, and that, in the opinion of the arbitrator, the Government ought to pay the damage, that the Government do not intend to pay, because the Government are not liable in the premises, the spark arrestors of the engine having been proved to be in good order.

CLAIM OF JOSEPH D'ANJOU.

Mr. BILLY enquired, whether it is the intention of the Government to pay the claim of Joseph D'Anjou, for ties belonging to him, and removed at St. Fabien Station, in 1882, by the employees of the Intercolonial Railway? If not, for what reasons?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At the time the claim of Joseph D'Anjou was established, he was indebted to the Government in the sum of $192, which, after deducting the value of the ties, $157.50, still leaves a balance due to the Government by him, of $34.50.

ALFRED OGDEN.

Mr. KIRK enquired, Is Alfred Ogden employed by any Department of the Government? If so, by what Department? What are his duties and what salary does he receive?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On enquiry, I find that Mr. Alfred Ogden is not employed by any Department of the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And gets no salary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He cannot get a salary if he is not employed.

WELLINGTON BRIDGE, LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. CURRAN moved for copies of all correspondence relative to the necessity for further accommodation for foot passengers at Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no objection to bringing down any correspondence. My recollection of the matter is that the hon. member for Montreal West made a very urgent application to the Government while the bridge was in process of construction to have accommodation provided for foot passengers, but it was found that the work had proceeded so far in the construction of the piers that a very great cost would be involved in affording this accommodation, and the contractors were unable to comply with the request of the hon. member for Montreal West.

Motion agreed to.

EDINBURGH FORESTRY EXHIBITION.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Governments of any of the Provinces, or between the Dominion Government and any person or persons respecting the advisability of adopting measures to secure an exhibit of Canadian woods at the Forestry Exhibition to be held in the city of Edinburgh in August next, said: I desire to make a few observations and will endeavour to make them as brief as possible. It will be admitted we have in Canada undertaken on many occasions to bring this country into prominence in England and the other countries of Europe. The course taken by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in securing the coming of the tenant farmer delegates to Canada had a very considerable effect in that direction. We have also had the able assistance of the Marquis of Lorne and the Earl of Dufferin in bringing Canada into prominence in the old country, but I think it will be admitted that there is no more effective mode of bringing about that desirable result than by the exhibition of our products at the great exhibitions of the world. I believe the Canadian exhibit held at the Fisheries Exhibition in London last summer, under the superintendence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, had more to do with bringing Canada into prominence in Great Britain than any other step taken previous to that time. It is true we expended a good deal of money in connection with that exhibition, but the fact that Canada was brought into such prominence by that means, the fact that Canada was in the mouths of so many people during the course of that exhibition has, I think, been justified by the Government in the expenditure made. In connection with that exhibit of wood, with which my motion proposes to deal, at the Forestry Exhibition in Edinburgh, in August next, I believe that such an exhibition would also tend to advantage Canada to a very great extent. It may be contented that the representation, if made at all, ought to be made by the different Provinces, who are more interested in the forestry of this country than the Dominion of Canada, but, if such an exhibit were made under the authority of the different Provinces, it would have to be divided up under four or five, or perhaps more different authorities, and it would not, to my mind, be nearly as effective as if that exhibition was made under the authority and under the jurisdiction of the Central Government; and I believe that I am not in error in stating that the industry of wood, the lumber industry, is of sufficient importance and has been of sufficient importance, in the commerce of this country to justify the Government in making a small expenditure in connection with such an exhibition as that which I advocate. I find, on looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns for the sixteen years which have elapsed since Confederation, that we have exported of the natural products of the country to the following amounts: Products of the mine, $51,416,647; products of the fisheries, $89,100,487; products of the forest, $352,353,118; agricultural products and animals and their products, $514,977,645. It will thus be seen that the exportation of the products of the forest, during those sixteen years, have amounted to an average of 33 per cent. of the exports of the whole of the natural products of this country, and, if we include the other exports with the export of the natural products we find the exports of the products of the forest amounted to 33⅓ per cent. of the whole of the exports of this country during the last sixteen years; and permit me to say, in addition to that, that the exportations to which I refer have no reference to the manufactures of wood or to the ships which have been exported during that period of time. It must, therefore, be admitted that the trade in the products of the forest is of sufficient importance to justify us in giving to that industry some consideration, and in endeavouring, if possible, if it be in our power, to give it the prominence it deserves in the old country. It has been stated, I am aware, by some hon. gentlemen, that the lumber industry is a waning industry; but when I inform the House that the exports of last year amounted to $25,370,726, as against an average export, during the last sixteen years to which I have referred, of $22,022,069, it will, I think, be admitted that that trade has not reached a point of decadence which causes us to believe it is not an important element in the exports of this country; and, if it is a waning industry, if the views that are held by hon. gentlemen in reference to it in that respect be correct, it must be because the products of the forest are being cut or burnt away; and, even in that connection, it seems to me it would be desirable that we should obtain all the information in our power to enable us to conserve these forests, by ascertaining as accurately as we can what modes are adopted in Norway and other northern countries of Europe for the preservation and replanting of the forest, and I know of no means which would be more satisfactory in this respect than a representation of Canada at the exhibition in Edinburgh in

August next, where whoever might be in charge of that exhibition would be brought in contact with representatives from those countries, and would be enabled to obtain the information that would perhaps enable us to preserve our forests from the destruction which has been going on from various causes. I do not intend to prolong my remarks in relation to this matter. I think the subject is one that ought to commend itself to the Government of the country and to the House, and I would venture to express the hope that the hon. leader of the Government, and the Government of which he is the head, will consider whether it would not be in the interests of this country, including all the Provinces, that the exhibit, if any be made in Edinburgh in connection with this forestry exhibition, should be made under the authority and under the auspices of the Central Government, instead of being divided up and subdivided, as it would be if made under the authority of the different Provinces.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to say something on the subject which has been brought before the House, and many members wish to speak on it, as it is a matter of great importance; and, as we should like to have an opportunity of doing so, I would prefer that the debate should be adjourned, if it would meet the views of the House. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think it would be desirable to have some expression from the Government in relation to this matter, because, if this debate is adjourned, it will take a place upon the paper where it will not likely be reached this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be paying a very bad compliment to my hon. friends who propose to speak, to come to any decision as to the course we ought to take before we hear their speeches. However, I might simply say that the Government thoroughly recognizes the importance of this question. The moment the official intimation was communicated to the Government that this forestry exhibition was to be held at Edinburgh, and inviting the action of the people of Canada as exhibitors, the Government transmitted copies of the papers to each of the Provinces—because the forests, as is well known, belong to the different Provinces, the Government having no authority of their own, except in the North-West, which is a prairie country principally, so that really it was in the hands of the Provincial Governments more than the Central Government—inviting them to act in the matter. There have been answers received from some of the Provinces but not from all. The papers will be brought down at once, the debate will go on, and I have no doubt the House will be glad to hear the discussion, and the Government will come to a conclusion as to what extent, if at all, they should ask for a vote of the House.

Mr. ORTON. I presume that the Dominion Government are making preparations for an exhibit at the coming Colonial Exhibition in Great Britain in 1886. No doubt the products of the forests of this country will be adequately represented there. It would also, I think, be desirable that we should have some expression of opinion by the Government as to whether they intend to have Canada represented at the Colonial Exhibition, because it would require some time to make the necessary preparation.

Mr. COCKBURN. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to say a word in respect to a very important product of the forest—I need say nothing of the staple article of pine as it is always a saleable commodity—I refer to the article of birch. It is worth mentioning that we have in the northern part of Ontario, and, perhaps, in the northern part of Quebec also, an immense quantity of very valuable black birch. Walnut is becoming very dear and scarce, and has almost disappeared from Ontario, but we have a splendid substitute for it in this birch I have mentioned. If the existence of this timber was made commonly known by the Government, it would be conferring a great boon upon the population throughout Northern Ontario. There is a vast quantity of this timber all along the Ottawa River to Lake Huron, which is very useful in the manufacture of furniture, and for various other purposes.

Mr. FISHER. Before this matter is disposed of, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to another phase of the question than that which has been alluded to by the mover of this motion, and that is that there will not only be an exhibition of forestry and of the products of the forest, but there will also be a meeting of gentlemen who are interested in tree planting and in the promotion of forestry, which is now obtaining a great deal of attention all over this continent. I would remind the First Minister that in our North-West, in that portion of it which is directly under the charge of this Government, the question of forestry is a very important one, and the report of such a commissioner as might be sent by this Government to this exhibition, would be of great value in regard to future tree-planting in the North-West. I have before me a circular by which I am sorry to see that exhibits at this exhibition ought to have been entered by the 1st of March, though it may be possible that exhibits from this country might still be allowed. I have also a communication from a gentleman who has been foremost in this country with regard to the science of forestry—I allude to the Hon. Mr. Joly, of the Province of Quebec. In speaking of this question, he says: "There is a serious risk at this late date in our sending exhibits to this exhibition, which might, perhaps, not do the country justice." At the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition our country obtained the foremost position in regard to lumbering exhibits, and it would be a cause of great regret to everybody in this country, especially those engaged in the lumber business, if Canada was not able to make a proper exhibit at the coming Colonial Exhibition. It is a question for serious consideration whether, at this late date, when the entries are already closed, we could make a satisfactory exhibit. I think that in view of the importance which forestry and tree-planting must obtain in the near future in this country, it would be very desirable that the Dominion Government should send a commissioner who might make a report, the publication and distribution of which would be very valuable in promoting the science of forestry in this country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will consider the matter.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

THE HIGH COMMISSIONER AND IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a copy of the letter of the Minister of Agriculture of the 5th of July, and of all cablegrams addressed to the High Commissioner, calling his attention to the demand existing in Canada for the labouring classes, and informing him that notwithstanding the large immigration which has taken place the requirements are still unsatisfied. Also, copies of special circulars issued by the steamship companies quoting the Minister's cable messages by request of the High Commissioner. Also, copies of the cuttings from the London newspapers on the subject forwarded by the High Commissioner. He said: I consider these papers are important in connection with the question which exists in this country as to the prudence and the propriety of the steps which have been adopted by the Government with reference to the immigration of certain classes of the population. I hope the hon. gentleman will bring them down at an early date.

Mr. POPE. Of course it is understood that I am not to discuss this question now. Still, I think the hon. gentle-

man might have known that he was foreclosing me on a subject on which I feel very strongly. Had he brought this question on at the time fixed for discussion——

Mr. BLAKE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The hon. member for Renfrew declined to accept the arrangement that was proposed, and therefore the hon. gentleman is left perfectly free to discuss it.

Mr. POPE. I am ready to stand by every statement I have made. I have always advocated the bringing of immigrants into this country. And the hon. gentleman will not find anything in any letter or cablegram out of which he can make any capital against the Government. I will accept the hon. gentleman's challenge when the papers come down. I am willing the motion should be carried, but I ask that it be extended a little so that it shall include all telegrams sent from this country in which it was represented that there was no labour to be found here for immigrants; and also that it shall include clippings from such newspapers of Canada as have represented the same thing.

Mr. BLAKE. Let the hon. gentleman amend my motion if he chooses to do so.

Mr. POPE moved that the following words be added to the motion:—"Also copies of all cablegrams from Canada and cuttings from Canadian newspapers transmitted to England, and all correspondence obtainable on the subject of the labour demand in this country."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

NEW MODEL OF A BALLOT BOX.

Mr. OUIMET moved that the petition of Joseph Dominique Ernest Myrand, of the city of Quebec, read and received on the 25th February, instant, praying for an examination of his new model of a ballot box, be referred to a Select Committee of this House, to consist of Messrs. Bossé, Shakespeare, Royal, White (Cardwell), Hall, Macmaster, Laurier, Weldon, Daly, Landry (Kent), Davies, Trow, Haggart, Kaulbach and the mover, with instructions to examine the merits of the said ballot box and report to this House as to the expediency of adopting the same for Dominion elections.

Mr. IVES. I suggest that the name of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) be added to the Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suggest that the name of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) be added.

Mr. OUIMET. I have no objections to add the names mentioned.

Mr. BLAKE. I suggest the addition of the name of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry).

Mr. OUIMET. I may say to those hon. gentlemen whose names I have selected without consultation with them, that the duty will not involve any great loss of time, as it will not require more than half an hour or an hour to examine the wonderful box, which, as I am told, will do away with all ballot papers, and evils and mistakes which ensue from them.

Mr. MILLS. This may be a very interesting invention. If the hon. gentleman says it does away with ballot papers, it may be just as well that the ballot boxes should return candidates as the returning officers.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I hope this invention will also embrace some arrangement by which the ballot boxes will always arrive in time.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I suggest the addition of the name of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook).

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. POPE.

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all despatches, and correspondence and reports, not already brought down, on the subject of a treaty between Great Britain and Germany under which immigrants to Canada shall enjoy the same immunity on visiting Germany as those who have become American citizens. Also, concerning concessions from the Prussian and Bavarian Governments to the Allan Canadian line of steamers as to the agencies and booking office in Germany. Also, as to a monthly steamer of the North German Lloyds' from Hamburg to Montreal. Also, as to the setting apart of a tract of land for German immigrants and for Swiss immigrants respectively. He said: This motion is also founded on the same report of the High Commissioner to which I alluded a moment ago. In that report the High Commissioner, after his visit to the continent, stated that one of the greatest difficulties in procuring immigration from the German Empire was the lack of a treaty such as that which is mentioned in this notice, and such as we know has been the subject of discussion for a considerable time; and he pointed out the importance of entering as early as possible upon negotiations with a view to the consummation of such a treaty. He also pointed out that concessions by the Prussian and Bavarian Governments to the Allan line of steamships, which has local agents in Germany, would be an important element in securing a large German immigration; and he also referred to the importance of making an arrangement for a monthly steamer of the North German Lloyds' from some German port to Montreal. He also referred to the importance of setting aside a tract of land for German and Swiss immigrants, respectively, as an element to be taken into account in considering the question of the immigration of people from the continent. Bearing in mind the fact that the hon. gentleman in his special capacity of conductor of the immigration business of the other side, subject to the instructions of the Minister of Agriculture, has reported on the importance of taking these steps to facilitate immigration, and in view of the fact that, in his general capacity as High Commissioner, the hon. gentleman is charged with the conduct of this class of negotiations on the other side, I think it is important to know what steps have actually been taken by him and by the Government to carry out these suggestions.

Mr. POPE. I may say that I believe the Allans are really our agents in Europe, and they are very good agents at that, and cost us nothing. As to the other matter referred to by the hon. gentleman it is very difficult to bring about. There may have been some written negotiations—I think there were some verbal communications, but whatever there is will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to know that so much of the report made by the High Commissioner has been approved of by his superior officer.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT LEAMINGTON.

Mr. LISTER moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government and any person or persons respecting the erection of a post office at Leamington, in the county of Essex. He said: I wish to say a few words with reference to this question. I may say that it is nearly two years since the General Election was held in this country, and certain constituents of the hon. member for South Essex have represented to me that previous to the Elections of 1882 not only the member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle) but the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) promised the people of Leamington that a post office would be erected there. I am also informed that as no steps towards the

erection of that post office have yet been taken, the people of Leamington are naturally anxious to know when the Government will move in the matter. It is true Leamington is not a very large place, but if such promises were made by the hon. gentlemen they were no doubt made with the sanction of the Government, and the honour of the Government is pledged to the fulfilment of those promises. I may say that in looking over the return of post offices constructed during the last three or four years, it would seem to me that the promise made by the hon. members I referred to, does not seem to be an unreasonable one. I find that a post office was erected in Carleton, N.B., in 1883, where the total revenue from the Post office, Customs and Excise office amounted to only $1,552. Carleton, I believe, is represented in this House by a Conservative member. The cost of the post office in that place was $16,500. Another post office was erected in Sussex, which, I believe, is in the county represented by my hon. friend from King's, N.B. I do not know whether it was done to help him in the elections or not, but I find that it cost $21,753, and the total revenue from the Post office, Excise and Customs amounted to the enormous sum of $2,680. I find that in the town of Hull a post office was erected, at a cost of $21,290, the total revenue amounting to $1,798. In the town of Berlin, a post office was erected at a cost of $44,600, while the revenue amounts to $45,000. I believe my hon. friend for North Waterloo sitting on the opposite side of the House represents the county in which that money was expended. A post office was also erected in the town of Gananoque, in the county represented by another hon. gentleman on the other side, at a cost of $8,217, while the annual revenue from that building is $23,567. Port Hope, which is represented by the hon. member for East Durham, had a post office erected in 1883 at a cost of $25,912, while the total revenue amounts to $40,134. I find also that a post office was erected at Nanaimo, B.C., in 1882, at a cost of $18,994, from which the total revenue is $1,552. So I repeat, that in view of the fact that these post offices have been erected throughout the country at that particular time, just previous to the Elections of 1882, yielding such revenue as I have named, it was not an unreasonable promise for these hon. gentlemen to make. I think these hon. gentlemen respectively should get up and say whether they made such a promise, and if they did, to give reasons, if they can, why that promise has not been carried out.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I have great pleasure in tendering my thanks to the hon. gentleman for the kind attention he has paid to the county of Essex during the present Session. I trust the Government will always give proper attention to the representations of hon. members of this House, and that we will have the cordial assistance of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) in securing the erection of this post office. I am satisfied that if one thing were wanting in order to secure that building it was the assistance of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister); and I now appeal to the Minister of Public Works, in that gentleman's presence, in the presence of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and other hon. members, to implement any promises he may have made, to give the thriving town of Leamington a public building in the shape of a post office and Custom house. I may tell the hon gentleman that by the manner in which he has brought forward certain matters this Session in connection with the county of Essex, he has made himself the tool and the instrument,—the unconscious instrument—for the gratification of private malice. I may also tell him, that he is talking about matters of which he has no personal knowledge. He has made charges against me in the House, although he said at the time he was making them that he had no personal knowledge of them. He made a charge against me with regard to a particular harbour of which he did not even know the name; and on another occasion he attacked a respectable gentleman holding a public office in the county, though he did not know that gentleman's name. I say that it has been charged against that gentleman in this House, and in the press of the country that he has been shielded by the Postmaster-General because he was a Tory politician. I may say that that unfortunate gentleman never supported me when I was the candidate for the representation of the whole county, and that I am entirely disinterested in mentioning this matter, because he does not now reside in the portion of the county I represent, and never did reside there. He is not a Tory partizan, and I may say that he is so respected by the people, that living as he does on the boundary between the counties of Essex and Kent, he has represented in the County Council of Essex the old Reform township of Mersea, and in the County Council of Kent, the Reform township of Romney. That is the man whose character has been attacked because, by no fault of his, a registered letter was lost—who has been attacked in this House and in the Reform press of this country in order to make capital against the Postmaster-General. Now we have an attack made upon me and my colleague from Essex, and through us upon other gentlemen in this House, with respect to a public building at Leamington. Well, I trust that if there is anything fair or proper in the proposition of the hon. member for West Lambton, it will receive attention. I trust that there may be a public building erected some day at Leamington; and with respect to promises, I can tell the hon. gentleman that I hold myself responsible to the people of North Essex for any promise I made there or here or anywhere else. I consider myself as independent as any man who sits on either side of this House. I do not presume to dictate to the Government of the day what they shall or shall not do, and no member of that Government has ever offered to dictate to me what I shall do in this House or out of it. I am quite satisfied that the hon. member for South Essex has not noticed the attacks the hon. gentleman made on him because he considered that the proper manner of treating them was with a contemptuous silence. Now, with respect to public buildings at Leamington, I feel it due to that portion of the county of Essex, although I have ceased to represent it, to say that any promise which was made by me or by my colleague, the hon. member for South Essex, will be faithfully fulfilled to the letter; and I tell the hon. gentleman that while I might have retaliated by bringing up little instances in which he might have failed to do the duty he owed to his constituency, I refrain from doing so. I also tell him that in any matter affecting his constituency in which I can honestly and in good faith be of any assistance, I shall for the sake of my friends in West Lambton be willing to assist him to the best of my ability. I do not think that it is to the credit of the hon. gentleman, coming from a section of country whose interests are not largely represented in this House, to allow himself to be made an instrument for the purpose of creating an antagonism between different localities, instead of doing as we might, pull together for the common benefit of the people of that district. I do not know why my hon. friend has chosen to single out that county or myself for his attacks in this House. I am not aware that I have ever done anything to the hon. gentleman to cause him to attack me in the manner he has done during the present Session. I know that his visits to the county of Essex have been confined to those official visits which he has made as Crown Prosecutor, as the paid official of the Attorney General of Ontario, to do duty which the local ministers ought to perform, and which they pledged themselves in the Local House to perform when they received their increases of salary; and to that extent the hon. gentleman has taken the shilling to advocate their cause outside of this House, and possibly in it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman when he states that the Government built a post office at Gananoque, and to inform him that such is not the case.

Mr. COOK. Before this debate closes, I would like to ask the Government if they are aware that the erection of a post office in the town of Barrie, in the county of Simcoe, has been made to do service in several election campaigns. I do not suppose for a moment that the Government would use the public money for the purpose of influencing an election; and I am sure that as soon as the attention of the Minister of Public Works is drawn to the fact, he will at once put his foot on it and crush out any movement on the part of any of his friends in any constituency to do that sort of thing. A post office was for many years promised to the town of Barrie; and just before the last Election the hon. gentleman representing the constituency in which that town is located succeeded in inducing the Government to put a sum in the Estimates for this purpose. Just before the Election of 1882, a piece of land was purchased for this post office, and the Government got a man with a wheelbarrow to commence digging a hole to show the people of Barrie that they were in earnest about building a post office. They also had a waggon load or two of brick brought and placed on the ground. They remained there until the next Election for the Local House. When that time arrived it was noised about that the building was going to be erected immediately, and the consequence was that there were a few more loads of brick brought to the ground, and this time they succeeded in getting a waggon instead of a wheelbarrow, and enlarged the hole. But they did not build the post office. Well, immediately after the election, a petition was filed against the member (Mr. Phelps), and he was eventually unseated. In the meantime, the proceedings stopped, and the second enlargement of the hole did not take place. But after he was unseated, and an Election was about to come on again, they immediately started another game on the people, to endeavour to make them believe that they were going to have the post office, and I believe that this time they got half-a-dozen waggons and went to work to make the hole larger still. But since the Election I believe nothing more has been done. Now I know that after the attention of the Minister of Public Works is drawn to this matter, he will not permit that to be done. He lives in the Lower Province. It is unfortunate for the people of Barrie that he does not live in Ontario, because if he did he would not have allowed that to take place. But the Ministers from Ontario are censurable for not having noticed it. But I am glad to say that the people were not hoodwinked the third time. Barrie being a Conservative town, at the last Election gave a majority of 6, whereas at a previous Election it gave a majority of 158. This shows with what success efforts are being made to convert it into a Reform town, and of course hon. gentlemen opposite would not like that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the debate proceeds any further I would ask the hon. member for North Essex to withdraw the statement he made with regard to the hon. member for West Lambton having taken the shilling to advocate anything in this House. I do not think he meant that.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I did not mean that the hon. member took the shilling to advocate anything in this House. I think that the natural provocation which I have received from him all this Session, unnecessarily, and without any justifiable ground, is my excuse, and if I have transgressed the Rules of this House in any manner, I beg to apologize to you, Sir, and to the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to take this opportunity of saying a few words on this question which I intended addressing to the House on the bringing down of the Supplementary Estimates, but then they may be too late to have any effect. I do not want to raise an objection or to find any fault in particular with buildings that have been erected in the constituencies of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not pleasant, I know, to hon. members to have it cast in their teeth that certain things have been done in their favour, but I wish to call the attention of the Government to this one point. I myself, I think, first brought under the notice of the late Administration the necessity of giving increased post office accommodation, especially in towns where there was a large Customs and revenue service. I pointed out that in the large cities enormous sums of money were expended in the erection of very fine and costly buildings, and without attempting to detract from the architectural beauty which, I think, it is desirable that Government buildings in large cities should have, in order that they may challenge the admiration of strangers, I still hoped that some of the very great expenditure in those cities might be saved, and that the public interest might be served by the erection of public buildings, not so costly in their nature, in some of the other, not so large, but very important towns. The leader of the Government then, although the finances were not in the best condition possible, took the subject into consideration; and after I had brought it under his notice on one or two occasions, he announced to the House that he had a plan whereby he intended to give to four or five of the larger towns which have since become incorporated as cities the benefit of public buildings, and he mentioned the names of those towns. One was the city of Belleville which is in the county represented by the hon. Minister of Customs, and the others were the city of Guelph and the city of St. Catharines, and the city that is within the borders of my own county which I have the honour of representing here, and also the town of Stratford. I merely mention this point in order that the Government will notice that when my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) who then led the Government, adopted that plan, the Government, in adopting it, was not influenced by any political considerations at all, and in saying that I desire to do so without seeming to impute to hon. gentlemen opposite that they act solely on such considerations; but it is an unfortunate fact in connection with public buildings erected under their Administration, that, if I remember aright, there has been no public buildings erected in a riding which happens for the time being to be represented by an hon. gentleman on this side. It is the more difficult for me to understand that they have given as full consideration and justice to the different municipalities as did my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) when I note the fact—a fact upon which I do not wish to comment, but which has been alluded to by the hon. member for East Lambton—that many of the towns which have got these public buildings—and I am not finding fault with that for the present—have not the amount of public business transacted in them to anything like the extent that have other important towns which were passed over. That is the point I wish to bring before the Government. It does seem to me that while there are legitimate means which the Government may use to strengthen themselves and the hands of their friends, it is not a legitimate weapon to use against their opponents that public moneys contributed by all the people of the country should be spent for the benefit of particular localities, unless such expenditure be in the public interest; and again I repeat, without saying that the buildings erected have not been in the public interest, that the only way to avoid feelings of—might I say jealousy?—I may, perhaps, use that expression—however, I will only say that if any regard is to be had for public feeling with respect to the equitable and fair distribution of public money in that direction, the public interest would have been served better if the public had been led to expect that the towns having the most business, the towns contributing most to the revenue,

were taken up in their order, and facilities in the way of public buildings given to them as the public finances warranted. That much I desire to say preliminary to mentioning a fact which no doubt has, previous to this, been brought to the attention of the Government by the Postmaster General, who has been memorialized, I believe, for the erection of a public building in the very important town of Paris which now, thanks to the kindness of my hon. friends opposite, forms a very important part of my constituency. They represent that it is a very large and very important town, and, without instituting any invidious comparisons, I might say more important than many that have been favoured with these public buildings. I might say that the business transacted there of all kinds is of greater magnitude than that transacted in those other towns. I thought that perhaps the hon. Postmaster General would have recognized this as a very fitting time and a very auspicious opportunity for manifesting, by a vote in the Supplementary Estimates of this year for that town, his desire to relieve what I consider has been the unvarying monotony of granting public buildings to towns and cities wholly represented by hon. gentlemen opposite, in full accord with the Ministry of the day. I mention this without desiring to arouse any feelings of enmity or hostility on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I do think that in the expenditure of public money contributed by all the people of the country, we should, in the matter of the erection of these public buildings, take the same line of conduct that was uniformly acted up to by the late Government. If we should do so, I think that in any further grants that are to be given, the one that has been already brought to the notice of the Postmaster General cannot but receive favourable consideration at the hands of the Government.

Mr. HESSON. I am glad that we have had a post office erected in the town of Stratford, and from what I can learn from hon. gentlemen opposite it was the intention of the late Government to have erected a post office there, but unfortunately the revenues of the country were not then in a condition to warrant such an expenditure. When this Government found themselves in a position to do so, they very wisely adopted the course contemplated by the late Government, and I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is well to take up first those larger towns in which the Customs, Excise and Post office revenues combined make it desirable in the interest of general usefulness that public buildings should be there erected. I am glad to say that in the town the hon. gentleman referred to, where a post office has been erected, the revenue is of such a character as to justify that expenditure, and it is not one of those small towns to which my hon. friend has referred. In the town of Stratford the revenue returns of last year gave Excise $58,000, Customs $42,000, Post office $9,000, or a total revenue of $109,000, and the Government were paying rent in three different places. I think it was but right that the Government, under such circumstances, should take that place into consideration, and the post office erected there is a credit to the Government of the Dominion. It is not of that gaudy cheap style of architecture of which the country would be ashamed and which prevailed in the buildings erected under the late Administration. I do not believe it would be judicious to erect public buildings in every small place, but when the place is worth such structures, they should be constructed in a manner worthy of the Government, and not as erected in Guelph and Brantford in the days of the late Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Brant as to the unvarying monotony with which grants were made to counties represented by friends of the Administration, I must say that as regards New Brunswick his remarks are not quite correct; for during the present *regime* grants have been made for post offices in the county of Carleton which is represented certainly not by a supporter of this Government, in the county of York, which was not represented by a supporter of this Government, and in the county of Charlotte, in the town of St. Stephen's, which was not, and is not, represented by a supporter of this Government. If the hon. gentleman's accuracy in all other matters may be measured by his accuracy in this, the House will have not a very good impression in regard to it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I said I spoke subject to correction.

Mr. MACKENZIE. At what place in York was there any building put up?

Mr. FOSTER. The post office in the city of Fredericton.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, not by the present Administration. It was by the previous Administration.

Mr. PATERSON. So the hon. gentleman is inaccurate.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am happy to be able to set the mind of the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) at rest as to the Barrie post office. I think he has not been there lately, and has not taken as much trouble as he ought to have taken to inform himself as to the facts. I find in a Barrie paper of the 14th February some remarks which I will read to the House. I suppose, as a good Reformer, the hon. gentleman never reads the Conservative paper, and so is only half informed as to matters in his own county:

"Our Reform friends will not be at all pleased at the vigorous way in which the work on the new post office is being pressed. Ever since Mr. McCarthy first brought the matter before the attention of the Government, they have been in hopes that his efforts would be unsuccessful. When tenders were called for, it was a mere electioneering dodge, and the knowledge that the Reformers are an authority on this subject doubtless led many to believe it. When it was announced that the tender had actually been granted, we were assured it was bogus. When the work of excavation was commenced, the Government was just digging a little hole in which to bury Mr. Phelps. As soon as the election was over, according to our Reform contemporaries, who, of course, are in Sir John's confidence, the whole thing would be permitted to fall through. When the bricks were put upon the ground, they were mere dabs of clay that would melt at the first shower. These, of course, were electioneering tactics which the exigencies of the party required. But, when the election was over and the necessity for them ended, one would think they would cease. But nothing of the kind. When the excavation was stopped by the frost and a dozen men and teams thrown out of employment, there was rejoicing among the Barrie Grits, and Mr. Phelps was not ashamed to stand up in his place in the House and assert that it was stopped because he was elected. But now, when the stone is being delivered and the mallets and chisels of the stone-dressers are ringing all day, there is not a word upon the subject, not even a local line in either of Mr. Phelps' organs. What is music to the public ear is heard by them with bitterness of spirit."

Mr. IRVINE. I ought to be very thankful to the member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster) for having referred to Carleton. The hon. gentleman must know very well that the promise, at all events, if not the contract, was made by the present Government during the time the country was represented by the late Mr. Connell. I have to remind the member for King's that the Government of this country has done better towards the people of Carleton, New Brunswick, than he did. Last fall, he delivered a temperance lecture in the town of Woodstock, and he could not do that without reminding the people that, if they sent up a petition to the Government of Canada numerously signed, he would use his influence with the Government to put an illuminated clock in the tower of that building; but, he said, in return remember that your duty is to send a man to support the present Government. Allow me to say that the hon. gentleman got his deserts. Although it was in a Methodist meeting-house, he received hisses. That is the pay the hon. gentleman received.

Mr. IVES. In the absence of my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), I would like to call the attention of the Government to another kind of grievance altogether. It seems to be the practice here to complain that public buildings have not been erected in towns of a certain size. Now,

as a citizen of Sherbrooke, I [have] to complain that public buildings have been erected there, that is to say, they have been commenced, and the progress of construction has been continued so long that, if they are not finished soon, the people will really not be grateful when they are completed. I do not think the Government are doing this intentionally for the purpose of influencing the electors of Sherbrooke, because it is well known all over the Dominion that the people of Sherbrooke are the most uniformly sensible people that exist in the Dominion of Canada. They cannot be endeavouring to make better Conservatives of the Sherbrooke people than they now are; but, *badinage* aside, I think it has been almost as bad to have a public building erected in Sherbrooke as to have it not commenced at all. That building, which should not have cost more than $25,000—I do not know what it cost—and which is a building of the kind that our people are in the habit of putting up in six months, has been going on for two years. The principal street of the city of Sherbrooke has been filled with lumber and material and stone and rock for two years. The building is not now completed. The progress is very slow indeed, if anything is being done, and, unless the hon. Minister takes hold of the matter with that promptness for which he is noted, it will be two years still before the public will have any advantage from that building, or will be relieved from the nuisance of having the principal street of the city obstructed with rubbish and brick and material unnecessarily. For my part, I do not want a public building built in Richmond if it is going to take two or three years to complete a building such as the people themselves would complete in six months. Our people do not take long in putting up a building of that kind, and they have an idea that the Minister of Public Works, when he undertakes to do a thing, does it promptly; and I can tell him that his reputation is suffering sadly in our part of the country from the manner in which the contract for the public building in Sherbrooke is being dawdled over.

Mr. KIRK. As this is a question in which so many members seem to be interested, it might be well for me to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works the fact that I have presented a petition from the town of Guysboro' asking for the erection of public buildings in that town. I am not going to complain that the present Government or any Government have not done their duty in regard to erecting public building in towns, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned, because I think not only the late but the present Government have done their duty admirably in that regard. There are many towns in Nova Scotia where they have public buildings that do credit to the Government who erected them, but we have other towns that require those buildings, and the town of Guysboro' is one of them. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works, when he brings down his Supplementary Estimates, will pay attention to the petition presented to him, asking for a sum of money to erect buildings there, and will place a sum of money in the Estimates for that purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the hon. Minister seems to be in an unusually receptive mood, I would call the attention of the First Minister to the extreme desirability of redeeming certain promises made in his name touching the erection of a post office and custom house in the town of Napanee. I am not prepared to say that he made them, but I am prepared to say they were made for him—at least I was so assured by a great number of very highly respectable citizens of Napanee, who supported him. Now, Sir, it is rather hard that the people of Lennox, and the citizens of Napanee should lose both the First Minister and the Custom house, and I hope that justice will be done them.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the Government is justified in erecting buildings in any town where they are required. Now, Sir, I believe that in no town in the Province or in the Dominion can an investment be made to better advantage, in the way of public buildings, than in the town of Owen Sound. At the present time we pay rent for a post office, we pay rent for a Custom house, and for the office of Inland Revenue. I believe if the Government were to spend a reasonable amount in putting up public buildings there it would pay good interest on the capital invested. I would recommend the Government to take this matter into their serious consideration, and I hope they will see their way clear to make an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. As a number of hon. gentlemen are making suggestions in the public interest I would take the opportunity of making one if I have correctly construed the principle on which these public buildings are erected. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. McIsaac) tells me that a public building was erected in his county for some purpose but that it did not accomplish that purpose. Now that is unfortunate. He has been returned as an opponent to the Government in this House. I would therefore suggest that in future these public buildings should be placed on wheels so that they could be removed from place to place in case they do not serve the purpose for which they were erected.

Mr. McISAAC. I hardly feel obliged to my hon. friend beside me for making a reference to the building in my county. He asked me whether there was any building in my county about which I had any complaint to make, and I told him that I was fortunate in that a building was purchased there in 1881 and converted into a public building. But I have this to complain of, that the building is not yet finished. I had nothing to do with it. It was my opponent who, in the interest of the county, I presume, and particularly in his own interest, carried on negotiations with the Government for securing that building. That building was purchased in 1881, and somewhat over $5,000 have been voted in two instalments since, but I am sorry to say that it remains in pretty much the same condition it was at first. It may be finished by this time although that is rather a long time to finish such a building. It is about in the same condition as the building referred to by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). During the past two summers a load of brick has been hauled on to the spot every month or two, and a load of sand in another month, just enough to say that the work is going on. I hope no further time will be lost. I call upon the Minister of Public Works to see that it is finished immediately; and I may tell him also that the plans according to which portions of the building are fitted, are anything but satisfactory. The result is entirely too small, and there are other arrangements which are unsatisfactory for county purposes, and I consider it a great pity that so much public money should be expended in the way it has been. It might be expended to better advantage to the county, and, perhaps, to better advantage to the gentleman who had the superintendence of the expenditure—that is my oponent at the last election. I do not know whether it has done him any good. I have nothing to say against the gentleman. However, he did not happen to come here. I see by the return referred to by the mover of this motion that large sums have been expended on public buildings in counties where the revenue was not nearly as large as in my county; and I hope the Minister of Public Works will take means to ascertain how this work is being done, and that if further money is voted, and it ought to be voted, it will be more properly expended than the money voted in the past. I see by the papers brought down the other day, that the warden of the county was in correspondence with the Minister of Public Works but received no reply. Two or three rooms in the building were offered for county purposes

and the warden wrote to the Minister of Public Works to find out the terms on which the county should have the use of these rooms. This was over a year ago, and he has had no reply. I am not censuring the Minister of Public Works. I am glad that so much money has been expended there, because if the principle that has been insinuated guides the Government in the expenditure on public buildings, I am very glad that I happen to be an exception, and that over $5,000 have been spent in a county which sent an opponent of the Government to this House.

Mr. DAVIES. I have no complaint to make that a public building has not been erected in my county town, but I complain that the Government, having had a first class building handed over to them, have managed to burn it down. A few years ago a building was handed over to the Government as a public building. It was roofed with slate and was well protected against fire. The workmen were demanding a National Policy, there were plenty of men out of employment, and in order to give them employment—so it was rumoured—the slates were positively removed from this building and replaced by wooden shingles. The Government were warned at the time that the result would be, in case a fire took place in that wooden town, that these wooden shingles would probably catch and burn the whole building down; but it was necessary to give employment to the unemployed at the time, and they went through what seems to be the ridiculous farce of removing slates and putting on wood. The other day a fire took place; the south side of the square was destroyed, and just as predicted the sparks flew over and caught these wooden shingles and the whole building, costing the Government $75,000, was destroyed.

Mr. FARROW. This question has taken a very wide range. I suppose I represent a riding as important as any other riding represented in this House, and it is in a county as important as any other county in the Province of Ontario. I do not rise to make a charge against the Government, but I do rise to make a charge against the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is not the first time he has risen in this House to belittle his own riding, and I am very sorry for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Explain.

Mr. FARROW. I will before I finish. I say our county is second to no county in the Province of Ontario, and the other night my hon. friend had not a good word for his own riding, which is in that county, and to-day what does he do? When this discussion is going on, when he might have put in a good word for the town of Seaforth where they have no post office, what does he do? Why, Mr. Speaker, he says that the Government ought to build a post office in Napanee. I think it would have been well, and I say it in all good nature and advisedly, if the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) had put in a word for Seaforth, Exeter and Goderich. Those places are represented by what they call Grits, but I feel an interest in those places. The town of Wingham, which is in my riding, I hope will not be overlooked. Although I am constantly spoken of as having been an ardent supporter of the Government for a great many years—a fact which I do not deny, for I am proud of it—yet they have overlooked this nice little town, but I hope when it has grown a little larger we shall have a Government post office and Custom house combined, erected there.

Mr. VAIL. I desire to take this opportunity of saying that there is an important town in the county which I represent. A few days ago I received a letter from the inhabitants of Digby, asking me how they should proceed to bring the subject of public buildings before the Minister of Public Works, and whether it was necessary to forward a petition. I told them to send a petition by all means, and that I was quite sure the Minister would take the matter into consideration, and if he were disposed to build post offices in any towns in Nova Scotia, the claims of Digby would be among the first considered. When the petition is forwarded I hope the hon. gentleman will consider the claim put forward, and if he will enquire into the necessities he will find they are great. Digby has no public buildings of any kind, and it is a place deserving of some Government buildings.

Mr. GORDON. The remarks made by the mover of the motion with respect to the Nanaimo post office leads me to offer a few observations in regard to that building. It has been stated that the post office revenue was only $1,500, and that the expenditure on the building was over $19,000. That statement is calculated to mislead the House, and if the Government were expending $19,000 for $1,500 revenue, I would not support their action. What are the facts? The post office building at Nanaimo is intended to accommodate the Customs, Savings Bank, Post Office and Telegraph Office, and Internal Revenue Office. The Customs revenue last year amounted to over $34,000. I do not know what the revenue from the other branches amount to. I think the Government are perfectly justified in erecting such a building as will provide security for the books and documents of the various departments. These branches were formerly accommodated in wooden buildings, which were liable to be destroyed by fire at any time; the present building is, however, fireproof, and I think the Government were fully justified in erecting a building that will afford security to their various offices at Nanaimo.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). One of the complaints made by the mover of the resolution was, that the Public Works Department had constructed too many post offices in the country. That is not the complaint I have to make; my complaint is that they have not built a sufficient number. When the hon. Minister of Public Works comes to consider the question of providing for an increase of those valuable adjuncts in connection with the collection of public revenue, I hope he will take into his favourable consideration the claims of the town of Pembroke, in my constituency, a town of very considerable importance, where a very large amount of revenue is collected. I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the hon. Minister to its claims, and I venture to express the hope that when the Supplementary Estimates are submitted, it will be found that its claims have been recognized.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) has already called my attention to the wants of the town of Pembroke, and of course those wants will have to be considered and weighed well; but I am not in a position to say what the Government may do regarding the buildings at Nanaimo. I could not exactly hear what the hon. member (Mr. Gordon) said, but I may say that I think we have done what is required at present. If the town grows by the opening of the railway, which I suppose will be the case, of course, its wants will be greater, and the Government can afford to further consider its claims. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has called my attention to the town of Digby. I do not think I have yet received the petition of which he spoke, but I shall have great pleasure in receiving it and submitting it to my colleagues. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow) has called my attention to the requirements in his riding. It is a very important constituency, no doubt, and requires the consideration of Parliament, which, no doubt, it will receive in due time. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has spoken of the building at Charlottetown, which he nearly accused us of having burnt down. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that—though if he did know it, I do not think he would have spoken as he did—when the roof was removed, it was done in accordance with a report made by the architects

who were instructed to examine as to the condition of the building. The recommendation of my officers was to put on the roof as it had been built; and if it has contributed to the burning down of the building, I am very sorry, but it is not the only building with such a roof in thriving Charlottetown. The building will have to come down, and there will no doubt be an item in the Estimates to re-erect a building there. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allen) has called attention to the claims of Owen Sound. That is a familiar name to the Government. I think we have done a great deal for that place by way of harbour improvements, and no doubt the hon. gentleman will see that we cannot do everything at every place; we must do something at one place and afterwards do something at another place. Therefore, I think the erection of a public building may remain in abeyance until we see what the improvements in the harbour bring forth. As to Napanee, all I can say is, that so far as I am concerned this is the first time I have heard of a public building being specially required there. The ex-Finance Minister has called the attention of the House to that place, which is a very important town no doubt, and it will be placed on the list of names of those places where public buildings are asked. I cannot say more than that. As to Guysboro', this is the first time that my attention has been called to it. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has called attention to the delay in the erection of the public buildings at Sherbrooke. He is perfectly right in saying that the delay is very great. The reason for that delay is the fact that according to law if we call for tenders we have to accept the lowest who complies with the conditions and specifications of the Department. That system is one which has been followed for many years, though it has been found faulty by the several Ministers who have occupied the position that I occupy to-day. But it is provided for by an Act of Parliament, and I suppose each Minister has hesitated in asking for more powers than the Act gives. There would be less delay if we could follow the rule which prevails in some other countries, where the Chief Engineer, or other officer, makes calculations and estimates of the work to be done—makes the specifications. Then they call in some contractor who is known to be a good contractor, who has done work for the Government, and who has fulfilled his contracts well. He is asked if he will execute the work at the price mentioned by the engineer. The contract is made with such a contractor as that, and the Government is sure that they have a good contractor, and that the price is sufficient to complete the building and leave a profit to the contractor. Under the law we are obliged to accept the lowest tender, and the result is sometimes as we find it in this case, that the contractor breaks down after a certain time, and we have to take the work off his hands. This necessitates the making of new estimates and specifications for the remainder of the work. My hon. friend may rest assured, however, that my Department is pushing and will push that work to completion in as short a time as possible. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has spoken on the subject in a kind way, I must say, for he did not cast any reproach on the Department, but he thought that perhaps some of the buildings erected from time to time, not in the large towns, might be perhaps a little costly. The hon. gentleman must remember, however, that when you have to put a post office, a Custom house, an Inland Revenue office, a Weights and Measures Office, and sometimes an examining warehouse under the same roof, you must have a large building; you want to make it a substantial building, and, therefore, it will cost more money than you sometimes might desire. At the same time, I do not think there has been any extravagence in those places. The buildings are about the same now as when they were erected under the previous Government, and under the Government which preceded them. My attention has been called to the same subject by another hon. member, and I called the attention of the Chief Architect especially to it, in order that he might reduce as much as possible the expense without impairing the appearance of the building or destroying its usefulness. The hon. gentleman may rest assured, therefore, that the matter has not escaped my attention. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) has spoken in a very amusing way about wheel-barrows, carts, &c. These things may be known to him but they are not known to my Department. We had a site secured for the erection of the building, we gave the contract after calling for tenders, and the contractor is going on with the work. I am informed by my officers that the work is being proceeded with with all due diligence, and that the building, when completed, will be a substantial building, one which would be a credit to the place and to the Department. Now that I have answered as fully as I can the remarks made by the different hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, let me say to the hon. mover of this motion, that although two members for the county of Essex have spoken to me more than once with regard to this matter, of a post office at Leamington, there is no correspondence of any kind, and I would suggest that under these circumstances he should withdraw the motion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman forgot to say what estimate he would put in for Paris.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Paris is such a large place, and would require such a nice building, that I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman just now. He will have to wait for the Supplementary Estimates, and if he finds anything there he will be rejoiced, and if not I will be sorry with him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman say that he remembers nothing of any representations to him about Napanee?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. None that I remember.

Mr. BLAKE. We all know what an active memory the hon. gentleman has; we know how much he is master of the affairs of his Department, and I am convinced, Sir, that his memory on this occasion played him false. The hon. gentleman is an accessible man, he is courteous, he does not frown down those who approach him on public questions, and I am sure the first Minister was not afraid, he was not under any apprehension which would prevent him approaching the Minister of Public Works and asking him to make good those promises, which, if not made by him were made in his name, to the electors of Lennox, in connection with a post office in Napanee. Therefore, I am convinced that the first Minister must have represented to the Minister of Public Works repeatedly, must have told him time and again, and yet the Minister remembers nothing about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is convinced that representations must have been made to my hon. friend, and that he has forgotten them—that his usual accuracy of memory has failed him. The hon. gentleman says he is convinced this is the case, which only shows that he may be convinced, or profess to be convinced, and all the same be in error. The truth of the matter is, that I heard very little, if anything about a post office or Custom house during my election campaign. On the contrary, we heard that we should have our public buildings occupied by way of rental—that they should be rented still, because the person who rented the building was either a widow or daughter of the former proprietor, and her only means of subsistance was the rent of the building. So I never pressed that matter on my hon. friend. I must say that the Government is in an unhappy condition about all these post offices. There is no pleasing hon. gentlemen. If a public

building is erected in a constituency represented by a Ministerial supporter, it is stated that he is affected by getting this building—that it is placed there for a purpose. If a building is erected in a county which is represented by an hon. gentleman opposite, then hon. gentlemen, like the hon. member for York says, here is a building like the one in the county of Antigonish, which is built for the purpose of bribing the people to vote against the present member. So that there is no pleasing them any way. If we build a post office in a constituency of a Ministerial supporter, then it is said that it is built for the purpose of unduly gratifying him, or bribing his constituency. If we build at a place which is represented by an opponent, then we are told that it is for the corrupt purpose of stealing away his constituency from him.

Mr. LISTER. I wish to say, in reply to the hon. member for North Essex, that when I introduced this subject, I had no idea at all that it was going to provoke the discussion it has, or perhaps I should have been deterred from bringing it before the House at all. I would simply say to that hon. gentleman and to the hon. member for South Essex, that while they are representatives in Parliament they do not certainly represent the great proportion of the community. Those people have a perfect right to bring their grievances before this House by any means they think proper, and they have thought proper to bring this matter before the House through me. Now, I desire to assure the hon. member for South Essex that I have now, as I always have had, feelings of the greatest personal kindness towards himself. I should be sorry to say anything that would wound his feelings on this or any other subject. But if he thinks proper to take exception to what I say in the discharge of a public duty, I can say nothing as to that. I think the hon. gentleman, however, did not do credit to himself in referring to me in the way he did. As he has withdrawn those words, perhaps I need not say anything further about them. But he made an attack on Mr. Mowat, because Mr. Mowat, not being able to attend two Assizes at the same time, thought proper to appoint me Crown Counsel in the county of Essex, and I hope I discharged the duties devolving upon me there faithfully to the Government and to the public. The reference which the hon. gentleman made to me in that regard was unworthy of him, and when he reflects upon it I am sure he will think so himself. Now, I made no complaint against the hon. members for Essex or against the Government; I simply asked for information. I asked those hon. gentlemen to say whether it was true or not that they had promised the people of South Essex that those buildings would be erected. The hon. member for North Essex, while he was willing to reply, said that the hon. member for South Essex would treat my words with contempt. It is somewhat extraordinary to me that the hon. member for North Essex should have thought proper to reply himself. I asked this question, and it has not been answered; the hon. gentleman has not stated whether he made this promise or not. If he did, he should frankly say that he did; and if he did not, he should contradict that statement. I can only repeat that I have found no fault at all with the construction of this post office, but I mentioned the fact of these post offices having been built at these small places as evidence that the statement which has been made had something reasonable about it. In the town of Sarnia, where I have the honour to reside, the Customs receipts last year amounted to $94,646, and the place has some 6,000 inhabitants. In addition to that, we have Post Office receipts and Inland Revenue receipts; and yet the public offices in that town are a disgrace to the country. But, strange to say, a place with no more than 500 inhabitants, and yielding an annual revenue of only $1,500, can have public buildings erected, while large and prosperous business towns in the country are denied them. I think it is the duty of the Government to adopt a general principle for the erection of public buildings where the business done requires them, because otherwise the Government lay themselves open to suspicion, if suspicion only, that they are putting up buildings in these small places for the purpose of purchasing the constituencies.

Mr. WIGLE. I cannot sit quietly and allow the statements made by the hon. member for Lambton to pass without notice. It appears from what he has just said, that the town of Sarnia is entitled to a post office. Well, if the hon. gentleman will look more after the interest of West Lambton and allow South Essex to look after itself, he would be better serving the interests of his own constituents The people of South Essex are perfectly satisfied with their representative, but it appears that the hon. gentleman cannot find anything wrong in West Lambton, and he goes fishing about the country. He first took up the question of the Colchester lighthouse, and he could not find anything wrong there. Then he took up the Morrisburg post office, and he did not find anything wrong there Then he went to the Kingsville harbour, and he found it was all right. Then he went to the Wheatley post office, and tried to insinuate that Mr. Fox, the postmaster, was not the kind of man he should be; and the very same correspondent who wrote to the hon. gentleman, sent a letter to the *Globe* newspaper stating that the Wheatley postmaster had lost a registered letter containing $500, whereas we found out that it was less than $100, and that the postmaster said, "as soon as I find that the letter is lost, I will pay the money," and he paid it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is referring to a former debate.

Mr. WIGLE. I will leave that matter, then. I have said all I care about saying in reference to it, at any rate. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman makes a motion for certain papers regarding the Leamington post office. Well, Leamington is not a large village, but it is a place where a great deal of business is done and it probably ought to have a post office. I have always urged on the Government to build a post office there, but it has not yet been built. I hope that when the village grows a little larger, it will get a post office, and I am satisfied that when it is entitled to one, the Government will give it a post office. I am responsible for the acts of the Government in South Essex, and the people of South Essex are satisfied; and I say that I never promised South Essex a public institution of any kind in any election I ran in that constituency. I am perfectly independent, and I think the people of South Essex will not thank the hon. gentleman for poking his nose into that county. If the hon. gentleman wants any information with reference to that county, he can get it at any time by asking its representatives; and if he wants us to assist him in promoting the interest of his constituency, all he has to do is to come to us and say so, and we will be happy to assist him. But if he keeps fishing around, as he has done in South Essex, the people of that district will not think as much of him as they have hitherto done.

Motion withdrawn.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY FREIGHT CHARGES.

Mr. INNES moved for statement of the amount of freight charges of the Intercolonial Railway against the Londonderry Steel Works of Nova Scotia, for each of the years 1879 to 1883, inclusive; the amount paid on account thereof in each of such years, with dates of payment; the amount remaining due in respect of each of such years, and the security therefor, with copies of all correspondence as to such arrears.

Mr. DAVIES moved that the motion be amended by adding the following words: "Also, statement of any special freight charges of the Intercolonial Railway allowed to the Spring Hill Mines Coal Company for the carriage of coal from the Spring Hill Mines to Montreal, also the ordinary freight charges of the said railway for coal, fish and agricultural products from the principal stations on the said railway in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to Montreal."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ST. CROIX COTTON FACTORY.

Mr. INNES moved for a statement showing the value of machinery imported for the St. Croix cotton factory at St. Stephen's, N.B., the date of import, the amount of duties chargeable on the same, the amount paid and the amount still due and the security held therefor, and copies of all correspondence on the subject.

Mr. BOWELL. I would like the hon. gentleman to inform the House what object he has in moving for these papers. I am not aware there is anything peculiar in the importation of machinery or the collection of duties in connection with the St. Croix cotton factory any more than there is with any other factory in the Dominion. If there is anything wrong, I should like to know what it is, and I am sure the House would be glad to know the facts connected with it.

Mr. INNES. The papers will show that. What I wish to know and what the House wishes to know, is, whether this factory is indebted to the Government for duties.

Mr. WELDON. The statement of the affairs of that Company some time ago showed that a large amount of money was due the Government for duty. If that is the case, we wish to know whether the Government have taken a first lien on the factory and claim priority, as the hon. Minister of Finance did in the case of the Exchange Bank.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no knowledge of the statement referred to. No instructions were issued to give that cotton factory any advantage in connection with the payment of duties upon the machinery they imported, other than given any other similar company in the country. Of course the hon. gentleman will understand I am not questioning the veracity of what he says, but I have no knowledge of the settlement of which he speaks. The practice that has been in vogue in connection with the importation of machinery for any of these establishments has been this: They have been allowed to bring in the machinery to place in their mills. It goes in piecemeal, but after it is placed they are asked to pay the duty before operations are allowed to begin. That is the practice that has been carried out in connection with the Montreal factories, and not only cotton but other factories throughout the country, as well. If there has been anything remiss in the collection of duties down there, it has not been through any instructions given from the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite clear there has been very serious remissness, for I have been given a copy of the statement of the affairs of that company, which has been in operation for a considerable time, and in that statement there is an indebtedness to the Dominion Government for Customs duty on machinery, to the amount, if I remember aright, of something over $30,000. If it be the case that the invariable instructions of the Department have been to allow the machinery to be first set up as it goes in piecemeal, and then to insist on the payment of duty before operations begin, it is clear there has been a violation of those instructions, on the present occasion, of a very serious character. I assume the Government has a lien of priority for those duties; perhaps the hon. gentleman will inform me if that be so. It is clear that if persons have lent money on mortgage on the the factory, or have become its creditors generally, and afterwards find that the Government have a superior lien on the property, innocent persons may be very much embarrassed, and the indulgence of the hon. gentleman's officer may add to the distress occasioned to the people by the unfortunate failures that have cropped up throughout the country.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no question as to the lien the Government holds on all property brought into the country, on which duty has not been paid. That has been settled lately in a suit instituted in Montreal. I can inform the hon. leader of the Opposition that it is just possible that portions of the machinery may have been imported and not used, that a number of looms may have been placed in the mill and never yet used, and the delay in collecting the duties may have arisen from that fact. In some cases that fact has been called to my attention when I asked why the full amount had not been collected. Acting on instructions to collect the duties before operations commenced in the different mills, these may have been allowed to remain standing for too long a time.

Motion agreed to.

"A," "B" AND "C" BATTERIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) moved for a return showing the number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men at present comprising "A", "B" and "C" Batteries, the Cavalry School and the Schools of Infantry; also, return giving the names of the commissioned officers of "A", "B" and "C" Batteries, the Cavalry School and the three Infantry Schools, distinguishing such as are graduates of the Royal Military College; also, the dates of appointment of each, and the date of their commissions in the Militia; also, showing their previous service, and their qualifications.

Mr. WELDON moved in amendment that the following words be added to the motion: "And from what Provinces they respectively come."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

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

After Recess.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. FORTIN. Mr. Speaker, before this House proceeds with the business of the evening, I would like to make some explanation relating to part of a speech made last Monday by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). My remarks will be in the shape of a personal explanation. During the said speech, the hon. member pronounced the following astounding words. The hon. gentleman, it appears, wanted to pay a great compliment to the discipline that was carried on on board a vessel which I had the honour to command for sixteen years, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, but we will see whether he carried out his purpose. The hon. gentleman said:

"Let me make a comparison between the state of efficiency of the Militia of this country and that of our Navy. A few moments ago I observed Commander Fortin in his seat. Let us see how men in the navy have learned that the first duty is obedience. When an order comes from a superior they at once obey it. On one of the little excursions down the River St. Lawrence, Commander Fortin, of the Canadian Navy, was on board. While going down the the river, the men had a line run out aft for the purpose of catching fish. They hooked a porpoise. On hauling it on board the steamer, Commander Fortin said it was a shark. The men all thought it was a porpoise. But the Commander said it was a shark; and ever from that day to this, wherever the broad pennant of the Canadian Navy floats, a porpoise is known as a shark."

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this article is—I do not know whether the word ludicrous is a proper word; I should say in French *prête à rire* rather than anything else. Let me explain that the hon. gentleman has

made several errors. First, I was not on board of a steamer. The vessel that I had the honour to command was a sailing vessel, built after the celebrated *America*, now owned by General Butler, perhaps the finest vessel in the world. A picture of *La Canadienne* can be seen in the library of this Parliament, and I may be allowed to say, having been her Commander for so long, and having found the vessel such a faithful friend, that the tallness of her masts, the great spread of her wide sails, and her fine lines, made her very fit for the service which she performed—a difficult and important service, the service which was composed of cruising all the time, day and night, to protect the fisheries, and to prevent evil-doers from doing evil. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not of the vessel that I wish to speak. It is of its officers and its crew and of myself, because, in those few words, we are attacked; we are attacked not violently, perhaps not willingly, but, Mr. Speaker, we are attacked in our honour. The officers and the men that I had the honour to command were submitted to the same discipline as on board of men-of-war—if there was a difference, it was more strict—and those men understood what honour was, what duty was, what truth was, and, when those men were commanded to do a duty, day or night, in good weather or bad weather, they went to work and obeyed without reluctance in any way. Now, it is I who am specially attacked in this speech, and the people of this country, and perhaps the people of other countries where the speech of the hon. gentleman may be read, will suppose that I do not know the difference between a porpoise and a shark. Sir, I hold in my hand, printed reports for thirteen years in which reports I have described minutely eighty-three species of marine animals and fishes, and I think that hon. gentlemen and the public generally who know how long and hard I worked in describing these fishes, will believe that I can make a distinction between a porpoise and a shark. Now, Sir, as regards the discipline on the vessel which the hon. gentleman made the subject of his remarks. I will repeat, there was rigid discipline on board, and the men had great regard for truth and honour, and all the qualities of gentlemen. I think if I had been in the place of the hon. gentleman who spoke, and wanted to prove that there was good discipline among the sailors and that they were men of truth and honour, I would have contented myself with saying that the Commander, while in a state, I may say, of distractedness, saw a porpoise being hauled on board his vessel and he called it a shark, and asked his men and officers to call it a shark too; and I would have said that the men and the officers, out of regard for truth and honour, said it was not a shark but a porpoise. That is what the hon. gentleman might have said. I do not wish to speak at length on this subject. I rose not only to defend myself but to defend the officers and men who served under me for thirteen years—men who did their duty to their country under the flag which floated over their heads; men who did their duty in time of peace and who would have done their duty as well in time of war; men who would have stood to their guns and defended the flag of this country as their forefathers did before them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough, first to prove that the remark of the hon. member was altogether erroneous, and that if those who in this House or in the country, wish to sneer at the old Commander of *La Canadienne* and her officers and sailors, let them first go round the Gulf of the St. Lawrence and question the mariners who have seen us, and the fishermen who received help from us, as to the manner in which we performed our duty. I might also appeal to that hon. gentleman under whom I then served, and who is now a member of this House, when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I was ordered to go and report myself to the then newly appointed Minister of Marine the moment Confederation took place, and I went up the River Miramichi amongst strangers to me and to my men; and I would like that hon. gentleman who has seen us at work, to be pleased to tell this House and the country how we performed our duty.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the House passes to the next item on the paper, I wish to make a few explanations to my hon. friend—personal explanations to Commodore Fortin as a question of privilege. I may state to my hon. friend that I had not the slightest intention in the world of saying anything uncomplimentary to him in the remarks which I made in the House the other evening—far less had I any intention to say anything uncomplimentary to the officers and men of *La Canadienne*. I said, in all seriousness, what I said at that time, that I believed that their efficiency was undoubted, that a state of discipline existed which was complimentary to the Commodore and to the officers under him. If I made a statement about a little incident which occurred when the Commodore was passing down the Gulf, I did not do it of my own self; it was a common report I heard from several hon. gentlemen in this House. My authority for the statement was the hon. gentleman for Restigouche (Mr. Moffat), and I asked him to-day whether the statement he made was true or not, and he told me he had the information directly from the Lieutenant who commanded the vessel, Lieutenant Têtu. I am sure any hon. gentleman who heard me speaking on the motion the other evening, knows perfectly that I had not the slightest intention of saying anything derogatory to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, or to any of the officers or crew. I merely, perhaps, not believing the little story myself as I heard it from the gentleman, stated it for the purpose of illustrating the speech I made that evening, without any intention of insulting the hon. gentleman or any of the officers of his ship.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the House is willing, this matter cannot be discussed any longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, Go on.

Mr. MITCHELL. I merely rise because I have been referred to by the hon. gentleman from Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), and I am only going to occupy a few minutes. I feel it due to him, when insinuations have been made against him, and he is made the subject of what I thought to be ridicule, but which my hon. friend who has just sat down has explained he did not mean as ridicule, but simply repeated as a story—I say when the hon. member for Gaspé refers to me in the manner he did, he does it for the purpose of eliciting from me my opinion of the services he has rendered this country. I had the honour to be the Minister of Marine and Fisheries under whom the hon. gentleman served, and I will say this for him, that for efficiency, for discipline, for cleanliness and order, for the manner in which he fulfilled the duties of the very important office he held as Chief Magistrate or Judge, extending along a thousand miles of coast, his conduct was such as reflected the greatest honour alike upon himself and upon the Government he served. Sir, as his Minister, I take this opportunity of paying to that hon. gentleman the highest compliment that can be paid him. He was always zealous, and he did what a great many Militia officers do not do if we may judge from the statements we heard the other night—he obeyed orders—and looking at the reports, extending over thirteen years, and seeing the study, the attention, and ability, and particularity which those reports displayed, every one must agree with me in saying that the country owes to my old friend the Commodore a debt of gratitude for his practical services, and for the manner in which he performed important and delicate duties along that coast, where now his present

constituency lies, and the respect and confidence of whose inhabitants he then earned. In the Department over which I presided, we all liked him, we all loved him, and I can only say that I regret that he has had to come before this House and to make the personal explanation he did. But I am sure the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) did not mean anything personal, and that as he has made a retractation, I hope my hon. friend from Gaspé will forgive him.

Mr. FORTIN. Certainly, I accept with pleasure the explanations of the hon. member for South Lanark.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

Mr. HAGGART, in the absence of Mr. ABBOTT, moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I trust this Bill will not be pressed to-night, as I know the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), desires to speak upon it. The hon. gentleman is at present absent from his place, but may return in an hour or so, when it might be taken up.

Mr. HAGGART. I will not press it now, if it is understood by the House that the Bill can be taken up later in the evening; but the promoter of the Bill is very anxious to have it pushed forward, and requested me to move it to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go on.

Mr. CAMERON. There is nothing to be gained by pressing it to-night. I wish to raise a question of privilege in regard to this Bill, a question which affects the House, and I should prefer the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) to be present. The Bill was proposed by the hon. member for Argenteuil, and it was carried to its present stage by that hon. member, and I wish to raise a question of privilege affecting the position of that hon. gentleman in regard to this Bill. I do not like to discuss it in his absence; he is in the city, and I believe was in the House to-day. It is a matter personal to himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see how a question of privilege can arise in any way on a private Bill. If it is a question of privilege, it must be taken up as such, and certainly not in the discussion of a private Bill. However, this order can stand over and be placed at the foot of private Bills, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will be present at that time.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time, and passed:

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 80) to amend the Act incorporating the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Act incorporating the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

Mr. HAGGART, in the absence of Mr. Abbott, moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I rise to a point of order. I notice that the Bill stands on the Orders in the name of Mr. Abbott, the hon. member for Argenteuil, and I think it is according to our rules and practice that nobody else can move the Bill. I believe it can be done by another person in the case of public Bills, but not in the case of private Bills. The promoter of the Bill must move it himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. The English practice is that a member cannot move any Bill for another, if it is opposed in any way.

Mr. HAGGART. If a public Bill can be moved by another person I do not see but that the same rule should apply to private Bills.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. ABBOTT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I submit a question of privilege, a question of very considerable importance, a question which affects the independence of Parliament as well as the dignity and independence of members of this House. It is generally known, it is stated, I believe, in the public press, that the mover of this Bill, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) is the solicitor, the advocate, the standing counsel of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is understood that in that position the hon. gentleman prepares all agreements, all documents, concerning the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and prepares such Bills, advises upon such Bills, as it may be necessary to submit to Parliament by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and under his engagement as the advocate, the solicitor, or the standing counsel of the Company. Now, it is understood that this Bill which the hon. gentleman introduced, of which he moved the second reading, and promoted before the Railway Committee, was prepared by the hon. gentleman, advised on by the hon. gentleman, in his position as standing counsel, advocate, or solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If that is the fact, it is strange that the hon. gentleman should have introduced this Bill, moved its second reading, and moved it so far; because the hon. gentleman appears to occupy a peculiar position in relation to this Bill, and to all other matters of legislation in this House, in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are concerned. Of course, as a member of Parliament, as the representative of the county of Argenteuil, he is bound to bring to the consideration of this and all other questions, a free and unbiassed judgment. As the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as their counsel, their advocate, of course he is bound to advocate their interests. Now, I submit that it is a difficult matter for a member of Parliament occupying that position, when he comes within the walls of this Chamber, to lay aside his professional capacity, and to assume that free and independent position which every member of Parliament is expected to assume when he comes to deal with questions before this House. Now, I wish to raise the question here, whether or not the hon. member for Argenteuil, if he is the paid solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, has a right to move this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I might ask the hon. gentleman if he is going to raise a question of privilege as to this Bill?

Mr. CAMERON. As to this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not consider that this is the time to raise a question of privilege relating to this Bill. The question of a member's seat can at all times be brought up, but a question relating to a Bill cannot be brought up while it is under the consideration of the House.

Mr. CAMERON. The question I submit is the question of the right of the hon. member to move this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. There appears to be no question about that right. May says:

"Though a member interested is disqualified from voting, he is not restrained, by any existing rule of the House, from proposing a motion or amendment. On the 26th July, 1859, Mr. Whalley moved an amendment to a clause added by the Lords to a railway Bill, in which he admitted that he was personally interested. In the debate, exception was taken to such an amendment having been proposed by a member having a pecuniary interest; but the Speaker ruled that though it was a well-known rule of the House, that a member under such circumstances could not be permitted to vote, and though the course adopted was certainly most unusual, yet there was no rule by which the right of a member to make a motion was restrained, and he had been given to understand that Mr. Whalley did not intend to vote."

Mr. CAMERON. Allow me to call attention to a rule passed in 1858, which reads as follows:—

"That it is contrary to the usage, and derogatory to the dignity of this House, that any of its members should bring forward, promote or advocate in this House, any proceeding or measure in which he may have acted or been concerned, for or in consideration of any fee or reward."

Let me also call your attention to a statement of May:

"It has also been declared contrary to the law or usage of Parliament for any member to be engaged, either by himself or any partner, in the management of private Bills, before this or the other House of Parliament, for pecuniary reward."

The point I make is that if the hon. gentleman—I do not say it is a fact—is the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, although he has no pecuniary interest in this Bill, yet as the paid solicitor of the Company he is not in a position to promote it in Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. He has no right to vote upon it, but according to the authority I have read, he is not restrained from proposing a motion or amendment.

Mr. CAMERON. But you will permit me to say that that is not my point at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair; order, order.

Mr. CAMERON. That is not the point I am submitting at all, Mr. Speaker. I quite admit that a member interested in legislation has possibly a right to move a motion or amendment with reference to it in the House, possibly a right to discuss it, but no right to vote. But I mean to say that a professional man, who has been engaged professionally outside the House in connection with a matter of legislation, has no right to promote that measure in the House, and the rule of 1858 was intended to cover that class of cases. It arose in this way. There were complaints in the public papers that professional men in England had been engaged in advocating the claims of certain Indian princes. These professional men were also members of Parliament, and the interests which they represented outside they also advocated in Parliament. This rule was made to cover that class of cases; and according to it, a professional man, so situated, has no right to advocate in Parliament any matter of business in which he has an interest outside of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member raises a question of privilege, he must conclude with a motion. That is just where the difficulty is. When an hon. member objects to another hon. member moving a Bill at any stage, he is raising a question of privilege that ought to be raised as a distinct question, and that ought to conclude with a motion; and when an hon. member brings forward a question of privilege, the motion to which he alludes should be relevant thereto.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But you do not propose that a member should make a motion to decide a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; if there is no motion made I decide there is nothing to show that a member is disqualified from moving a measure because he has a pecuniary interest in it, although he is prevented from voting.

Mr. CAMERON. My object, Mr. Speaker, in calling attention to this matter, was to enable the hon. member to state in his place in the House whether he comes within the class of cases mentioned by me as coming under the rule passed in 1858. I stated, when I rose, that my information was derived from the public press, and I asked if that information was correct, because if it was, the hon. gentleman was not capable of promoting this legislation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman has spoken three or four times——

Mr. CAMERON. I have a perfect right to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whenever there is a decision of the Speaker, and any hon. member chooses to dispute it, he must appeal from that decision without debate.

Mr. CAMERON. I am not disputing the ruling of the Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. CAMERON. I want to know what the ruling is.

Mr. SPEAKER. I decide from May, page 389, of the edition of 1879, that although a member who is interested is disqualified from voting, he is not disqualified by any existing rule of the House from proposing a motion or amendment. Therefore, so far as I can see, the hon. member is not disqualified from moving this motion.

Mr. ABBOTT. I move that you do now leave the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall this motion be adopted.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hour for private Bills is up. It is the standing rule that one hour after the evening sitting is dedicated specially to private Bills. That hour is now over, and as I have on the paper some measure in which I am interested, I claim the privilege of coming, in my turn when the time is over.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hour for private Bills is used up, then the House must proceed to other business on the paper. As I told the hon. gentleman who was speaking on a question of personal explanation, he was taking up the time devoted to private Bills.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, you only took the Chair at 8:20.

Mr. SPEAKER. Whether I took the Chair at ten or fifteen minutes past eight, makes no difference. The Bill will be talked out in any case.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I would like to ask whether we are to understand that it will be the rule hereafter that the hour for private Bills means up to nine o'clock, for if the Chair is only taken at 8:20, that only leaves us 40 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour dates from the hour I take the Chair, and if I only took the chair at 8:20, the hour is not yet expired. There are still ten minutes left.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I maintain that I am not wrong in claiming that the hour is over. If it is not over, as you have just mentioned, it will soon be over. What is the question before the Chair? I maintain that the position I have taken is correct and I intend to prove it to you in the five minutes not yet elapsed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak French.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation). I am called upon to speak French and I will do it with great pleasure. I trust it will be in my power to show in a clear and distinct manner——

Some hon. MEMBERS. English.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is very extraordinary that when I want to speak English they will not allow me, and when I want to speak French they will not allow me.

An hon. MEMBER. Speak in Gaelic.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation). I must admit that I never spoke Gaelic. French and English are the two only languages I ever spoke. But to come back to the main question now laid before us, I think I may say that the rule invoked by us is binding and cannot, by any means, be done away with. If you are of opinion, Sir, that the hour is over, I am willing to end my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the hour over.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION BILL.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlton, that Bill (No. 6) to provide for the punishment of Seduction and like offences, be read the third time, and the motion of Mr. Foster (p. 666) in amendment thereto.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). I would like to ask, through you, Mr. Speaker, whether this Bill has been reprinted or not, as it was understood, I believe, when the amendment was moved, and it was cut all to pieces, that it should be reprinted. I ask if it has been reprinted, and, if so, why it has not been distributed?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; it has been printed.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). It is not distributed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that it was distributed this morning.

Mr. DESJARDINS. We have not the French copy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I object to going on with the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He cannot object, because it is not required to be printed. No amendments need be printed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was understood by the House, and settled by the House, in fact, that it should be printed before it was discussed, and that was one reason why the adjournment of the debate was moved, in order that it might be printed and distributed to members for their information.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The matter was suggested, but that does not afford ground for any member to take exception under the Rules of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The amendment was printed in the Votes and Proceedings, page 205. It has been in the hands of members for some days.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is in the Votes and Proceedings. The Bill has been reprinted, and the amendment is in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. MILLS. The rule does not apply to the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I moved the adjournment myself, and I moved it for the purpose of having it printed for the information of members. That was the ground of my motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is printed in the Minutes, in the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not what we required.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Every member is supposed to look at the Votes and Proceedings. The Bill itself was printed. This is a mere amendment. Hon. gentlemen may take some other method of killing the Bill, if they want to do it, but this objection cannot legally be taken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The understanding was that the amendment should be printed, and the amendment was printed in the Votes and Proceedings; but the only Order of the House on which I can go is the Rule of the House, which says that a Bill, before the second reading, shall be printed in English and French, and there is no Order of the House which requires that a Bill should be printed afterwards. The debate was adjourned in order that the amendment should be seen in print.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a motion before the Chair, moved by Mr. Foster.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). He does not move it now

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Foster) does not choose to move his motion, I move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The motion cannot be withdrawn without the consent of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then the House can pass on the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of Mr. Charlton that the Bill be read the third time, and the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). I move that the debate be adjourned, for the purpose of having the Bill printed and distributed in both languages.

Mr. CHARLTON. The amendments have been printed and distributed in both languages in the Votes and Proceedings, and, as you yourself ruled, Mr. Speaker, there is no Order requiring the printing of the Bill after the second reading. I submit that that motion is out of order, and, while I am on my feet, I wish to call attention to the motion now before the House. It will be in the recollection of the House that, in the Bill as originally introduced, the first clause provided for the punishment of seduction under promise of marriage, and for the punishment of a feigned or pretended marriage. That has been divided into two sections. One has been incorporated in the Bill, that for the punishment of seduction under promise of marriage, and the second is named in this amendment now before the House. In consequence of dividing one section into two, it became necessary, in section 4, to refer to offences named in three sections, which were formerly named in two, and the changes provided are merely verbal ones, except the one making a false or pretended marriage a crime. It is merely dividing the first section in the original Bill into two, making two sections for two offences, and making the verbal changes necessary in consequence of one section being divided into two. The matter is easily understood. It has been in the hands of the House since the last debate; it is printed in the Votes and Proceedings; and, although I would be quite willing to abandon this proposed section as to feigned or mock marriages, I do not think the House has any objection to that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is that the debate be now adjourned; the hon. member cannot give any reasons in the motion.

Mr. MILLS. Is not that amendment out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment is that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. OUIMET. I shall support the amendment of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Landry). But I would like to know if it is to be understood that our privilege of getting the papers of this House in French ceases after the second reading of a Bill. I think if the use of the French language is not only permitted but is enjoined in this House, it ought to apply to all the proceedings on any Bill, and until the Bill is disposed of, every order of this House to

have the Bill reprinted as amended, should mean that the Bill should be reprinted in French as well as English.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So it is.

Mr. OUIMET. I have had the Bill as reprinted in English, but I could not get it in French. It has certainly not been distributed, and I pretend that we have a right to it, and we shall insist on that right. This Bill, as it now stands reprinted, would be a disgrace to our Statutes. But I shall reserve further remarks on it until it is reprinted in French.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Montmagny. I must say, however, that we, the French members, do not always insist, as we have a right to do, that motions and other proceedings be read in both languages. Very often, in order to expedite business, in order that the time of the House may not be taken up by reading all the documents and proceedings in French, we waive the right and say "dispense." But hon. gentlemen should understand that though we may waive that right, they should not try to refuse it to us. This Bill has not been reprinted in French, though there was a formal Order of the House that the Bill should be reprinted as amended; and, Mr. Speaker, you have admitted that it was the understanding of the House that it should be reprinted in French as well as in English, and the First Minister has expressed the same opinion. Now, if that Bill had been reprinted only in French, I wonder whether those hon. gentlemen who are not willing now to delay its consideration because it is not printed in French, would not have insisted on the Bill being reprinted in the language which they understand best. Of course, I am not speaking for myself alone; I understand both languages and am able to speak them fluently enough to be understood, but it is a right, and when our right is contested, we must insist upon it. I am sure all will admit that this right is not left to the will of the majority of the House; it is a right we have by the Constitution of the country, and I must ask you, Mr. Speaker, that that right of ours be recognized and acted upon. For my part, I have often waived my right to have these papers read in both languages, but if that right is contested, of course we shall have to insist upon it strictly, and have all documents, all motions, and all proceedings read in both languages.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very sorry that our friends from the Province of Quebec take the position they do in this matter, and for this reason, that at this stage of the Session, the point they take is equivalent to a defeat of the Bill. The rest of the Bill has been acted upon, except the amendment I moved the other night. It is simply an amendment providing for the punishment of seduction under promise of marriage, limiting the act to twenty-one years. This amendment, now before the House, has been printed in French as well as in English, and has been in the Votes and Proceedings since the day of the last debate took place. This amendment could not be incorporated in the Bill. The point raised by my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, does not hold, because all the information he desires is already printed in French, and, Sir, I cannot but consider the objection raised to be not upon the point of the matter not being printed in French, but as an objection raised for the purpose of assassinating the Bill. The Bill cannot be reached again if this motion for the adjournment of the debate passes. Under cover of asking that the Bill be printed in French, the motion is directed against the provisions of this Bill as it stands; and although I would extend the utmost courtesy to the members from Quebec, I feel disposed to hold that the request is not a reasonable one. I assert that the papers, the motion, the amendment, are all in French; that those gentlemen have everything that they require in the French language in reference to this Bill, and the reprinting of this Bill in French will not enlighten them in the slighest degree. The Bill as it stands before the House now is simply the Bill as it was first introduced, printed in French, and with the one part of the clause which was struck out, reinserted—that with reference to seduction under promise of marriage. I regret very much that this course has been taken. I must say that I recognize in the course that is taken, a desire, not to get information in French, but a desire to kill the Bill, under the pretext that it has not been reprinted in French.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention is called to the fact that the hon. member has made an accusation that ought not to have been made.

Mr. CHARLTON. If I have made any accusation, or said anything in my remarks that was unparliamentary, or was unkindly to my French friends, I am very sorry. But it strikes me that they are quite able to understand this Bill without waiting seven or eight days to have this amendment, which, as I have said, has already been printed in French for several days, reprinted in French again.

Mr. VALIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I believe we are entitled to a French copy of this amendment. Among the members of this House, are a great many lawyers, but we are not all lawyers, and it is of the utmost importance that laymen—such as myself—who do not always understand the somewhat exclusive wording of the law should have a copy printed in French, of this Bill, in order to get information on the actual bearing of such an important Bill as this. Moreover there is a rule stating that both languages will be used in this House, and I for one will insist on its being carried out. We will have to give explanations as to our conduct, and it is important that we should know what we are doing, because it is a question of marriage, and marriage is always a very interesting matter. The crime, for the punishment of which this Bill provides, also requires all our attention. Before taking a decision we will have to consult persons thoroughly conversant with the law. I, for one, am not prepared to express an opinion until this Bill and the motion amending it shall have been printed in French, for one word misunderstood might perhaps be sufficient to put us in a false position, and we would be very sorry to give a vote which would be detrimental to the Province of Quebec or to the French speaking people.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Translation). After the peremptory reasons just given by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Valin) I have no more to say.

Motion agreed to on a division, and debate adjourned.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved that the Bill be printed in both languages, together with the proposed amendment.

Motion agreed to.

FRAUD IN RELATION TO CONTRACTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 12) for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the House resolves itself into Committee, perhaps the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to explain in what shape the Bill came from the Special Committee?

Mr. CASGRAIN. The Bill was passed by the Special Committee with an amendment. The most simple way is to read the Bill, which is as follows:—

"1. Whosoever, for the purpose of assisting in any election to the Parliament of Canada, or to the Legislature of any of the Provinces of Canada, while performing any such contract as in the first section of the

said, Act mentioned or awaiting payment in respect of any such contract or having held any such contract or awaited payment as aforesaid, within twelve months previous, or who, holding or having held any such contract, within twelve months thereafter subscribes, furnishes, gives or promises to give or furnish any sum of money or consideration whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, by himself or by the agency of another person on his behalf, to any person whomsoever, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to a penalty of not less than *one thousand dollars*, together with imprisonment, for a term of not less than one month and not more than twelve months; and in default of payment of the penalty so incurred, the offender shall be imprisoned for a further term of *twelve months* unless such penalty be sooner paid; and the offender shall, in addition, forfeit all right and claim to recover any payment in connection with such contract."

The object of the amendment is this: It is to prevent contractors who have contracts twelve months before the Elections, or twelve months after the Elections, from providing, either directly or indirectly, any funds in order to secure the election or return of any member of Parliament. The clause, as framed by Dr. Wilson, is drawn in such a way as to secure the object I have in view, which is to prevent contractors from providing, during the time they hold their contracts with the Government, any sum of money, directly or indirectly, for the promotion of Elections. That is the object of the Bill, which is a sound one, and one which should meet with the approbation of the House. Under these circumstances, I think the Bill should receive the assent of the House. I need not go into any details; I desire to avoid such a course; but I am sure the First Minister will see that the object I have in view is to secure the purity of Elections, and the larger the election funds are the greater is the danger of poisoning the electoral body. There can be no doubt that if you provide a remedy to prevent large contributions to election funds, there is a chance of our having pure Elections. I propose this Bill in the interests of the public, and with the good intention of its being passed and afterwards carried into effect. If this measure does come into effect, we shall have pure Elections. We know that our election expenses are small, and they should be so. I need not say that we have had, in the Province of Quebec, cases of persons who have said they control the Local Legislature. That has been a boast made in the public papers. It should not be so, and I think if the House will pass this measure, it will have a beneficial effect. I do not say it will cut off all the evil, but it will, to a great extent, deter the improper expenditure of money, as offenders will be liable, not only to a money fine, but to imprisonment. The amount of $1,000 would be a small penalty to a man who is making thousands upon contracts—he would laugh at the money penalty; but the punishment by imprisonment will have a deterrent effect, and will certainly prevent others from following such examples. I believe the measure is a good one in itself, and that there is not an hon. member who does not feel that it is one which should be adopted.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). The remarks of the hon. gentleman induce me to say a few words, and I will speak them in English. The object of the Bill is to prevent all fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public money. The hon. gentleman believes that, if the Bill becomes law, the election expenses will be very small, and that we will have fewer Elections in future. Our election expenses are always small, except perhaps those in the county of L'Islet. I have here a statement of the expenses paid by the hon. gentleman in his last election, and I intend to prove that his Bill, if it passes and becomes law, will never prevent him from doing what he has already done. The Bill is rather late in being introduced. It should have been passed last Session, before the hon. gentleman was returned by a minority of the electors. I have here, I say, copies of the hon. gentleman's election expenses, and I see that while he was canvassing his county he met poor children and poor widows, and was very generous.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Mr. CASGRAIN. To what extent?

Mr. LANDRY. Not to a very large extent—I suppose to the extent of his means. I find by one of the items that he gave a $10 bill for a bazaar, and 25 cents for a young lad who had taken his first communion that year. The hon. gentleman was so pleased that he could not do otherwise than give him 25 cents. I will now read it in French as it is in the return:

FEDERAL ELECTION IN L'ISLET, 20TH JUNE, 1882.

Statement of the personal expenses of the candidate, Philippe Baby Casgrain, Advocate, of Quebec, as furnished by him to L. Z. Duval, Esq., of St. Jean Port Joli, R. O., according to section 123 of the Federal Election Act:—

Trip from Quebec to St. Roch and return	$5.50
" " L'Islet "	4.50
Board at Achille Anctil's at St. Jean Port Joli	3.00
Trip there, 75c.; board for myself and horse, $2.50	3.25
Alms to the Goudreault woman sick a-bed	1.50
Refreshment in carriage	0.75
Telegrams	1.65

I suppose that was 50 cents for each brother—

Pierre Blanchet, carter, for his trip—a certain price agreed upon (*a bargain or job*)	$10.00
To the same, lodging and breakfast at his house on the return trip	1.00
Goudreault, sick a-bed	0.50
Child, first communion, gift	0.25

That is a gift to a young lad on his first communion: 25 cents. Then he went to a concert at L'Islet during the election: $1.70. Then he gave to the curate, or parish priest, for a charity concert, $10—

Dinner and supper at Jules	$1.00
Paid to Achille Anctil for himself, horse and buggy during election, balance	25.00

Here is an item; expenses for travelling:

St-Jean and St-Cyrille	$5.00
Another man receives	2.00
Another man named Nazaire Caron	3.00
Dussault and Brothers; bottle for him.	1.00

Now, the total of these expenses, as given by his agents, amounts to $230.75, and I find that there are a few accounts that have not been inserted in those general expenses. I hope, Sir, that the hon. member, if he wants to have a pure election, will not lose his time by attending concerts or giving charity to a sick woman. I hope that he will observe the law himself, and that he will add an amendment providing that candidates should not go to such expenses. I hope the Bill, when it comes before the Committee, will receive all the attention it deserves. I hope that we will make such amendments as will render the Elections purer than before, not only in respect to contracts involving the expenditure of public money, but also in respect to Elections involving the expenditure of the candidate's money.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give the full amount of the expenses. That is the question now before the House.

Mr. LANDRY. No; the question before the House is the motion to go into Committee.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will lay the paper on the Table, as the Rules require, we will see what the expenses are. I ask the hon. gentleman to lay it on the Table.

Mr. LANDRY. As a schedule to the Act I suppose. I hope it will be translated into English for the use of hon. members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In looking over the Bill, I notice that the Committee have retained a feature of the original Bill which induced me to speak against it before, and I believe, to vote against it. The first clause of the Bill reads:

"Whosoever, for the purpose of assisting in any election to the Parliament of Canada, or to the Legislature of any of the Provinces of Canada, while performing any such contract as in the first section of the said Act mentioned, or awaiting payment in respect of any such contract."

Now, the House objected strongly, and I did personally, as an individual member, to this phrase "awaiting payment in respect of any such contract." After a man has had a contract with the Government and performed all the work upon it, and has ceased to have anything to do with the contract, but has not got his money, he is liable to be sent to gaol for a year, and to pay a large sum of money because the Government refused to pay the amount. It may be a matter of long litigation. Look, for example, at the case of the Intercolonial Railway, which has been built for many years. All those claims are not settled yet, though the railway has been running for years, and yet this Bill disfranchises any one of those persons—he cannot be elected a member of Parliament, because ten years ago they fulfilled their contract and are awaiting their payment from the Government. This measure provides that if a contractor, while awaiting payment in respect to his contract, offers to give or promises to give any sum of money for the purpose of assisting in any election, either for himself or anybody else, he shall be liable to a penalty and shall go to gaol at the discretion of the court for one month or twelve months. So he is disfranchised, and cannot be a member of Parliament and cannot assist either in his own Election or in the election of his friends, even though the expenses should be as moderate as they were in the case which my hon. friend behind me has alluded to. This provision was considered exceedingly objectionable last Session, and in Committee I shall move to strike out these words, and after they are struck out, so far as I am personally concerned, I do not object to the rest of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move to amend the Bill in the way I have stated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point raised by the hon. gentleman may be fair enough as regards the man's own election. My hon. friend, I presume, did not intend to interfere with that. But there are very grave objections to any man who has an unsettled claim against the Government being allowed to subscribe to Elections. There is no more fertile source of bribery than the desire of men, who have large unsettled claims against the Government, to obtain a favourable settlement. And I think my hon. friend beside me is quite right in saying that this is a matter which should be settled by law. While men have these unsettled claims against the Government, they should not be allowed to subscribe to the election funds of either side. There is no intention of disfranchising anybody. They are not deprived of their votes, though I think there may be force in the First Minister's contention, that a man should not be prevented from subscribing to his own election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think my first objection, relating to a man's own election, is unanswerable; indeed, the hon. gentleman admits that it is. But after a contractor has fulfilled his contract, the action of the Government in keeping him out of his money should not prevent him from having the same right as any other man in the land. No Government should be able, by hanging up a man, to prevent him from exercising the same right as any other man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know that very heavy unsettled claims are preferred against the Government by the contractor after the completion of every contract. We know that it is in the contractor's interest that the Government should take a favourable view of his extra claims. The hon. gentleman knows, and every man in this House knows perfectly well, that whenever a large contract is concluded, these extra claims are preferred, and we all know that the Government are likely to treat them leniently.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks from experience, I have no doubt. He speaks with authority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the point of order. The hon. gentleman says we all know that Governments are lenient, and I say I suppose he speaks with authority, and we will take his own statement. I am not making any charge of any kind. I am only saying that I suppose he speaks from his own experience, and I do not admit that the experience has been the same on this side. But what I say is this, under this provision any Government could hang up a man and prevent his exercising his rights by refusing to pay his account, and in that way make him subject to an indictment and to imprisonment as committing a misdemeanour. I think it is an outrageous proposition; I think the very statement of it shows that it is outrageous; and I certainly press my amendment to strike out these words.

Mr. CASEY. There is a point that both my hon. friend from South Huron and the hon. leader of the House have overlooked. This measure has been discussed as if it prevented somebody who had already a right to be a candidate at an election from being a candidate. It only applies to contractors, and we know that contractors have not now a right to be candidates or to sit in this House until their contract is settled up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has been decided in the other way. When a contractor has finished his work he ceases to be a contractor, and all that remains to be done is to settle his account. This is decided by English law; and it was decided some years ago, by discussions in this House, who were contractors and who were not.

Mr. CASEY. With regard to the time between the conclusion of their work and the settlement of their account, that contention, no doubt, applies. But my hon. friend is right in insisting that that is just the time when corrupt contributions are likely to be made to Elections—just the time when a man who is hung up by the Government is willing to shell out in order to be cut down.

Mr. IVES. Not cut down.

Mr. CASEY. Not cut down in his figures; he might cut up rough if he were. Without imputing any motives to Governments, past or present, we know that constant charges of this kind have been current, and they will continue to be current until the thing is put an end to. If the hon. gentleman wishes to clear the skirts of the Government of all suspicion of being influenced to make favourable settlements with contractors, if he wishes to guard against such attacks as have been made when contractors, for instance, took frozen whiskey to spend it among the electors, he should support this measure. Now, the hon. gentleman wishes to prevent that sort of thing, and his only way to do it is by adopting this proviso which the First Minister wishes to strike out.

Mr. MILLS. I think that what we ought to consider in a measure of this kind is, whether there is any real mischief likely to occur from the absence of such a measure, and whether there is any evil to be remedied by that particular clause which the hon. First Minister proposes to strike out. What is the proposition alleged by the promoter of the Bill? It is simply this, that a man who has claims against the Government that are still unsettled, claims to which he

thinks he is entitled, but to which the Government thinks he is not entitled, he is much more likely to secure their settlement if he is a promoter of the Elections in the interests of the Administration than if he were not. The experience of hon. gentlemen during past years shows that there is an evil in this particular that requires to be remedied, and that this measure does meet the mischief. The hon. gentleman says we are depriving a party of his rights. I do not know that any one would feel very much grieved, who has claims against the Administration, to be deprived of the liberty of contributing any aid to any election other than his own, while that claim remains undisposed of. If the hon. gentleman will permit this clause to remain a part of the Bill, he will not find many petitioners asking that they shall not be restrained in their liberty, and that they be allowed to exercise those rights which he is so anxious to secure to them, by striking out this provision. The hon. gentleman says the Government may hold over a claim indefinitely. I suppose any person who has a valid claim against the Administration can, in almost every instance, have redress by petition of right; and however anxious the Government may be to delay settlement, they cannot prevent him seeking redress in the courts. We have had many instances, during the last ten years, of redress being sought in the Court of Exchequer, and of its being obtained against the views and even the active opposition of the Administration. This is not an unreasonable proposition. There is a real evil requiring redress, and this clause does afford a reasonable remedy for the mischief. I do not suppose it is possible to propose a measure in this House as a redress for some wrong in the conduct of public affairs, to which exception cannot be taken. But the fact that exception may be taken is, after all, no valid objection against such a proposition. The question is, if there is an evil that requires to be redressed, is this a reasonable mode of seeking to redress it? I think there does exist the mischief sought to be remedied, and I believe this is not an unreasonable remedy. Before the hon. gentleman objects to this, he ought to submit to the Committee some mode of redress for the mischief complained of, which will accomplish the same object and be less open to objection than that before the Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say that this provision in this clause will be called an Act for the purpose of inducing Governments to be corrupt. The hon. gentleman admits that any other person has a right to spend money in a legitimate way to promote his own election or the election of a friend, or anybody else. Provided his expenditure is within the limit of the law, there is no fault in him. A man who has performed his contract to the public and the Government has a right to take his money; but if there is a dispute between the two, he is to be punished for doing what otherwise would be perfectly correct, for fear that the Government might grant him, if he might be corrupted, some favour. That is like the old plan adopted with the children of our English and Scotch kings, that when a young prince behaved badly they had a boy who was whipped in punishment for the young prince's sins. For fear the Government may be corrupt, this man is to be guilty of a misdemeanour and sent to gaol. But what is to prevent the corrupt Government saying at once to contractors—the hon. gentleman says we all know the Government will be lenient in settling the account—well, if the Government is corrupt enough to be lenient because a man has subscribed to election funds, all the contractor has to do is to go the Government and say: settle my claim at once; this Act is passed, as long as I have to wait for payment, I cannot help you, but just pay me what I want and I will do so. Of course the Government, if it be a corrupt Government, as it must be in order to make out this case, they will settle up the account at once. Then the party will not be waiting payment; then he will spend his money and be very grateful for having got such a large sum out of the Government; he will work at the elections; he will come down handsomely, as my hon. friend says. There is no ground or basis for that sentence in the clause; otherwise, personally, I do not object to it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is no doubt that there have been and that there are still to-day a number of contractors with large claims pending against the Government for a long period of time. Of course, in many instances, that cannot be helped; but these contractors, in the meantime, are absolutely in the hands of the Government, and being under the influence of the Government they will, in order to get a settlement of their account, in order to get the favour of the Government, befriend the Government, by subscribing in the proper time for the Elections. I can say this from what I have seen, and I know it is the experience of everybody. This clause does not deprive any man of his real rights. A contractor cannot be a member of Parliament under the law as it exists to-day. If this clause were for an unlimited period, I agree that it would be hard; but the period is limited to a certain time—six or twelve months—during which he will be debarred from subscribing. There is another reason which I consider covers the case. Why should that man be at liberty to subscribe at an election at all, when no money is wanted for an election? The hon. member for Montmagny quoted my personal election. I gave every cent in my expenses which I had to expend directly. I was bound in honour and conscience to do it, and I did it; and what did that amount to? It amounted to some $340 for running that county during more than six weeks. That was all my own expenses and I might have made my expenses heavier. I made them exactly under the law and I do not want any contractor to come forward and help me to pay my election expenses. Where is the member of Parliament to-day who could not carry his own elections for three, or four, or five hundred dollars, especially in the counties? Therefore, I mean to say that it is not needed at all to have recourse to outside subscribers. It is not necessary at all, and, in the few instances in which it might be necessary, a candidate will find a friend to help him rather than go to a contractor. That is what I want to bring to the consideration of the House, and I am sure this is the true principle upon which we ought to be guided in conducting our own elections. That is the reason why I bring this measure forward, and I hope it will be carried with the intent that I have in view—that is to say, to make it effective before the country.

Mr. CARON. Occasionally we hear a good deal about Provincial rights. Now, there is a point in the Bill of the hon. member which I consider to be of very great importance. I can easily understand that we should have jurisdiction to enact a Bill for the purposes of our own Federal Elections——

Mr. CASGRAIN. If the hon. member will allow me, we will discuss that question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CARON. But how, in a Bill framed by an hon. member in this House of Parliament, he could put in such a clause as to provide that whosoever, for the purpose of assisting in any election for the Parliament of Canada, or the Legislature of any of the Provinces of Canada——

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will you allow me?

Mr. CARON. I can understand that the hon. gentleman's zeal should display itself in regard to elections affecting the Parliament of Canada, but I am afraid he is over-stepping the mark, and, in his zeal to make our elections absolutely pure, he is going beyond the jurisdiction of

this Parliament, and enacting a law affecting elections over which we have not the slightest jurisdiction.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If the hon gentleman would have allowed me, I would have cut short that speech. If you refer to the Act passed last year, you will see that we have provided exactly what is in this Bill. It applies both to the Local Legislature and to the Federal Parliament.

Mr. CARON. But that is no answer that the hon. gentleman should make mistakes two years running.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is the House, not me.

Mr. CARON. It is no answer to say that the hon. gentleman made the same mistake last Session. If it is wrong this Session, he should not have put it in the Bill last Session; or, if he found it out after the Bill passed last Session, he should have taken it out this Session.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see, if he looks at the measure, that it is declared in this Bill that this is a crime; it is made a misdemeanour. Now, while the Local Legislatures can punish by fine and imprisonment any offence commited against any of the laws of the Provinces, it is very doubtful whether they could declare any particular act against their legislation a crime. I am not going to argue the question as to whether they can do so or not. They certainly have the power of declaring certain acts, by the British North America Act, offences against local legislation, and can punish them by fine and imprisonment, but I do not think, when they are specially authorized to punish such offences by fine and imprisonment, that we can assume that they have any implied power beyond that to make any offence a crime; and this Act declares that. Whether it is expedient or not expedient to declare offences against local legislation crimes, is another question; but there can be no doubt that, if it is proper to declare this act a crime, here is the proper place to make that declaration, and it is by an Act of the Parliament of Canada and not by an Act of the Local Legislatures that the declaration should be made. Now, the hon. the First Minister refers to the clause which he read, relating to contractors awaiting payment, and he thinks it strongly objectionable that we should declare that parties who have claims against the Government, should not, while those claims are in existence, be allowed to contribute to any other elections than their own. The fair way to consider this question is to consider what are the practical mischiefs that grow out of the power to make such contributions, on the part of persons who have claims against the Administration, the same as those who have actually subsisting contracts. Why, look at what transpired in the case of the Local Elections last year, in the Province of Ontario. Everybody knows the Shields' brigade, who went from this city into the Muskoka district. Every body knows the relation in which those parties are said to have stood to the Administration. They were large contributors to the election of the Conservative candidate. Their corrupt acts were in part, and only in part, disclosed in the courts. It was rumoured abroad everywhere that those contractors had their work remeasured by an engineer favourable to them, for the purpose of enabling them to receive a larger sum from the Government than they otherwise would receive. Now, I am not saying whether that is a well-founded charge or not. I am expressing no opinion upon that. I do not care whether it is well-founded or not, for the purposes of this discussion. But it is a very serious matter that such a charge should be made, and that a large portion of the community should believe such an offence possible. Suppose they had already completed their contract, and were simply awaiting payment and asking for remeasurement of their work by an engineer more favourable to them than the one who had been employed on the road, would not all the objections that apply to their conduct, while there is a subsisting contract, be equally applicable to them in case their work had been completed and was simply awaiting payment? I say that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, as well as on this, will see that the objection would have been quite as strong if their work had been completed and the contributions had been made, as it was when the work was incomplete, and those contributions were made. If we propose legislation on this subject, we should look at the evils that are likely to arise in these cases, and should make our legislation what experience shows is necessary to remedy these mischiefs; and it seems to me that the objection is quite as strong in the case of parties who have been contractors and are awaiting payment from the Government, as if those contracts were still subsisting, and something was still required to be done on the part of the contractors. If the right hon. gentleman can point out any difference in the hypothetical cases that I have put, in the case of actual contract and the case of a completed contract awaiting payment, I should be delighted to hear the distinction which the hon. gentleman, no doubt, can make; but, to my mind, they seem to stand upon exactly the same footing, and the objections which lie against the one lie equally strong against the other, and if a remedy is proper in the one case a remedy is equally proper in the other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it necessary to go into any discussion of that section. The hon. gentleman has explained his views and I have explained mine. But as to the point raised by the Minister of Militia, there is a good deal in it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), is quite correct in stating that a Provincial Legislature cannot declare any matter to be a crime or a misdemeanour or any other branch of the criminal law. What the British North America Act declares is that, for the purpose of enabling the Legislatures to enforce their laws, they can punish a breach of those laws by fines or imprisonment, or by fines and imprisonment. They can do that, but that does not make it a branch of the criminal law. Therefore, for the purpose of making it a branch of the criminal law, it must be put in a Bill here. But, on the other hand, the Parliament of the Dominion must be very guarded, as, under the guise of making a matter a criminal offence, they can rob a Local Legislature of most of its jurisdiction. They can say, for instance, that a man who does not pay his debts for a year has committed a misdemeanour, an offence, and shall go to gaol. That interferes with the law of contract.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Take the Factory Act as an illustration.

Mr. MILLS. The Factory Act is a case in point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will discuss the Factory Act when it comes up. Parliament could, in fact, deprive the Provincial Legislatures of most of their jurisdiction, for they could declare any breach of contract to be a misdemeanour. Now, the question is whether we ought to interfere with a subject connected with the election laws of the different Provinces. They can pass a law in the Provinces stating, in the words of this Bill, that no contractor shall be allowed to subscribe to any election, and if he does subscribe to any election and commits a breach of this Statute, then he is liable to fine and imprisonment. They can do that. Hence, I think my hon. friend's objection is well taken, in spirit, though if it is to be declared a misdemeanour, it can only be declared a misdemeanour by this Legislature.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I assent, with as good grace as possible, to the suggestion of my right hon. friend, and accept the amendment.

Mr. CARON. I propose that we strike out of the Bill the words "or to the Legislature of any of the Provinces of Canada."

Mr. CASGRAIN. There may be something in the objection made by the Minister of Militia, but we discussed the same point last year and the House, after deliberating upon that very point, adopted the view which I take now, and in which I followed in the Bill passed last year. Of course, if the House does not desire to follow the precedent of last year, it may go back upon its former decision. Of course, I am in the minority and cannot dictate, but I desire to call attention to the fact that in the Bill of last year these very words are inserted and are the law of the land to-day.

Mr. DAVIES. I have no doubt that this Legislature has power to pass the Bill in the form in which it now stands, but, personally, I do not think it is a matter of good policy for us to interfere and to declare, with reference to elections for the Local Legislatures, that certain things shall be misdemeanours. We may have power to do it in strict right, but I object myself to any unnecessary interference with Provincial rights, and on that ground I am strongly inclined to support the objection taken by the Minister of Militia, although I think the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) is right in introducing it. As a matter of policy, I think it is not desirable.

Amendment (Mr. Caron) agreed to.

Mr. MACMASTER. The effect of the clause as it now stands would prevent a tenderer for a contract from being a candidate for Parliamentary election. Of course, it is undesirable, and it could not be, that a tenderer whose tender was accepted, could be a candidate at a Parliamentary election; but the effect of the clause, as it now stands, is to prevent every man who has put in a tender for any public contract from being a candidate for Parliamentary election.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very proper thing.

Mr. MILLS. I think it simply prevents him subscribing for the election, not from being a candidate. But it is a question relating to the independence of Parliament, as to whether he may or may not be a candidate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he is a tenderer he cannot put up the $200 under this clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that it is a very desirable thing. I do not think any man who is a tenderer for any public contract ought to be a candidate for Parliament. I think the amendment is a very excellent one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong. Now, suppose tenders are called for, and there are ten, or fifteen, or twenty tenderers. They send in their tenders and they remain there before the Government, who are not ready to decide. Or, suppose the Government wish, under this law, to prevent a man who has tendered from being able to run at an election, the tender might be taken into consideration and kept two, three or four months. He is a tenderer, and his tender is there and he cannot be a candidate. Surely the object of the Bill is the exact contrary of this. You do not wish to put the fate of a candidate, or of any man who wishes to be a candidate, in the hands of the Government of the day, but you wish him to be free. In this case, the man who has tendered might be not at all acceptable; he might have put in the highest tender; but the Government not having decided, but keeping the matter three, four or five months in suspense, he cannot become a candidate, even though he were the most desirable candidate of his party. That, I think, is not the desire of the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not see any particular difficulty. If the tenderer be a desirable candidate in the interests of the party, it is a very simple matter for him to withdraw his tender.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then he will forfeit his deposit.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If he puts in his tender and insists on being a contractor, then he cannot be a candidate. If he prefers running for Parliament instead of getting a contract he can withdraw his tender, and I apprehend he he will be relieved of all responsibility.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that it is not desirable that any contractor should be a candidate for Parliament. I take that stand at once. I think the difficulty raised is of a most infinitisimal kind. I think a great many men are more likely to be good candidates, on either side, than the small number of persons who would be tendering for contracts under the Government. That is, of course, a matter of opinion. I think the provision a very excellent one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the words, "or holding such contracts, and while such contracts are under the consideration of the Government, for acceptance or rejection," be struck out.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see that the provision touches the person's eligibility, and that is the question which the hon. Minister has raised. His own case is excepted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not excepted.

Mr. DAVIES. That would be met by inserting, "in any election except his own."

Amendment (Sir Hector Langevin) agreed to.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is something in this Bill which I think is contrary to our legislation, and that is as regards the punishment of the offender. I do not think the Bill is a good one, and I will vote against it as a whole; but if the Bill is to pass, I say that, considering the circumstances of the case, there should not be a minimum of penalty and of punishment. Let the House set the penalty as high as it deems proper, but leave it to the Judge to consider what less amount of imprisonment and fine should be imposed. A trifling offence might arise—for a nest of lawsuits will be created by this Bill—and hon. gentlemen opposite will not object to provide, as is done even with respect to felonies, that the penalty should not be more than a certain fine or certain term of imprisonment, leaving the application to the Judge. Such a provision would be more in accordance with our ordinary criminal legislation.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman always forgets that Parliament intervenes and passes an Indemnity Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think the hon. gentleman should make that statement, as he himself passed a Bill to relieve a very large number of his supporters from penalties attached to violating the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. BLAKE. And you.

Mr. BOWELL. I never asked any consideration at your hands, or at the hands of anyone else. The statement made in regard to myself I knew was not correct, and I challenged the hon. gentleman and his party to test it in the courts, or anywhere else. When the hon. gentleman made that statement, he made an insinuation which I believe he knew was not correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. I apologize to the House, not to the hon. gentleman, who, I think, knew when he made the statement that he was stating what there was no foundation for stating. When hon. gentlemen opposite are so ready to talk about introducing Acts of Indemnity, they should look at their own deeds: they should look at what

they have done in their Local Legislature. How many were relieved there? How many were relieved by those hon. gentlemen in this House, when a dozen contractors, from the Speaker of the House down to hon. members, who were sitting here; when half a dozen, or seven or eight, of the hon. gentleman's friends were afraid to take their seats Some resigned and were re-elected and others were rejected, and that hon. gentleman was always ready to pass an Act of Indemnity. It would sound very well, coming from the hon. gentleman, to talk in this way, if he could clear himself, and if his party had never done anything requiring an Indemnity Act. If such were the case, we could well understand their assumed purity and virtue in connection with these matters.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg to say that according to my knowledge and belief, and it has always been such, the hon. gentleman's seat was voided. I believe that was decided by the Privileges and Elections Committee, which decided the case of Mr. Anglin, and I believe if it had not been for the Indemnity Act, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) would have been liable for the penalties. So with the case of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who resigned in consequence; so was it with the late member for Restigouche (Mr. Moffat); so was it with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier). So to say that that Indemnity Bill was designed to meet cases on one side and not on the other is—I will not repeat the hon. gentleman's offensive words. He will remember the words he used to me the other day; he can apply them to himself.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move that the clause be changed so as to read, "the penalty not to exceed a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months." The idea of imprisoning a man for twelve months for giving a subscription of perhaps $1 for election purposes, is preposterous.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I desire to direct the attention of the House to the nature of some of those offences, in cases covered by the Indemnity Bill, to show how contractors, such for instance as Mr. Currier, might be made liable to the clause in the present Bill. An officer of the Government went to his saw-mill and bought some boards which he wanted. Mr. Currier's man sold the boards and the bill was sent in in the ordinary way, in the name of Mr. Currier, who received the money but lost the receipt. Everybody in the House felt that the case was—

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was known and proved that Mr. Currier had been for years doing a large business for the Government——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am quite sure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, this individual sale was one such as any hon. gentleman might make in the ordinary course of business; it was a small account of $2—that I am sure about. It struck me as being a very hard case. Suppose a case of this kind. Take the case of a trunk maker, or a man who makes boxes, and a contract is made with him to furnish ten, or twenty or thirty packing boxes for any of the Departments. He is to be paid for them; he is as much a contractor as if it were to build a railway or a canal, though the whole account may only be £10. Yet if he should accidentally, after becoming a contractor, give 25 cents to a boy on his first communion, for improper purposes, for political purposes, or without any purpose—if he subscribes $1 to make up the $200 for a candidate, or to bring out a workingman's candidate who cannot raise the $200—this man who has a contract for £10, which contract is not yet finished, is liable to be tried for a misdemeanour, and pay a fine of not less than $1,000. The mere statement of such a case, shows with how little consideration the Act has been framed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The Committee to whom the Bill was referred reported it in its present form, and I do not think it deserves the strictures which the hon. gentleman has thought proper to pass upon it. It is true, the Bill may not be as properly drawn as it might be, and that is the reason why last year I asked the House to give me the benefit of their assistance in making the measure as perfect as possible. Moreover, last year I asked the Government to take this measure off my hands, and make it a Ministerial measure. I did my best with the Committee, however, to frame the Bill as well as possible, and it is in the hands of the House. It is a public question; it is not my own private measure, though I have striven very hard to have it carried in the way in which I think it would be most beneficial to the public. At the same time, I repeat, it is more in the hands of the House than in my hands.

Mr. BERGIN. I do not feel disposed to vote for this amendment of the Secretary of State any more than I feel disposed to vote for this Bill, which appears to me to be most effectually framed as a means of executing private vengence on a contractor who may dare to exercise his political opinions on any occasion. I do not know that this House has had before it any such tyrannical or arbitrary measure as this appears to be. No discretion is left to the Judge. No matter how trivial may be the offence, how small may be the sum, or how innocently it may be expended, the Judge must fine the man $1,000, and he may also add a year's imprisonment. And the offence against public morality—the offence against public justice, does not end there. In addition to all that, if his contract happens to be a good one and he is obnoxious to the person who prosecutes him, or the Government who directs the prosecution, all his profits in that contract are to be taken away from him. I ask you whether it is just and proper, in a free country like this, that such a law should come in force. To test the opinion of the House, I move the Committe do now rise.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has taken certain objections to the Bill as it stands, but he has carefully avoided making any objections to the amendment proposed by the Secretary of State, which meets his objection. The Bill does not leave the matter in the hands of the Judge, but the amendment of the Secretary of State leaves him a discretion. It says that the man shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000—the fine may be $1; or by imprisonment—not "and," it is disjunctive—of not more than six months; it may be an imprisonment of one hour.

Mr. BERGIN. Does not the hon. gentleman consider it of any consequence that the man should forfeit all his rights in addition. I object to the whole Bill, and I move, in amendment to the amendment, that the Committee do now arise.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to, and the Committee rose.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) to amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person.

Motion negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	Platt,
Bain (Wentworth),	Foster,	Ray,
Baker (Victoria),	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Béchard,	Guillet,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bernier,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Blake,	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Bourassa,	Hay,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bowell,	Hilliard,	Springer,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Thompson,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Trow,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Tyrwhitt,
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Vail,
Cartwright,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Casey,	Kirk,	Wallace (Albert),
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Catudal,	Lister,	Weldon,
Charlton,	Mackenzie,	Wells,
Cockburn,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
Cook,	McIsaac,	Wilson,
Davies,	Mills,	Wood (Brockville).—65.
De St. Georges,	Mulock,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dawson,	McGreevy,
Allison (Hants)	Desaulniers,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Desjardins,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dickinson,	Méthot,
Beaty,	Dodd,	Mitchell,
Bell,	Dugas,	Moffat,
Belleau,	Dupont,	Orton,
Benoit,	Farrow,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Ferguson (Welland),	Paint,
Bergeron,	Gagné,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Gault,	Reid,
Billy,	Gigault,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bossé,	Guilbault,	Scott,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Shakespeare,
Brecken,	Haggart,	Small,
Burnham,	Hesson,	Smyth,
Burns,	Hickey,	Stairs,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Tassé,
Carling,	Ives,	Taylor,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Temple,
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Cimon,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Costigan,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Coughlin,	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Coursol,	Macmaster,	Wigle,
Curran,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Cuthbert,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth.—86.
Daly,	McDougald,	

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Statement of all moneys paid to T. Charles Watson by the Government of Canada, since 1881, showing also the services, if any, performed by said Watson, in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals, or any other branch of the public service, since the year before mentioned.—(Mr. Wilson.)

Copies of the report of Mr. C. Michaud, Civil Engineer, as to the explorations made by him last autumn, on the River St. Francis, with the object of establishing booms upon it.—(Mr. Bergeron, for Mr. Vanasse.)

Copies of the report of Mr. Guerin, Civil Engineer, respecting the explorations made by him on the Yamaska River, and in the neighbourhood of Lavallière Bay.—(Mr. Bergeron, for Mr. Vanasse.)

Return of the names of the several persons who sent in tenders for the construction of a steamer to replace the *Princess Louise*, and of the person to whom the contract was awarded; also, copy of specification furnished parties tendering.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FRAUD IN RELATION TO PUBLIC CONTRACTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to move, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Monday next to consider further Bill (No. 12) to amend the Act for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys. I desire to take the opinion of the House on the principle of this Bill. It is true that the second reading of the Bill seems to carry with it the adoption of the principles by this House; but at the same time there are many ways in which a Bill may be disposed of by this House. After the proceedings of yesterday I do not consider that the House has expressed an opinion upon the question whether or not contractors in the future will be allowed to subscribe to election funds, as they have done in the past. That is the question that I desire to take a vote upon.

Motion negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Ray,
Béchard,	Geoffrion,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Robertson (Shelburne)
Blake,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Thompson,
Cartwright,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Catudal,	Lister,	Watson,
Charlton,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McCraney,	Wells,
Cook,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
Davies,	McIsaac,	Wilson,
De St. Georges,	McMullen,	Yeo.—59.
Dupont,	Mills,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Desaulniers,	Mitchell,
Amyot,	Desjardins,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dickinson,	Orton,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dugas,	Ouimet,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Paint,
Beaty,	Foster,	Patterson (Essex),
Bell,	Gagné,	Pinsonneault,
Belleau,	Gault,	Reid,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Benson,	Girouard,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Royal,
Bergin,	Guilbault,	Scott,
Billy,	Hackett,	Shakespeare,
Blondeau,	Hall,	Small,
Bolduc,	Hay,	Smyth,
Bourbeau,	Hesson,	Stairs,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Tassé,
Burns,	Homer,	Taylor,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kilvert,	Temple,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kinney,	Tilley,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kranz,	Tupper (Pictou),
Carling,	Landry (Kent),	Tyrwhitt,
Caron,	Landry (Montmagny),	Valin,
Chapleau,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Cochrane,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Colby,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wallace (York),
Costigan,	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Coursol,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Renfrew),
Cuthbert,	McDougald,	Williams,
Daly,	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Daoust,	Massue,	Wood (Westmoreland,
Dawson,	Méthot,	Woodworth.—96.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) was not in the Chamber when the Resolution was read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member for Gaspé in the House when the motion was read?

Mr. FORTIN. I was not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the hon. member's name must be struck off.

Mr. FORTIN. I heard the Resolution read from the gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question has never been raised here before. In the English House of Commons, the gallery is spoken of as part of the House; but I think that here the case is somewhat different.

Mr. BLAKE. I never heard the pretention before; otherwise an hon. member who was in one of the recesses might give his vote. If this be admitted, we can call on hon. members who may be in the gallery to vote. I have seen the hon. Minister of Railways several times in the gallery during this Session while votes were being taken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice in England is that the galleries are part of the House. No doubt the gallery is a portion of the House, and common sense shows that it is to be considered so because the object of the rule is that no member shall vote on a motion who has not had the opportunity of hearing it. He can hear it in the gallery as well as on the floor; not only that but if other people be in the gallery, we can say there are strangers in the House and they are obliged to leave. The galleries are as much a portion of the House as the floor, and members, if they choose, could speak from the gallery. They go all round, and there is no reason to make a difference between this House and the English House.

An hon. MEMBER. They might vote in the recesses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the recesses they cannot possibly hear. The recesses are for the purposes of getting out of the House and are portions of the corridors. We have reporters in the gallery to report our speeches, and there is no reason why a member should not hear as well as they.

Mr. BLAKE. It follows that if we are to adopt the practice of the English House, in which the hon. gentleman has rightly said the gallery is part of the House, an hon. member can address the House from the gallery.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see why not.

Mr. BLAKE. For the sixteen years this House has been sitting, members have not unfrequently retired to the galleries when they wanted to avoid voting, and have never been called on to vote. I pointed to a notorious instance, that of the hon. Minister of Railways, who withdrew to the gallery to avoid voting. If we are now to decide after sixteen years that on the purpose of voting and speaking hereafter the galleries are to be considered part of the House, it is well; but it is a revolution.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I may say there is a precedent to the point. I recollect the ex-speaker, Mr. Blanchet, decided that if a member left his place for a moment he could not vote. In my own case I left my seat for a moment and it was decided that I could not on that account keep the floor.

Mr. MILLS. This point came up in the case of the member for one of the Yorks, Dr. Strange. He was in the gallery and the question was raised whether having heard the motion he had a right to vote or not, and it was decided by your predecessor that he had not.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a rule if an hon. member leaves his seat while the vote is being taken, he is liable to have his name struck off the list. The inconvenience is this, that if a member hears a motion in the gallery and leaves the gallery to vote, his vote may be struck off. The rule is that a member must not, while the vote is being taken, leave his seat.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Bothwell says the question was decided in the case of the member for North York.

Mr. MILLS. Dr. Strange came and voted, and said he heard the motion put while in the gallery; your predecessor decided that he had not the right to vote.

Mr. CARON. A couple of Sessions ago a case identical to this came up. The hon. member for Leeds happened to be in the gallery while a resolution was moved by the leader of the Opposition. He came down here and was called on to vote, because it was considered that his being in the gallery did not exclude him from the House and that consequently he was bound to give his vote.

Mr. BLAKE. There was no ruling.

Mr. CARON. The reason given was the same as in this case, that, being in the House, he had heard the motion read, and could not be prevented from voting like any other hon. member who had heard the motion read.

Mr. ORTON. Some years ago, an hon. member for one of the Hurons stated that he was in the recess when the motion was read, and his vote was allowed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No, Mr. Speaker, he did not say that he was in the recess, but leaning against the door leading into the recess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt the question was raised in the case of the hon. member for Huron, and it was decided, as he stated that he was in that square box and heard the motion read, that he had a right to vote. His vote was challenged because some hon. gentleman said he thought he was in the post office at the time, but he said no, he was there and heard the motion, and thereupon his vote was recorded.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This vote, I believe, is not settled?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yet the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) has left his seat. Is his vote to be struck off the roll?

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has also left his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. I feel a great deal of delicacy in deciding this matter, because there is no precedent recorded. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) cites the case of Dr. Strange, who said he was in the gallery and heard the motion, but that was not considered sufficient and his vote was taken off. The hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Caron) calls attention to the vote of Dr. Ferguson, under similar circumstances, which was allowed. I do not think either of these decisions were recorded. The reason of the rule is that a member shall hear the question put, because he must understand the question before the House before he votes. In England the practice is that a member may speak from the gallery, that the gallery is a part of the House. I think here it would be an inconvenient practice, unless the House so wishes it, but if the hon. member says he heard the motion put, I must accept his statement. I think the question that ought to be put to the hon. member is: "Did you hear the motion put." Did you hear the motion put?

Mr. FORTIN. I heard the motion put, certainly.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I ask for your ruling on the point I have raised as to the vote of the member for Montmagny, who has left his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is another point. I think there is a rule that any member who leaves his seat before the vote is declared looses his vote.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) has gone out.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you mean, Mr. Speaker, that the member loses his vote when he leaves the House, or when he goes from one seat to another in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. When he goes from one seat to another. That is the reason that hon. members call out "order, order," when a member is seduced to leave his seat.

Mr. TROW. The member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) must have left his seat in the gallery to come down here.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, under your ruling, the vote of the member for Gaspé must be struck out. If he heard the question from the gallery, he must have left his seat, because we see him voting here.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is just what I pointed out before, the inconvenience of the practice when a man hears the question put in the gallery.

Mr. BLAKE. I ask your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall order his vote to be struck off on that ground.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In reference to the case of the member for Montmagny, who has left his seat since the vote was taken?

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think, owing to the long discussion on the point of order, you had better not call attention to members having left their seats. I find Mr. Ray's name is not recorded. I think the Clerk called out Mr. Reid. You voted for the motion?

Mr. RAY. Yes.

Mr. HESSON. The member for Marquette is not in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the motion lost.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the accident of hearing——

Several hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it desirable that some understanding should be arrived at on these points, in regard to which there is no precedent recorded.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This question about the gallery has been raised for the first time. It would be convenient to have that matter settled. I do not care which way it is settled, so long as it is settled, whether in future we are to consider the gallery a part of the House or not. That is one point. The other is whether an hon. member who, before he votes, or after he votes before the vote is declared, moves from one seat to another, loses his vote. The practice has been that the gallery is not considered a part of the House. In England the practice is otherwise, and the reason of the rule is what you have stated. We had better have that decided in regard to the future. As to the second point, I should be very glad if the ruling is carried out that a member loses his vote by leaving his seat. It is exceedingly inconvenient, disturbs the taking of a vote, and causes very unseemly noises in this House, so I should be very glad indeed if it is decided that every member who votes shall vote from the seat he happens to be caught in when the vote is put, and shall remain there until the vote is declared. If it is the general opinion of the House, I think it would conduce to the progress of business and prevent unseemly noises.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps it would be well to make those who make the noises lose their votes as well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps so. As to the gallery, the practice ought to be settled.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman comes a little too late with these observations. You have already ruled, Sir. You have ruled, first, that the gallery is a part of the House and an hon. member who hears the motion there does not lose his vote; and you have ruled, secondly, that an hon. member who changes his place during the progress of a vote, after the motion is put and before the vote is declared, does lose his vote. Therefore, it follows that the member for Gaspé, if he had remained in the gallery could have voted from the gallery. You have settled these questions. The leader of the House proposes that these questions should be unsettled in order to have them settled again. First, the vote of the hon. member for Gaspé was allowed, notwithstanding the fact that he was in the gallery when the question was put. Afterwards, it was struck off, because, having heard it in the gallery, he moved from his seat and came down here to vote. The vote of the member for Montmagny was also about to be struck off for the same reason, when you very properly suggested that it should not be noticed, owing to the long discussion on the point of order. Therefore, the matter is decided, unless any proposal is made to reverse your decision, or unless you, upon further consideration, decide to recall it. It follows from these decisions that, in accordance with the view of the hon. gentleman, which you have so far adopted, we can in future speak from the gallery.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I, of course, acquiesce in the proceedings of my colleagues, and on the whole agree, first, that the member, if he heard the motion from the gallery, had a right to vote; second, that if he leaves his seat after the motion is put, he forfeits his right to vote. No doubt that these two points are now settled, and my suggestion is that some rule should be made to cover them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope it will be settled one way or the other in consequence of this discussion. The question I put to the hon. member for Gaspé was "Did you hear the motion?" I did not ask him where he heard it. He said he did hear it, and I ruled that as I understood the rules of the House that was sufficient. But it would be a very inconvenient practice, if continued, that the gallery should be considered part of the House for the purpose of speaking or voting, and I would like the House therefore to authorize me to declare that for the future the gallery is not part of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. If the question is submitted to the House for decision, it had better be disposed of only after sufficient time for consideration. I am very glad the First Minister who defended the practice ten minutes ago, now says it is very inconvenient. I quite agree with him.

Mr. ABBOTT. We must not omit consideration of the question as to how far we would abandon our jurisdiction over the galleries if such a rule is made. We must not give up our right to consider the galleries as part of the House for admission of strangers, or for the exclusion of strangers.

Mr. SPEAKER. As part of the House except for purposes of speaking or voting.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If hearing the motion gives a right to vote, I may mention that the other night I was standing in this porch and heard a motion quite distinctly, and when it can be heard distinctly there, why not be allowed to vote just as well as when one can hear it from the gallery?

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill (from the Senate) was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 107) to amend Acts 40 Vic., cap. 49, and 45 Vic., cap. 24, being Acts relating to Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in Ontario.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the motion of Mr. Houde on the notice paper, "that this House is of opinion that the Liquor License Act, 1883, should be repealed," be the first Order of the Day for Monday next, and take precedence next after Routine Proceedings.

Mr. BLAKE. It was arranged some time ago across the House that this motion should be proceeded with to-day. It is well known that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) had given a notice of motion on this subject, but as it was desired to reach a discussion on this subject, the motion of my hon. friend for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) had precedence, and from time to time that motion has been postponed for one reason or another. Ultimately it was arranged across the House that this motion should be proceeded with this day. So late as last night on the adjournment, I called on the hon. gentleman to say what Government business he would take after that motion, whether that motion would come on first, saying that it might be possible to conclude it before adjournment, and asking what business he would take up after that. The hon. gentleman announced that he would take the first Government notice. I pointed out that that was not one that would take any time, and asked what he would take after that, and he said the House would probably go on with Supply. He now proposes, without any notice, that the arrangement made across the House, with reference to which we have arranged our affairs as to business, should be departed from, and that the motion of the hon. member for Maskinongé should not be considered, although it had been arranged across the House several days ago that it should be proceeded with to-day, and although that arrangement was repeated and reinforced across the House last night. Now, Sir, these arrangements across the House are sacred arrangements—arrangements upon the faith of which members on both sides act. They are arrangements with reference to conduct of public business which, if broken without any cause at all, without explanations given, without any proper justification, and without any other arrangements being made in consequence of that, render it quite impossible to conduct public business efficiently; and I think I have cause of complaint that the hon. gentleman should not have intimated his intention of departing from that arrangement—grave cause of complaint, the more so that I have been told that it was arranged yesterday that it should be departed from. If my information on that subject be correct, and it was arranged by the Government with the hon. member for Maskinongé, that his motion should not come on to-day but should be postponed until Monday, I have still graver cause of complaint, inasmuch as by that arrangement that decision had been reached yesterday. And it is difficult to understand how the conversation which took place last night could have taken place, how that could have been the understanding, and how it could have been repeated. That is the first point, The second one is, that I think the motion ought to go on. I see no reason why it should not go on. I do not see the hon. member for Maskinongé in his place, but no doubt he is in attendance—I saw him not long ago, and he told me he would be in his place this afternoon. If he is not here it must be because he understands that the Government is about to insist upon this postponement. I think this is a convenient day for the discussion of this motion. This is our day which was taken away from us by the Government, but taken away from us almost contemporaneously with the understanding that this particular Thursday should be devoted to the discussion of this motion. Then the hon. gentleman says: "No; we take the day away for Government business," although we had reason to understand, until we heard a rumour, two or three hours ago, that this licensing question, which is a very important question, upon which the people's minds and the minds of hon. members are agitated, would be the *cheval de bataille* of the day. Then the hon. gentleman said: "I propose to have this discussion on Monday." Look at the order paper for Monday. Among other business there is a very important Bill, that for the incorporation of the Loyal Orange Association. By this arrangement that Bill will be thrown over for this Session, because the time for receiving reports of Private Bills will expire in a few days, after next Monday and before the following Monday; and if the measure is postponed over Monday first, it will not come on effectively this Session. Besides, rumour says the Government intend to take all succeeding Mondays. The hon. First Minister has had a conversation with the Minister of Inland Revenue on the subject I observe, and no doubt the Orange and Green are quite in accord as to this disposition of the matter. Whatever differences may have existed between the hon. gentlemen a while ago, which resulted in a painful, though fortunately only a temporary separation, no difference whatever exists between them on this subject. But there is a great deal more than that. There are three or four pages of important notices of motion in the hands of private members, which should come up and ought to be taken up, but which cannot be effectively debated if the proposal of the Government to take Mondays is carried. I think the proposition of the hon. gentleman is extremely objectionable; and I move the following amendment:—

That all the words after "that" be omitted, and the following inserted: "It was arranged across the House that Mr. Houde's motion on the Liquor License Act should be called as the first item of business, and before the Government business of this day; that this arrangement should be observed; that to fix the said discussion for Monday next will prevent the consideration of much important business in the hands of private members; that notices and Orders of the Day be postponed, and that the motion of Mr. Houde be called."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in his opinion that there was any arrangement or suggestion of any kind declared yesterday with respect to this motion. I had no communication with the hon. gentleman, or with Mr. Houde——

Mr. BLAKE. I do not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—of any kind; nor was there any determination come to or expressed by myself, or so far as I know by any member of the Government. All I can say is, that this morning the members of the Government had a conversation with Mr. Houde, and it was agreed to postpone the motion until Monday and make it then the first Order of the Day. I announced some time ago that the Government were very desirous that the House should be prorogued by Easter; and, in order to do this, it is necessary to push forward Government business. It was for that reason that we took Thursdays. I do not know whether the day was fixed for the discussion of the license question before Thursdays had been taken or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I think about the same time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then it was an open day.

Mr. BLAKE. Thursday had been taken and perhaps it was the same, or the next day, that this arrangement was made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Thursday was suggested by me without recollecting the fact that it had been taken as a Government day. It can be of no consequence whether the subject be discussed to-day or on Monday; but I would ask the House to assist the Government in getting on with Government business. The hon. gentleman alluded to a number of notices of motion on the paper. On looking over them, I find that most of them are for returns, which may be disposed of on any Government day by taking half an hour, and it is the common practice on Government days, after considerable progress has been made with Government

business, to go over notices of motion and carry those which are unopposed. I do not think there is much difficulty in the matter. I think the proposition is a reasonable one. We will discuss the licensing question fully on Monday, and after Routine Proceedings, which will be very short, the day can be devoted to this very important question. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his amendment, but allow us to go on with business and discuss the licensing question on Monday.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. member for West Durham has referred to private business, and especially to the Bill of which I have charge, the Bill to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association. If the effect of carrying the motion moved by the leader of the Government is to take away all Monday next from private members, so as to practically prevent the moving of the second reading of this Bill, and if the time for the reception of reports on private Bills be not extended, I must oppose the motion made by the leader of the Government, inasmuch as it is my wish and intention to have a discussion on that Bill and a vote taken at the earliest day on which it is possible. On that occasion no doubt the hon. member for West Durham will give me his support and assistance, and with that we will no doubt succeed in carrying it.

Mr. BLAKE. I will express my views fully.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I hope the hon. gentleman will support the Bill respecting which he has made many enquiries during the last few days, and which he now brings forward as a reason for opposing the motion of the leader of the Government. Probably the difficulty may be got over by an arrangement being made to extend another week the time for receiving reports of Private Bills, in the event of time not serving on next Monday for a discussion of the Orange Bill as well as a discussion of the motion of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde). If it be understood that the time for receiving reports on Private Bills be extended, I shall have much pleasure in supporting the motion of the leader of the Government; but except on that understanding, I shall vote against it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. First Minister has very coolly stated that there is no business of importance in the notices of motion, and that the Government will allow time to move them as a matter of form. There are a good many motions on the notice paper in the hands of private members which are of importance; a good many motions which hon. members wish to discuss, and in taking the course proposed the hon. gentleman is depriving a great many members of an opportunity to present their views.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a notice of motion.

Mr. CHARLTON. Several of those now on the paper are most important motions. The hon. gentleman's proposal will merely allow them to be called and carried without discussion. The course which is being taken is one that tends to stifle discussion on important subjects which hon. members desire to discuss, and which in the interests of the country should be discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I should like——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I presume the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) wishes to exclude the Orange Bill from being called.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before putting the question to the House I may say that I wish it to be understood that if a member changes his seat after the motion is put, he is liable to have his vote struck out of the division.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	Mulock,
Allison (Lennox)	Forbes,	O'Brien,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Baker (Victoria),	Gillmor,	Platt,
Béchard,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bell,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Innes,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Irvine,	Shakespeare,
Burpee (Sunbury),	King,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Landerkin,	Springer,
Cameron (Victoria),	Laurier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Lister,	Thompson,
Cartwright,	Livingstone,	Trow,
Casey,	Mackenzie,	Tyrwhitt,
Casgrain,	McCraney,	Vail,
Catudal,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Charlton,	McIsaac,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McMullen,	Wells,
Cook,	McNeill,	Wheler,
Davies,	Mills,	White (Hastings),
Fairbank,	Mitchell,	Wilson.—70.
Fisher,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dodd,	McGreevy,
Allison (Hants),	Dugas,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Dundas,	Massue,
Baby (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Méthot,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	Moffat,
Beaty,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Belleau,	Foster,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Paint,
Benson,	Gault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Pope,
Bloudeau,	Gordon,	Reid,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bourbeau,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hackett,	Scott,
Brecken,	Hall,	Small,
Burnham,	Hay,	Smyth,
Burns,	Hesson,	Stairs,
Cameron, (Inverness),	Hickey,	Tassé,
Carling,	Hilliard,	Taylor,
Caron,	Homer,	Temple,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Pictou),
Colby,	Kinney,	Valin,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Daoust,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Williams,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth,
Dickinson,	McDougald,	Wright.—102.

On the main motion being put,

Mr. MACKENZIE. As I am anxious to relieve the distress of some hon. gentlemen in the House, I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this motion is out of order. No order can be postponed in this way without notice being given. Such is the well known Parliamentary law, and I can give you a number of cases if you desire. The motion is practically to put a specific order ahead of some other orders, and thus deprive members of the opportunity of proceeding with their motions. I would not be so anxious to take the point of order but for my feeling of sympathy for the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who is always courteous and obliging to myself.

Mr. MITCHELL. I could not hear what the hon. gentleman said, but I think considering the amount of private business to be done the Government should have

hesitated before taking away the only day on which private members will have an opportunity of moving matters with which they are charged, and it is with deep regret that I see they have been able to get a majority to enable them to do this. I think it would be well if they would yet consider whether they will deprive private members of the opportunity of getting their business before the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not hear me, and I may repeat that I was calling attention to the fact that this motion was out of order. May says:

"When it becomes necessary to disturb the appointed order of business, and to give precedence to some important subject of debate, a special order is made for that purpose. If it be desired to give priority to a notice of motion on any day on which Orders of the Day are entitled to precedence, notice having been previously given, a motion is made that the Orders of the Day be postponed until after such notice of motion."

Now, I have searched the Minutes and I cannot find that any notice has been given, and, therefore, the motion is entirely out of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This motion stands on the paper as it is. It cannot come up before Monday and there is no order of the House that Mr. Houde's motion should come up to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. No; but of course my hon. friend is right in the point of order. The motion is one of which notice is required.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House has destroyed that by having decided the matter by a vote.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no. All the House has done is to negative an amendment to a motion. That is only a decision that the House shall not substitute certain words in the main motion. Now the words in the main motion fall to the grouud and we are where we were.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order having been taken, and this motion being one of which notice is required, we will proceed to the Orders of the Day.

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow, to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor General in Council to acquire for the Dominion, from the Government of Nova Scotia, the Eastern Extension Railway from New Glasgow to the Gut of Canso, and the Steam Ferry in connection therewith, together with the rights of the said Province in the Truro and Pictou Branch Railway, for the sum of one million two hundred thousand dollars ($1,200,000), and the new rolling stock and equipments of the said railway, for a sum equal to the cost thereof and charges; the said sums, with interest thereon at per cent. per annum from the 1st October, 1883, to be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, after the necessary legislative provisions shall have been made by Nova Scotia for giving effect to the said acquisition, according to the agreement between the two Governments to that effect, laid before this House on the 6th day of February, instant.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. Charges of Management..... $169,123.15

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is to be regretted that this item is not divided, as it used to be, under different heads. The hon. Minister will see that there are some twenty different items here which are not necessarily connected. I would suggest that in future it would be convenient to have them divided. I rather think also, that a portion of these sums are voted by Statute.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has only been within the last year or two that it has been considered desirable to submit a formal vote to the House. But since that time there has been no change made in the arrangement. There may be something in what the hon. gentleman says, although I do not see that any great inconvenience arises from the items not being divided, and if it is thought desirable to separate them it will be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When three or four subjects not necessarily connected are connected in this way, the discussion becomes exceedingly irregular, and more time is lost than would be if they were divided. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what is the absolute cost to the country of managing the savings banks. If my recollection serves me, we now borrow some $26,000,000 in this way, and it is a matter of considerable practical moment to know exactly what that costs.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have not yet made the estimate this year, but I think it was made last year, and the commission was found to be a little over one quarter of 1 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course that varies as the debt increases.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It varies from time to time, but not very much, as the salaries paid are in proportion to the amount deposited. The salaries go up to $400 as a rule; I think there are only one or two above that; I think the highest is $500, and the lowest $200. If the amount deposited in a bank is small, the commission is a little more in proportion than in the larger offices; and as the deposit increases, and is paid into the larger offices, the commission becomes less. The calculation was made about two years ago, and I found that one quarter of one per cent. would pay the salaries and all the expenses in connection with the savings banks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In former years this was not a matter of quite so much importance, because then the sum borrowed was only about $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 and a large portion of it was borrowed at certain points where great sums were deposited. But the total number of these offices has apparently increased very much; and I would like to know what the hon. gentleman's present arrangements are. Of course, where the salary is so small as $200, there may be difficulty in getting the right sort of man to take hold of it. Is there any alteration in the regulations now that the sums have so much increased? What rule has the hon. gentleman laid down with respect to these minor offices where the salary is about, say $200? What is the allowance for contingencies? There must be some.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will require to have safes in those offices.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Perhaps, in some cases; now it is so arranged that the banks have branches in almost every important town, and therefore it is only in a few cases where safes are required. The salaries and mode of payment remain the same as when the hon. gentleman was Finance Minister, the minimum salary being $200 and the maximum $400, except in one case where the party is not an officer of the Government. It is exceedingly difficult to get a reliable party, a man who can give the necessary bonds, who is not holding office under the Government, to take the position for $200 or even $400. We take a Collector of Customs, especially in the Maritime Provinces, where this system is more generally in force, and there we pay from $200 to $400 to the officer who discharges that

duty. In some cases it is the postmaster, but we have discouraged latterly the appointment of postmasters, because we have not the same check on them as we have on other officers. I think there are but two cases where the parties are not officers, the one in New Westminster, B.C., if my memory serves me right, and there the agent receives $450 or $500; and the other one in Yarmouth, N.S., where the person appointed is not an officer; and as there is over $500,000 deposited there, he gets $500. All the other salaries range from $200 to $400, and they are paid on the same principle as when the hon. member was Finance Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At Yarmouth the sum assigned is only $300.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has been increased since that return, the 1st July.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then practically speaking, almost all these men are obliged to deposit in banks. Is that the general rule?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not at all desire to criticise the management of the savings banks; where they have increased as largely as they have generally, I am quite aware some little irregularities occur. We have seen statements that there have been some losses in connection with these, but I do not notice any sums put down on account of losses of savings banks. I would not at all desire to hold the hon. Minister responsible for any on so large a business as this for some few losses which may have occurred, but I would like to know if any have occurred—I do not mean losses indemnified by the securities.

Sir LEONARD TILLY. There has been two or three defaulters, I think, in Nova Scotia, and proceedings have been taken against them. I cannot say what the position is, but I will enquire and inform the House before Concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know the amounts and the probable losses.

Mr. DAVIES. Last year I called the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that while in Nova Scotia they have branches in the different counties, in Prince Edward Island the savings bank is confined to the capital. The object of these banks is, of course, to enable the small farmers and labourers and others who have money saved to deposit it in a place of safety. As the savings bank institution is carried on in Prince Edward Island, there is only one office, and that is in the capital. So far as the wants of capitalists who have money to invest that is all very well, but as regards the wants of small farmers and labourers, fishermen and others, living in remote parts of the Island, it is impossible for them to take any advantage of the savings banks at all. I would suggest to the hon. Minister the desirability of establishing in the other counties of the Island branch offices for the purpose of receiving these deposits. If he did, it would be a very great advantage to those who have money saved. One of the local banks attempted to meet this want, the Merchants' of Halifax, but while that is a good bank, and the people have confidence in it, they have not that confidence they would have in a Government savings bank. It would be a very great advantage to the people of the outlying counties if branch offices were established at Summerside or Souris, either in the post office or elsewhere, so that they would enjoy the same facilities which are enjoyed by the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is evident that a man who has $2 or $5 to deposit will not travel 20 or 30 miles to deposit it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No doubt it would be desirable to have these savings banks in every county throughout the Dominion, but I may state for the information of the hon. gentleman, that perhaps not half the counties in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have them. They are established at points where there are considerable numbers of persons employed, but it would not be politic on the part of the Government to establish too many of these offices, for the lowest salary that can be paid is $200, and if that had to be paid in places where there would be only $2,000 or $3,000 deposited, it would make a very high rate of interest. It was intended in the vote of last year to give another office to Prince Edward Island, and I was under the impression, and am so still, that an office has been established at Summerside, though I am not very positive that that has been done. Having been consulted with reference to this by, I think, the representative from that district, some time ago, I decided that it was a locality where we would be justified in having an office, and I am under the impression that an office has been established there; but, if it has not been done, I can only say I will enquire into it, because I was under the impression that it was done. The other county did not appear to have so large a number of that class of persons who would be taking advantage of the appropriation; but still applications come in from year to year, and, as the hon. member will see, we are asking for an additional sum in case it is made out to the satisfaction of the Department, and of the Government, that the locality for which application is made would give the advantage to a considerable number of persons, and that the amount deposited would be such as would warrant the Government in making such an arrangement. If in a locality, such as the hon. gentleman speaks of, first, there are parties whom it would be important and desirable to benefit by such facilities, and, in the next place, the amount deposited probably be enough to justify the Government in paying the $200, then it will be applied there. The hon. gentleman will see that it might easily be a losing operation, and no doubt there would be any number of applications if it was supposed that it was only necesary to ask for the $200 to have it appropriated. Summerside has been provided for, or was intended to be provided for, and this vote proposes to give a small sum for the purpose of opening some additional offices.

Mr. VAIL. The Finance Minister might extend this system a little further than he has, with great benefit to the people and without any loss to the revenue. There are some counties peculiarly situated, and I refer especially to the county I represent. It is divided by a bay 30 or 40 miles long, running through the centre of the county, and one portion of the people are cut off from the mainland, and they have no banking facilities at all. There are many thousand people in this section of the country, mostly fishermen, who are earning a certain amount weekly and receive their money every week, and it would be a great advantage to these people to have the opportunity of investing their money in that way. I hope he will take this matter into consideration, and, if he can see his way clear, give them the benefit of a savings bank at Westport.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have one in your county.

Mr. VAIL. Yes, two, one at Digby and one at Weymouth, but this neck of land extends over 40 miles, where the people are entirely cut off, and they are very much in want of something of this kind, as there is no banking agency at all amongst them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman lay down any limit? He said very truly that it would never pay to receive a few thousand dollars, and pay an official $200 and the contingent expenses, which must be more or less, for the purpose of so small a deposit. Does he lay down any limit? In Nova Scotia, I observe there are no less than thirty of these savings banks, and, although

those at Halifax and at Yarmouth have large deposits, the remainder can hardly, I should think, have an average——

Mr. VAIL. Yes, they have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRICHT. What sum would they have on an average?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know what the average is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He will see that it would require very nearly $100,000 to keep the expenditure within a quarter per cent. I would like the Minister to take a note, and, at Concurrence, if he will be good enough, to bring down a memorandum showing the total expenditure for savings bank purposes. That, of course, would include that portion of the expenses of his own department which might properly be chargeable to savings banks. If I am not mistaken a good deal of the vote for contingencies and a good deal of the general vote are incurred in consequence of the savings bank expenditure. There is a special branch to look after it, I think. This is now becoming a very important thing. There are $26,000,000 of money borrowed at call, and they have to be looked after. What is the arrangement now as to odd days? Is it the same as it was in former times? What notice does he require? Is it the same as before?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, the same as formerly; but we seldom hold them to that. There is a certain number of days during which we are not bound to pay it. We have made one change since the hon. gentleman was Finance Minister. At that time they received the interest from the day the money was received to the day it was paid A change has been made in that respect. If it is paid in the early part of the month, they receive no interest for that month, but commence at the first of the month following, and, if it is paid at the end of the month they do not receive anything. There must be a full month. They receive nothing for the portion of the month the money is paid in, or the portion of the month in which it is drawn out. In every other respect, it remains just the same as it was before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No matter how long it remains on deposit.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No matter how long. We found in some cases some parties in the towns were using it as a bank account, to some extent, and therefore it was to check that that we found this was necessary. We reduced the amount to $3,000, and made this a condition, and there was not the same inducement to do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Allow me to understand. If a man pays in money on the 15th of one month, and six months afterwards draws it out on the 15th, he would loose fifteen days at each end?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. He would lose a month.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to that. I think the hon. Minister is dealing very liberally with the public, and I do not at all object to that. The more important question, however, comes up here. We have now $26,000,000; we may have more; the hon. Minister thinks, I believe, we will have more. Of course, in prosperous times, the Minister understands that nobody supposes there will be any great amount of withdrawal, but, should the times become less prosperous, then a considerable amount of withdrawal might occur. I would like to know exactly how at present the hon. gentleman proposes to meet possible withdrawals? He has altered, if I remember aright, to a very considerable extent the provisions made in my time for retaining a large amount of gold over and above what the immediate wants of the circulation required. I had retained that partly with a view to meet just such contingencies as I allude to, and they might be much more formidable now than in the earlier days, seeing that our savings bank deposits are double or triple what they were then. I notice that, by the returns, a certain amount of the guarantee which, I think, has not yet been used—the English Imperial guarantee—is held by the Minister. That, I suppose, is intended to take the place of gold, and to be sold if required?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, of course, so far, is good enough; but does the hon. Minister make any special reserve with respect to this $26,000,000, except this guarantee of £500,000 or £600,000 sterling, whichever it is? How does he propose to meet a possible contingency of that kind?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is well known to the House that the law was amended in this respect. Previous to 1879, 25 per cent. of the circulation—so far as that is concerned this is a separate question, but not separate exactly—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not altogether separate.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not altogether separate—25 per cent. of the circulation was held in gold. That was amended by reducing the amount of gold to 15 per cent., and 10 per cent. was held in Dominion debentures guaranteed by the Government, and that was arranged so that, at any time, if necessary, we could fall back upon that £600,000 sterling to meet any demands that might be made after the gold was exhausted. We do more than that. As to the savings banks, I do not feel so much alarmed about that, when I inform the hon. gentleman that, from 1874 to 1879, when you would have supposed—particularly during a portion of that period—that the amount probably might be reduced in the savings banks, the amount was increased $2,800,000, which, of course, was about equivalent to the interest. The hon. member will himself recollect that he was not called upon during all his five years of office to provide for the savings bank. Therefore, I think this is a fair inference, although the amount is larger and we are, perhaps, more likely to have a considerable call. But I do not feel any doubt or hesitation about that. I am satisfied that we will have no difficulty in that respect, even though we should experience the difficulties that were experienced from 1874 to 1879. But there is another reason why we should hold in reserve, to a certain extent, as we do in the banks, not less, as a rule, than $2,000,000—we may require it for ordinary expenditures. At the present moment exchange is very high, there is likely to be a demand for gold, and our circulation may be reduced to some extent. Under these circumstances the Government, as our predecessors did, keep a very considerable amount deposited in the banks, not only to meet the savings bank call, if that was necessary—which I am satisfied it will not be—but to meet the demands for gold. In addition to the 25 per cent. in gold, and to the guaranteed debentures which can be converted into gold at short notice, there is always in the hands of the Government, lying principally in the Bank of Montreal, a considerable sum to meet any such demand should it occur. Therefore, we do not allow these deposits to get below a certain point if we can help it, in order to meet any emergency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Besides the gold, which I think is about $3,000,000 is it not?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; probably, over $2,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course the hon. gentleman must remember that under the present policy

he is becoming to a very great extent the sole custodian of the gold reserve of the country. Every bank return shows that more and more. He has got to furnish gold on a certain call to an extent which was not known in former years. However, what I want to know is how much he proposes to hold? He has now got about $42,000,000 in the savings bank, and in Dominion notes payable at call. That is about the position, roughly.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Forty per cent. is held by the banks—about $10,000,000 of it. That cannot be presented and payable on call very well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are only compelled to hold it in certain contingencies. The hon. gentleman will remember that that contingency is one which may or may not occur—we are speaking of possible contingencies. What I want to ascertain is exactly how much the hon. gentleman thinks it is necessary to hold in reserve. He has his $3,000,000 in gold; he has got £600,000 sterling and the guaranteed 4 per cent. of the Imperial Government, which of course, are as good as gold, and I have no doubt he could use them as floaters at an hour's notice. Besides that he has a special reserve of $2,000,000 which he proposes to keep for meeting just such demands. Now, there is one point on which I think the hon. gentleman's memory is at fault. In my time they altered the law, so that for certain amounts notes were issued. You must hold gold for the whole amount of extra issue. It was not nearly 25 per cent.; and after a certain point you had to hold gold for every dollar you issued, and that he did away with. Well that was of no great consequence so long as these deposits remained small, but it becomes another question when they run up to sums like $42,000,000. Now, I do not think the hon. gentleman, as I said, is in any very great risk of having to provide large sums for redeeming circulation; I think his precautions are probably sufficient for that. But the other matter is of somewhat more consequence, I want to ascertain about what the hon. gentleman thinks is the cost to the country of borrowing money thorough savings banks. There is first the 4 per cent.; there is next what he says is ¼ per cent., that is 4¼ per cent. that it costs us. Is this amount of $2,000,000 intended to be held always at interest or not?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These are Dominion bonds bearing 4 per cent., therefore there is no interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case I am speaking of what he keeps in the banks to meet these special demands.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is 4 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that there is no loss upon that; so that we might then consider that supposing the reserve to be sufficient—of which I am not quite sure; probably future events will disclose that—from 4½ per cent. to 4⅛ per cent. according to his calculation, will cover the cost to the country of borrowing this money. That is his calculation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that is on the hypothesis that $2,000,000 will be sufficient. Well, Sir, I see here some little increases made. By the way I suppose the Winnipeg allowance is an allowance for the extra expense of living at Winnipeg.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; of course it is more expensive living there than it is in Ottawa, but the impression is that that state of things will not always continue, because when the country is opened up fuel and other articles will be more in accordance with what is charged here. Therefore it was not desirable to fix the salary permanently at a higher rate, because, as the hon. gentleman knows well it is difficult to cut it down again when once you have established it. Therefore the principle was adopted of paying about the same rate of salary as is paid here, and then giving a certain percentage as board allowance, varying it according to the amount of salary, though the small salaries receive a larger percentage than the higher salaries. We gave what was considered about sufficient to pay the additional expense of living there, and we can regulate the scale. At the present time it is not as expensive as it was a year ago, and therefore there is not as much paid to some of the officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman says it is not as expensive as it was a year ago, but he asks for $50 more.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is for an officer who has been in the North-West a long time, I presume. Length of service entitles most of the officers to an increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman will see that the increase ought to have been among the $5,700, in the line above.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is just what he would receive if he were here; he would receive that $50, although the amount paid additional has no reference to this. That is what he would be entitled to here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not understand me. He said the board allowance was made to meet the expenses of living in Winnipeg, which, he said, had been decreased, and that is true. They are less now than they were a year ago, as I can answer from my own personal knowledge. But notwithstanding that, he has increased this board allowance. His argument would have been quite good if it had been to increase the permanent allowance.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is not the board allowance. I think it is an increase of salary without reference to board allowance. It is probably in the wrong place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see an increase of $1,000 for Victoria. What is the cause of that?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. An additional officer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there only one savings bank there?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is one in Victoria, one in Nanaimo, and one in New Westminster—three in all. A very large sum is deposited in Victoria.

Mr. VAIL. I find from the return of the savings banks of Nova Scotia that in thirteen of them there has been an increase of $100,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I perceive here an increase of $1,300. I suppose that is due to the increased number of officers that the hon. gentleman employs.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, in part. The hon. gentleman will see that, according to the scale of salaries, they range from $200 to $400. If an officer was receiving $200, and the deposits increased to $30,000 or $40,000, then he would be entitled, under the scale, to receive another $100. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), has just now pointed out that there has been a large increase in Nova Scotia, and it is the cause of the increase throughout the country generally that these parties are entitled to an increased salary of $50 or $100, as the case may be, according to the increase of deposits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state the total amount of deposits in the savings banks?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the last return showed $26,000,000, and since then $1,750,000, in round numbers, has been added over the withdrawals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, while the discussion was proceeding, said something about not desiring to mix up the post office system with the savings bank system, more particularly under his own control. What was the special reason for making that statement? Because it occurred to me that many of the post offices in outlying places were very convenient offices in which to manage savings banks, and it could be done cheaply.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Where defalcations have taken place they have been almost exclusively committed by postmasters, not under the Post Office savings bank arrangement, but where they were agents for the Finance Department. These were effected in this way. Notices are sent from the Department to the depositors every quarter, stating the condition of their accounts. A postmaster who had not entered a deposit, when he saw this letter come from the Finance Department at Ottawa, destroyed it, and the result was that we did not obtain information until the defalcation had taken place. It was thus in the power of the postmaster to intercept communications between depositors and the Government, and in that way the difficulty occurred in the two or three cases to which I have referred.

Mr. DAVIES. I observe that the Finance Minister has returned over 330 Post Office savings banks in the Dominion. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some information respecting the system in the Maritime Provinces.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We had in the Maritime Provinces a different system from that which existed in Ontario and Quebec. In the latter two Provinces it was mainly carried on through the Post Office Department and was under the directions of the Postmaster General. In the lower Provinces we had a different system of Goverment savings banks; these have been continued and still exist. The Post Office Department has not established offices because we have made other arrangements, and their establishment would entail additional expense.

Mr. DAVIES. I am anxious to have the Post Office system extended to the Maritime Provinces if possible. I see that the average expense of the Post Office savings banks is 4¼ per cent. It does not appear to cost more than under the system in force in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the working classes who use these savings banks in the Maritime Provinces?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. With the exception of Halifax and St. John, no large sums are deposited. It might be an advantage to decrease the amount allowed to be deposited $3,000, and increase the number of savings banks.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is the principle on which we have acted. When the hon gentleman was in the Government he took $10,000 from one depositor. We have reduced the limit to $3,000 and have thus gone on in the direction indicated.

Mr. VAIL. I am not finding fault.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is doing very well. In the Maritime Provinces capitalists formerly used the savings banks for the investment of very large sums, and many trustees who had amounts of $10,000 were glad to have the privilege of investing them there. I know many instances myself of this kind. I think the change made is a desirable one, being in the direction of enabling the people to take advantage of these banks for their deposits.

Mr. VAIL. I mentioned one case last year where a party had $30,000 invested in the bank; $10,000 in his own name, $10,000 in his wife's name, and $10,000 in the names of his children.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The moment it came to the notice of the Department it was ordered to be paid back.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will not say that this was a permanent investment, because if it is the case to which reference was made, the money was there only for a time waiting investment of a more permanent character. Such instances are known—and they have come within my personal knowledge—where money is invested in the savings bank until investment in mortgages or otherwise at a higher rate of interest are offered. I do not think savings banks are used to a large extent in the manner suggested.

Mr. VAIL. There is not the same necessity for giving them privileges of this kind as there is for the poorer classes who deposit their money for safe keeping, or as a permanent investment.

Mr. STAIRS. I would like to ask the Finance Minister whether there is to be any provision for opening a savings bank in Dartmouth. There has been a strong memorial presented on that subject, and I think a good case has been made out. Though Halifax is near to Dartmouth the hours in that office are such that the people of Dartmouth cannot use it to any extent without considerable cost. I hope if it is not provided for in these Estimates the Government will consider it during the recess and make provision for it next year.

Mr. DAVIES. If the town of Dartmouth, which is so close to Halifax, that you can cross over to it for one or two cents, is to have a savings bank, what is to be said of large counties where there are 40,000 or 50,000 farmers who are perhaps 40 miles away from a savings bank?

Mr. STAIRS. We will endeavour to get a savings bank in Dartmouth if we possibly can, as I think it is needed, and I suppose farmers who are living 40 or 50 miles away from savings banks should have them too.

Mr. HESSON. I concur in the desirability of giving al possible facilities for people to make these deposits, and although 4 per cent. is paid on these deposits, and one quarter per cent. for cost of management, it would still represent a much cheaper rate as a loan to the Government than anything they can get in a foreign market. I notice that about $23,000 is paid for commissions on the payment of interest by our agents in the old country, and that would be saved by obtaining the loan here. By giving facilities for deposits in these banks, we not only get our money at a cheaper rate of interest, but the interest remains in the country instead of being exported. I think that in that regard there has been a great improvement within the last few years, as our foreign indebtedness has to some extent become a home indebtedness, and I hope further efforts will be made in that direction as quickly as possible. I am informed that money is becoming cheap to-day, and that the banks will not take money on the understanding that they are to pay anything like 3 or 4 per cent.; and as the depositors in savings banks are limited to from $1,000 to $3,000, they are the class whom we should encourage into a system of saving. For these reasons, I think that every possible facility should be given to such depositors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may point out that the cost is $65,000 on $26,000,000; whereas the cost on the $100,000,000, which is about what is represented by $4,000,000, is about $23,000. So the hon. gentleman will see that there is a marked difference between the sum paid in that respect for the management of the debt and the sum paid here. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what he proposes to do should the interests on money at call fall, as it has done before, considerably below 4 per cent. At the present moment I do not think that difficulty is likely to arise because my information differs from that of the hon.

gentleman who has just spoken. I think there is no difficulty in getting 4 per cent. in the banks just now, but they may reduce it as they did before.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say that there is no intention at present to reduce the rate of interest paid to the people of the country who deposit their small earnings with the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No matter whether the rate obtainable in the open market falls or not?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When that time arrives we will judge of the question as we have judged at present. I may say that parties do not really receive 4 per cent, because as I stated before, if the money is deposited in the middle of the month and paid out in the middle of another month, there would be one month's interest lost in, say, six months. The Government consider it to be a matter of vital importance that there should be institutions such as these, where parties having small earnings may put them for safety. In the next place if there was a loss sustained, we believe the country would justify us in incurring that small loss rather than that we should withdraw from the people the advantages they now possess. At present there is not such a state of the money market as would warrant us in asking that depositors should receive less than 4 per cent. under the conditions which I have stated. As to the question of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Stairs) we have an amount to cover the opening of such new offices as the Government may consider it wise and proper to establish. So far, however, we have not seen our way clear to give Dartmouth an office, owing to its proximity to Halifax, where we have officers paid by the year who can take this money without additional expense. I cannot say what our decision may be in the future.

Mr. HESSON. What I said with reference to the payment of commissions on the interest paid in the foreign market of $4,750,000 is perfectly correct, and I might have added the additional expense in obtaining the loan in the first instance in the old country, because I understand that no loans are quoted without paying commissions to float them. When this is added to the 4 per cent. it will make it more than the 4¼ per cent. we are now paying to our own people. The more we encourage our citizens to deposit in the Government savings banks, the better.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as it goes; although it is not very profitable for us to have our own people lending us money at 4¼ per cent. if we could borrow it at 3½ per cent. on the other side, particularly as this money, which is practically taken out of the wage fund of the country, will require to be replaced to a very great degree by other moneys borrowed at a much higher rate of interest outside of the country. There are two sides to the question, as the hon. gentleman will perceive. I quite agree that it is not desirable that the Government of the country should violently or frequently change the rate of interest; but that is a matter which ought to be very carefully considered. I was not speaking of an imaginary case, but of an actual case, that while the banks would not give more than 3 per cent. on deposits, the hon. Minister was paying 4 per cent. I would go a good way to encourage the deposits of the poorer classes; but there comes up a question which my hon. friend raised whether the limit of $3,000 is not too large. A man who has $3,000 to his credit in hard cash is not to be considered a very poor man, and for that reason among others I think the hon. Minister would do well to consider the question of decreasing the rate. The House ought to understand that the hon. Minister is paying largely above the market value of money, whether at 4¼ or 4⅓ per cent. If he could succeed, as he intimated to us, in borrowing money at 3½ per cent. in England, he is still paying largely in excess of the market value, making allowance for commissions and other charges. I would be glad if the hon. Minister would just briefly state how he stands just now with relation to our London agents.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman knows that the commission we pay is ½ per cent. upon the coupons as they fall due, because that was his own arrangement. The hon. gentleman says that I stated that I expected to get money at 3½ per cent. I did not say that. I stated the other day that agents advised us to issue a short loan at ten years at 4 per cent., because the redemption of the other would not be at par, but about equivalent to our 4 per cent. loan; but when that 4 per cent. loan matured our 3½ per cents. would probably be at par. I did not intend to convey that money could be got at 3½ per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the real practical question at this moment is the maximum. There is no doubt that the present rule has been abused; that is, that other persons than those for whose special benefit these savings banks are established avail themselves of them; and it is not to be forgotten that the observation the hon. gentleman made with regard to minor losses of interest through the broken periods, applies more to the cares of the smaller depositors than the larger. The larger depositors, who can make their own arrangements, and who use these savings banks as a means of investment, are very likely to divide at the end or beginning of the month and loose very little in that way; but the smaller depositor, who wants a savings bank to put his money into, who cannot derive any profit from his money unless he does so, and who requires more hurriedly to take it out, is the person who is most likely to be the loser by the broken periods. That is an added reason for reducing the maximum. It was formerly found that $10,000 was too large, and it was reduced to its present figure; but it is said that sums are broken now, and stand in the names of different depositors, though belonging to one person. That is a dishonourable arrangement, and the circumstance that it exists under the present limit of $3,000 is an indication that you may still further reduce the limit without exposing yourself to any more danger than at present. Perhaps when I said it was a dishonourable practice, I used too strong a word; it is an evasion, at any rate, of the regulation. I think, therefore, that what we have to consider is whether the policy of the Government, in reducing the maximum from $10,000 to $3,000, should be extended further or not. I agree with my hon. friend that when you get up to $3,000, you get beyond the point at which we can talk of the working classes. So far as my experience goes, if a workingman has over $3,000, he invests it, and very properly so, in a homestead or in real estate, instead of putting it into a savings bank.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Our agents have an instruction that if a person brings in a large sum to be deposited, it is to be taken for a long time, in order to check the practice referred to.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not think the limit at present fixed is too high. I know cases in which mechanics in Halifax have the savings of a lifetime in the savings bank, and to whom it would be a great inconvenience to have to take their money out.

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLAKE. There are accounts and papers with reference to a considerable and probably long standing defalcation in the savings banks, as I understand the statements in the papers, and I am anxious to know if any defect has

been discovered in the system of audit for which we are asked to pay and whether any change has been made in consequence of these defalcations?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Some six or nine months ago, with reference to the Audit Department, a change took place which led to the discovery to which the hon. gentleman refers. That is now in process of litigation and we cannot say what the result will be. Of course there may be a very considerable deficit.

Mr. BLAKE. It is found there was some weakness in the system which before prevailed. I am not blaming the hon. gentleman, for I suppose he continued the old system.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, but the Deputy Minister of Finance thought it might be amended, and new regulations were adopted, which led to the discoveries referred to.

Mr. BLAKE. Were they with reference to the audit.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; and I will bring the new regulations down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some years ago I called the hon. gentleman's attention to the large amount of the Sinking Fund. That has since increased considerably. With reference to his intentions, or his expectations, if he prefers to call them so, with respect to the new loan, the hon. gentleman in making his explanations said nothing about his intentions with respect to the Sinking Fund. I should like to know whether he proposes to continue the policy of having a large Sinking Fund, in view of the new loans he contemplates making. It appears to me the time has come when the Sinking Fund can be fairly dropped. Other nations have none, and our standing is good enough not to require it any longer. It is clear this Sinking Fund is becoming a serious incubus in more ways than one. It is now $1,250,000, and it has this serious disadvantage, that it raises the nominal price of our bonds beyond their genuine value, which is not desirable. We are obliged to purchase back many of these bonds at a very considerable premium, and for this reason I came to the conclusion some years ago that it is desirable that we should have no more Sinking Funds, as the credit of the country is sufficient to dispense with them. What is the policy of the hon. gentleman on that point going to be?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman says he came to the conclusion some years ago to have no sinking fund. From 1874 to 1878 he did not put that in practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course not.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Therefore I did not take the course proposed. There is something to be said on both sides. During the time the hon. gentleman was in office he, looking at both sides of the case, took the ground that, on the whole, it was better to have a Sinking Fund. In that respect, I agree with him. There are advantages and disadvantages, but under the circumstances and seeing there is not one of the Colonies issuing loans without a Sinking Fund, I purpose, in the next loan, following in the steps of my illustrious predecessor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman is making a serious mistake. I find the Sinking Fund is nearly double what it was in my time, having risen from $500,000 to nearly $1,400,000. It is quite a different thing to have a sinking fund of $500,000 and one of $1,400,000; moreover there is this very great difference, that I was then establishing a new system of loans—of 4 per cent. loans—and moreover the American securities were being offered in the market at precisely the same price as I obtained for the loans I floated. Now the American securities are vastly ahead of ours. Their 4½ per cents. were then being offered in the markets at par, while our 4's were being offered at 90. Now the circumstances are different, and moreover money is cheaper now than it was then. And, although of course the hon. Minister must follow his own judgment in that matter, I regret to hear him say that he is not disposed to consider the question of dropping the Sinking Fund. I think that, in more ways than one, it is a serious error to continue it, but it is for him, of course, to decide, on his responsibility. It is my business only to call attention to the fact that the Sinking Fund has swollen to nearly $1,500,000, which, in the practical operation, means that we have to purchase our 4 per cents. at premiums of 4 or 5 all the time. I do not think that is a very profitable transaction for us, and besides it is open to the two objections I have mentioned—you keep your securities at a point beyond their genuine value, and that is not a desirable thing; and you add unnecessarily, which is a point he may well consider, to the nominal expenditure of this country. Of course, if he is going to take any action, he has got to make it pretty soon, because he will probably have, within the next two years, to borrow a pretty large sum of money; and it is for that reason that I call attention to it now.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not see the connection between the statement made by the hon. gentleman and the propriety of changing the policy. He justifies himself for not adopting the policy he now recommends, because American securities were nearer the rate at which our securities were. I do not see that that has anything to do with it at all. It makes no difference whatever to us. If American securities were double what they are, it would not affect our position one iota, it would not affect it to the extent of one cent. Then, if he makes the statement with the view of showing that our securities have not advanced in the same proportion as the United States securities, if that is the object he has in view, he knows perfectly well the reason which has led to the increase in the value of American securities. The Government have been paying them off at the rate of $100,000,000 a year, and certain securities, by the American law, are absolutely necessary in order to secure the bank circulation; so the fact that they are diminishing in number and the increased demand have increased their value. It does not bear on the question of the advisability of our having a sinking fund or not. The Sinking Funds will be less this year than before, because about $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 will be taken up of the sinking fund in the present year. Of course they are maturing, and they are held now by the Government; but, as I stated before, I cannot see any circumstances at the present time that at all change the reasons or make it desirable that it should be done now more than when the hon. gentleman had charge of the financial affairs of the Dominion. They were then about $900,000 or $1,000,000; this year perhaps they will be about $1,250,000; but that does not affect the case at all. The question is simply this, what would we receive for the debentures if they were placed on the market if they had no sinking fund provided for them? They would not bring the same price, and that must be taken into account as to the loss we sometimes sustain by buying these at a sum in advance of what we sold the debentures for, and that is a question to be considered in settling this point with no reference whatever to the value of American securities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I can explain to the hon. gentleman, or at any rate to many members of this House, that it made a very considerable difference when I was offering my loans. The price investors will give depends upon the price for which they can obtain as good securities in the market, and, when the American Republic were offering their securities at a certain figure, it was not very easy for the Canadian Government to get a higher rate. The hon. gentleman cannot fail to see the connection. What investors look at is the value of money and the number of other securities that are offered, and there is therefore a

strong connection between the price to be obtained for Canadian 4 per cents. and the price to be obtained for American 4½ per cents. As to the other point which he raises, I admit frankly that it is a point for mature consideration. I am not pressing upon the hon. Minister to act contrary to his own judgment, but I am pointing out one or two reasons why, in my opinion, it is advisable even to lose a point or two rather than to go on paying a large additional sum every year—4½ per cent., as far as we are concerned, instead of 4 per cent. Of course, he must do exactly as he decides. It is for him to weigh the various difficulties in the way of negotiating loans, and for him to decide. That is his business. My business, however, is to call his attention and that of the House to the fact that our Sinking Fund is larger than, I think, that of any other State of similar size at the present moment. He may be aware—I am not—of a State with an equal amount of securities on the market, that has an equally large Sinking Fund, and he must see that using this $1,250,000, which will go on increasing all the time, in this way, is not a very desirable thing. I am not proposing to abolish the Sinking Fund altogether, even if it were possible. He cannot do that. He is bound to go on with the Sinking Fund in the majority of these loans up to 1894 or 1895, I think. What I say is, the Sinking Fund which will be at his disposal, under present arrangements, is so large, that it would be wise for him not to add to it, and to endure even a slight loss—and I believe it would be a very slight loss, if any at all—in consequence.

Mr. HESSON. This is the first time I ever heard objection being taken to securities being strengthened by a Sinking Fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you know very little about it.

Mr. HESSON. I think I have had as much experience in regard to Sinking Funds as the ex-Finance Minister, perhaps not in a large way, but in a small way, and we must judge from experience. We know, that if you put securities into the market without any provision for a Sinking Fund, you will not get as good a price as if there was such a provision. I do not think it is any mistake for the Government to invest in their own securities. It is simply retiring their own securities every year to a certain extent, and it strengthens the value of their securities abroad. I think the hon. gentleman established a very good precedent when he established that, and perhaps under more trying circumstances than the country is now called upon to pass through. I think it would be unwise to abandon a policy which has been found to answer so well in municipalities, where I think they manage these things as carefully as anywhere else.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to differ with my hon. and experienced friend, but I will say this—he will understand it is not a question of dispensing with the Sinking Fund altogether. Under our arrangements, a very large Sinking Fund indeed will be applied to the payment of our securities for the next twenty-four or twenty-five years. I have very great doubts whether, in our position, a Sinking Fund is any longer wanted, and I have very great doubts whether it would add to any appreciable extent to the price we would get, while it undoubtedly will add to the burdens of the people of this country, because he must remember that every dollar unnecessarily taken from the people involves a greater loss than is represented by every dollar that goes into the Treasury. But we are not discussing the question of abolishing the Sinking Fund. For the next generation, at all events, we will have always a large Sinking Fund, which will go on increasing. It goes into an accumulated fund, and the interest is always added, and I say that, as it stands, is quite enough, and there is no need to add to it any further. I found the Sinking Fund increasing more than I thought desirable, and I did not hesitate to state to the Minister of Finance that I had determined myself and would have supported him, in 1880, or in 1879, if he had pleased, in dispensing with the Sinking Fund from that time out. I admit there is something to be said on both sides, but I think the advantages of the Sinking Fund are outweighed by the additional burden on the people, especially as we will not dispense with the Sinking Fund or a million and more applicable to it for many years.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

?. The Governor General's Secretary's Office..... $9,710 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is an annual increase to one messenger, $30; there is a decrease in the third class clerks of $100, and an increase of $50 to the chief clerk—on the whole a decrease of about $20, if you deduct the amount of appropriation last year to C. C. Jones, made under peculiar circumstances. The law provides that in the absence of an official, a chief clerk, for instance, the next on the list discharges the duties and receives the salary. In this case the chief clerk, a Mr. Stewart, died, and the Act does not provide for that, and we took a vote of $145 to pay him the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose these $3,000 are distributed for *Aides-de-camp* at the pleasure of His Excellency.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A question was raised, I think it was last year, whether it would not be advisable to have a gentleman born, or at least brought up, in Canada attached as one of these *Aides-de-camp*. There is a good deal to be said for that, in my opinion, although, of course, it is also very proper that His Excellency should have with him such officers as he may please to bring.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not recollect any reference being made to that subject last year, but there is a good deal in what the hon. member says. Of course, the Governor General's wishes must be considered in the matter. But while there is a good deal to be said in favour of the appointment of a Canadian, still I do not think that it should be laid down as a fixed rule.

Mr. BLAKE. I was going to say something to the same effect. Of course, His Excellency's *Aides-de-camp* are a part of his family, and it is very reasonable and natural that he should have the selection of them, but I have no doubt that his own comfort and the efficiency of his office, in some not unimportant respects, would be greatly promoted if we were to recur to the old system. In the old Province of Canada we had a Provincial *Aides-de-camp*, and I have no doubt whatever, that a native officer who was thoroughly acquainted with the people of the country, and could teach the new comers of the Staff, and inform those in authority on many important points, would be very conducive to the easy working of the office. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the suggestion is one of no little practical moment. It is no new thing. In the old Province of Canada we had a Provincial *Aides-de-camp* who filled the post for very many years, who was a man of great discretion and judgment, and was found extremely useful to the successive incumbents to the high office of Governor General—our old friend Col. Irvine. I think the sooner we recur to that plan the better it will be to the office.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In many of the Provinces, before Confederation, we had a gentleman filling that situation. In New Brunswick, there was an officer holding the position for over twenty years. There is a great advantage in it, as when a change in Governors General takes place, and a new Governor arrives, everything moves on as before,

There are many advantages, no doubt, attached to that principle, but still we are not in a position, I think, to ask that that should be the case.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I think it is well the question has been raised in the House, as it may attract the attention of His Excellency.

Mr. MILLS I understood the Minister of Finance to say that when an officer was absent and his duties were discharged by another officer of inferior grade, the second one received the same compensation as the first. Is that in all cases?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; that is the law now, and it is adhered to.

Mr. MILLS. I think I can show that the hon. gentleman has departed from it.

3. The Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada..... $18,847 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have there been any promotions in the Department, or anything but ordinary increases?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. None. The hon. gentleman will notice that $1,000 was appropriated last year for extra work; that is struck out. There is an allowance for the Private Secretary of the President of the Council, which is the only increase, except the annual increase of $50 in a few cases. For instance, two first-class clerks have $50 each, and four second-class clerks have $50 each, being increases.

4. The Department of Justice..... $16,950 00
5. do do (Penitentiary Branch) 5,200 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain about the increase and promotions?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is one second class clerk added to the Department of Justice, at a salary of $1,300. He was transferred from the Penitentiary Branch, where he was receiving $1,250. I believe during the present year one person has been transferred from that Department to the Department of the Interior, either this year or the close of last year.

Mr. BLAKE. I see where there were two third-class clerks, there is only one now. Did that change the hon. gentleman referred to take place in the promotion of one of these third-class clerks?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, it is a transfer. I suppose they found little use for him there, and he was required in the Penitentiary Branch.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe there is a third-class clerk added to the Penitentiary Branch and a third-class clerk gone away from the Justice Branch. Is it an exchange?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes. A third-class clerk has been appointed to the Penitentiary Branch in place of the other who is transferred to the Department of Justice.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the third-class clerk a new appointment or a transfer?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think it is a transfer, but I do not know?

6. The Department of Militia..... $41,360 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a very considerable increase. Last year the vote was $36,980; this year we are asked to vote $43,160, and we are asked for five additional employees, 32 as against 27. Independent of other matters, I call the attention of the Minister and the House to this: If you deduct the four messengers who are receiving $400 or $500 each, it follows that we have 28 officers, who, on an average, receive $1,470 a year. Really that seems a very large figure for the Department of Militia and Defence, or any similar Department. They must be all first class clerks, or very nearly so, in order to obtain such a salary average. However, the hon Minister, of course, will give his explanations to the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I should like also an explanation as to why it is that the Militia Department employs an architect and draughtsman. Surely if the Government have the Public Works Department and a Chief Architect, all work should be done under his supervision; but here is another Department which should have nothing to do with architectural work, employing an architect and also a draughtsman. Is there to be an Architectural Department in connection with each of the Government offices, or what does it mean? I think it is a great mistake, and one which should not have been taken without first obtaining the opinion of Parliament and its sanction thereto. This is an entire Departmental change.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will see that the increase is one which has been occasioned by a change which the Government considered it advisable to make in the Department of Militia. The Government considered that the Military works, which were being carried on by the Public Works Department added considerably to the works already so very large under that Department. And moreover, it was considered that the repairs which are continually being made to the military works in the country, fortifications and barracks, and other works requiring special knowledge, if I can use that word, would be better carried out by a gentleman who possessed not only the knowledge required by an employé of the Department of Public Works, but also knowledge of military works. I must say that the first item which has been referred to more particularly by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), that for an architect, was inserted in the printed copies of the Estimates by mistake. I therefore ask to drop that item, $1,800 for an architect. The addition to the expenditure in this Branch of the Department is $1,000 for a second class clerk and draughtsman, and $800 for a third-class clerk. These are required to enable the Department to carry out the change which has been considered advisable in transferring to the Department of Militia the work which had heretofore been carried out by the Department of Public Works. I think, judging from the experience of the past, it is an improvement; and these changes were made with the concurrence of the Minister of Public Works, who has had considerable experience, as both sides of the House will readily admit, in his own Department. Leaving out the item of $1,800 which will be struck out, hon. gentlemen opposite will see that the addition is altogether caused by this change in the system, which has been followed up to the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What promotions has the hon. gentleman made in his Department, if any?

Mr. CARON. There are no promotions. Col. Bacon, who was acting here as Brigade Major, was transferred to the position made vacant by the death of Col. Walkem.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What appointment is it?

Mr. CARON. Colonel Bacon was appointed, by Order in Council, at a salary of $1,50. The salary received by Colonel Walkem was $1,700.

Mr. BLAKE. I see there are two second-class clerks instead of one.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentlemam is quite right. The second-class clerk to whom he referred is Mr. Donaldson, who used to be in "B" Battery, Kingson. He is a gentleman who possesses special qualifications, and he has been appointed to the Store Branch. Hon. gentlemen will under-

stand that from the addition which has been made to the forces, the work of the Department is more than double what it was a few years ago and it was indispensable to have a man like Mr. Donaldson who was thoroughly *au fait* with all the technicalities of the Store Branch of the Department. So he was transferred, on the report of the Deputy Minister, to that Branch, at a salary of $1,150.

Mr. BLAKE. He had not been in the permanent Civil Service before?

Mr. CARON. No; it is a new appointment.

Mr. BLAKE. He comes in as a second-class clerk?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. About what age may he be?

Mr. CARON. I am told he is about thirty-two years old. Of course he is perfectly young enough to do the work in the most efficient manner.

Mr. BLAKE. Was he submitted to an examination under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. CARON. No; he was brought in for special qualifications and because it was found absolutely necessary, in that Branch of the Department, to have a man who possessed the knowledge of military stores, which are not qualifications contemplated by the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the age of Col. Bacon?

Mr. CARON. I suppose he is a man of about 48 or 50. The hon gentleman will recollect that Mr. Walkem was the gentleman who had charge of the ordnance land belonging to that section under the Act, and it really belongs to the Department of Militia. This officer requires the drawing out and preparation of plans for transfers of property, which are occasionally made by the Department, and Col. Bacon was a gentleman who besides being a Brigade Major had all the knowledge which was required to replace a gentleman in the position of Mr. Walkem. He had been an engineer, and he has a very considerable knowledge of architecture. He is a draughtsman, and can draw out plans and copy any maps, which are continually needed in the discharge of the duties required in that Branch of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Was he examined?

Mr. CARON. No; he was brought under the exemption, which is contemplated by the Act, which provides that in certain circumstances, specialists may be brought in without submitting to the ordinary examination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is also a third-class clerk, I notice.

Mr. CARON. Yes; this is in consequence of the increase of work in the Store Branch of the Department. The hon. gentleman will understand that from our permanent establishment, which is altogether new, and which is carried out under the vote of last Session, allowing the Minister of Militia to organize the new schools of infantry and a school of cavalry, an increase in the staff of the Department is absolutely indispensable. I may say that I do not consider that the increase in that branch of the Department is sufficient to carry on the increase of work which has taken place within the last few years. However, inasmuch as I am always ready to carry on the Department in the most economical manner possible, so as to be able to submit the votes which I am called upon to ask from hon. members, who are always sure to criticise them in the most thorough manner, I thought that I would merely add one third-class clerk in the Store Branch of the Department, as I considered it necessary to make this new appointment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is a new man? He has not been in the service before?

Mr. CARON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under what rule is a third-class clerk appointed at a starting salary of $850. The hon. gentleman will observe that two of those third-class clerks are apparently at $1,000 and one at $850. Now, what is the present maximum of the third-class clerks under the recent emendations of the law, and at what rate are they usually expected to begin?

Mr. CARON. This third-class clerk was employed in the cartridge factory at Quebec. He passed the Civil Service examination under the Act, and he was transferred to the Department to replace Mr. Jones, who left the Department. Mr. Jones was receiving $1,000. Mr. Knight, besides passing the examination took three optional subjects on which he passed. He is, besides, an accountant, and it was impossible to get the services of a gentleman who possessed the qualifications which he possesses without giving him at the outset the salary which I recommended should be given him. In giving him the $850, I have saved an additional clerk who would have been required unless I had found in the gentleman who received the appointment the qualifications possessed by the gentleman who was appointed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the maximum salary of the third-class?

Mr. CARON. The minimum is $400 and the maximum $1,000, under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BOWELL. The grade of junior second-class is abolished and the third-class goes up.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated that this officer was appointed in place of another gentleman who left; but I find that there is an additional third-class clerk.

Mr. CARON. I explained to the hon. gentleman that in consequence of the increased work in the Department it was considered necessary to add to the staff. The new appointment is a third-class clerk, who has not yet been appointed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another besides.

Mr. CARON. No, no other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman takes power to have three in place of two.

Mr. CARON. The new appointment which I spoke of is that of Mr. Donaldson, who has been transferred from "B" Battery, and, having special qualifications, has been appointed without being subjected to the examination required by the Civil Service Act. Mr. Knight filled the place left vacant by Mr. Jones, in November, 1883, at a salary of $850. The third is the new appointment which has not yet been made, but is considered necessary in consequence of the increased work in that branch of the Department. The new clerk, when appointed, is to have $850.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Last year the hon. gentleman took a vote for two clerks at $1,000 each. Now he takes a vote for three—one at $850, and two at $1,000 each. That $850 is, I presume, for Mr. Knight.

Mr. CARON. There are three third-class clerks. One is Mr. Clark, at $1,000 a year. Mr. Jones, who received $1,000, has been replaced by Mr. Knight, who receives $850. The third is an appointment which is not yet made, and for which the salary will be $850.

Mr. BLAKE. Last year there were but two third-class clerks—one at $1,000, who remains at $1,000, and another at $1,000, who has been replaced by Mr. Knight, at $850. Therefore, the hon. gentleman proposes to give the maximum $1,000 for the new third-class clerk whom he proposes to appoint.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will see that Mr. Jones' salary was $1,000. But he is gone, and I am asking for

a revote of that amount to pay the salary of Mr. Donaldson, who was paid last year out of the funds voted for "B" Battery, and who is now on the Civil Service list. Consequently, the hon. gentleman will see that the real increase which I am asking Parliament to vote is $850 for the new appointment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Tell us the names of the two at $1,000 each.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has given us one man who was in before and is in charge now. What is his name? He is a third-class clerk.

Mr. CARON. Mr. Clark.

Mr. BLAKE. I have got two third-class clerks at $1,000 each, of which Mr. Clark is one. I strike him out; that leaves one at $1,000. Then I find another at $850, Mr. Knight, in the place of Mr. Jones; I am left with one third-class clerk unaccounted for.

Mr. CARON. I am telling the hon. gentleman that the new appointment is an appointment at a salary of $850. I say the position left vacant by Mr. Jones and filled by Mr. Knight is a position, the occupant of which shall receive $1,000 a year. I have left the amount which he was receiving $1,000, and which was voted last year, in the Estimates, and which I ask Parliament to vote this year.

Mr. BLAKE. Why.

Mr. CARON. Because the difference between $850 or $700 which may be given to the new man to be appointed, I complete by adding the balance to the salary paid to Donaldson, who is transferred from "B" Battery, and which was not provided for in the Estimates of last year, except in the amount voted for "B" Battery. I kept that amount so as to complete the salary and make the new appointment of $850.

Mr. BLAKE. Donaldson is a second-class, clerk is he not?

Mr. CARON. No, he is not.

Mr. BLAKE. What is he?

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman misunderstands, but no doubt the fault is mine. Mr. Clark receives $1,000 a year; then there is the office vacated by Mr. Jones, who was receiving $1,000; I leave in the Estimates this year his salary as $1,000, as provided last year, and I make a new appointment so as to be able to meet the requirements of the Store Branch of my Department, and to that new appointee I give $850.

Mr. BLAKE. Who is he.

Mr. CARON. He is not appointed yet.

Mr. BLAKE. But the other man; Jones' place is filled by Knight at $850.

Mr. CARON. So it is, but I leave the salary which was paid to Jones so as to be able to make up the new appointment which I am making at $850, and a portion of the salary which Donaldson is now receiving, who has been transferred from "B" Battery.

Mr. BLAKE. That is entirely indefensible. We have now got to the bottom of it. We have got Mr. Clark at $1,000, and we have another new appointment proposed at $850, and beside these we have a vote of $1,000 for a third-class clerk to be accounted for, and the hon. gentleman accounts for that by saying that he shall receive $850 and the difference of $150 will be used to supplement the pay of some other clerk in some other grade. That will not do. If the hon. gentleman wants to pay Donaldson let him ask for the money under the proper head, but he must not ask us to give $1,000 for a clerk who is to receive only $850, in order that, with the difference, the hon. gentleman may give an increase to some other clerk. That cannot be done under the law. It will be military law, if the hon. gentleman does it, martial law, not the law we understand.

Mr. CARON. The position vacated by Mr. Jones, who received $1,000, has been left vacant and a new appointment of $850 given to Mr. Knight. Mr. Jones' position is left open, but the amount he received is voted so as to provide for the filling up of that position.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know which of these explanations we are to accept. We were told that Mr. Jones' place was filled by Mr. Knight, and we were told the reason why Mr. Knight received $850 to fill this place was that he had special qualifications to fill it, and then we were told that the hon. gentleman asked for $1,000 in order that he might use the difference of $150 to supplement the salary of another clerk. Now, he tells us that is not so; that Mr. Jones' place is not filled, that the $850 is for a new appointment, and that he proposes to fill Mr. Jones' place at the maximum rate of $1,000. Why should he give this maximum rate in the appointment of a third class clerk.

Mr. CARON. Mr. Jones was receiving $1,000, and his salary is placed on the Estimate at full, to provide for the new appointment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You cannot give $1,000 to a third-class clerk without special reasons.

Mr. CARON. There are special reasons.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman told us that the office of Mr. Jones was to be filled by Mr. Knight, at $1,000.

Mr. CARON. I made a mistake. Mr. Knight is appointed at $850. The position left vacant by Mr. Jones is still vacant, and will be filled by a new appointment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman says he was mistaken in one point. Did he also mistake as to the qualifications of Mr. Knight, who was the most admirable person that could be found?

Mr. CARON. So he is.

Mr MACKENZIE. He is still as good a man as he was?

Mr. CARON. He is quite as admirable as he was.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is utterly impossible for me, with my limited capacity, to understand why Mr. Knight, an hour ago, or nearly so, was admirably suited to discharge the duties Mr. Jones had to discharge, and he should now ask $1,000 for what $850 would suffice for. That is not explained yet; and then, if the hon. gentleman wants another third-class clerk, we ought to know what he is wanted for, and he must begin at the amount fixed in the Civil Service Act. He is adding to one salary illegally, and is now asking us to sanction the vote of a salary for another third class clerk, at the maximum, to begin with, instead of the minimum. That is also contrary to law, and no explanation is given.

Mr. CARON. I have given the hon. gentleman every possible explanation. I have repeated, time and again, how the new appointments were to be provided for. I have told the hon. gentleman that the position of Mr. Jones, not being filled, was left vacant, and was to be filled by a gentleman, and I provide for the salary which was voted last year to Mr. Jones. I have also explained that Mr. Knight was appointed at $850.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us, now, whether it is intended to apply $150 of this $1,000 towards Mr. Donaldson's salary because he said so a while ago.

Mr. CARON. No; Mr. Donaldson is provided for by the vote of $1,150.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, if it is not intended to apply that $150 to Mr. Donaldson's salary, it is not wanted, because that is the only purpose that the hon. gentleman gave us

for asking it—he only wanted $850, and was taking $1,000 to supplement Mr. Donaldson's salary. Of course, he will now strike off that $150, and will probably order Jones, Knight & Co. to form in close column and beat a masterly retreat.

Mr. CARON. I have told the hon. gentleman the $1,000 was provided for the vacancy in my Department, and is intended to be given to the new occupant, provided the man who fills the position will have the qualifications to receive that amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it is very objectionable to have an appointment of a third-class clerk made at the maximum. There is no use in having third-class clerks appointed in any Department at the maximum salary. It is a very bad precedent. It will do mischief, as the hon. gentleman knows right well, if you find in the Militia Department, where the salaries are very high, much in excess of the other Departments, that a man comes in as a third-class clerk at $1,000, the maximum of the class. The precedent is a very dubious one, at any rate. It would be better to face the question at once, and put him in some grade where the precedent would not be so injurious to the rest of the Service.

Mr. CARON. The only difference is about the amount of $150, and I think, as the hon. gentlemen have shown so much confidence in me, they may leave it to my discretion to decide whether it will be given or not. If it is not given, it will be struck off next year, and the hon. gentleman will be convinced that I am trying to work my Department in the most economical manner possible.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think that is a proper matter to submit to this House for its consideration. The whole of this Civil Service Act proceeds on the principle of gradation. The hon. gentleman or his colleague, submitted a measure two or three years ago for the purpose of Civil Service examination. The parties who have entered the Civil Service are put in various classes. They begin at a certain salary. Here a vacancy occurs in which the party who held the office was receiving $1,000 a year. That was the maximum sum, which, perhaps after years of service, was obtained by this officer. Now, when that officer has risen from $300 or $400 up to $1,000 by efficient public service, extending over a series of years, the hon. gentleman proposes that the new occupant to the office shall begin at the point which the late occupant only reached after several years of faithful public service. Suppose the hon. gentleman acts in this way with regard to every vacancy. He need only hold the office a few years until every clerk in every grade in that office receives the maximum salary allowed by the law. He enters at the maximum salary. There is no such thing as a gradation, or an increase of salary, except by the transferrence of a party from one office to another. Now, if that is the principle upon which the Government is going to proceed, then we ought to have an amendment of the Act, we ought to have that policy enunciated here, and the hon. gentleman should propose that, instead of parties beginning at the minimum salary fixed by the Civil Service Act or regulations, they shall begin at the maximum salary so fixed; he should do away with this progressive increase of salary provided for under the Act. The hon. gentleman makes to this House a proposition in direct violation of the Act, in violation of the spirit, the principle and the policy of the Act. His proposition is that, there being a vacancy in an office held after a number of years of service at $1,000, an inexperienced party shall be appointed to fill it at the same salary, instead of beginning at the smaller amount. If he wishes the House to assent to that proposition, it should come before the House in some other way than by a violation of the principles and spirit of the Act under which he professes to act.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will see that I have been carrying out, in the administration of my Department, exactly the views expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. Last year, Mr. Walkem was receiving a salary of $1,700. Parliament agreed to that amount, and I filled the position left vacant by his death by appointing Col. Bacon at $1,450.

Mr. MILLS. Then you do not want $1,000 now.

Mr. CARON. I am asking only for $1,450. This vacancy has taken place in one of the most important branches of the service, and I am asking Parliament to vote a salary which was voted last year. I do not at all say that I will give that salary to the occupant of the position which I want to fill, but if I can find a man to fill that position at a less salary than the amount voted last year, I shall do as I did in replacing Mr. Walkem, to whom I gave $1,500 instead of $1,700; and next year the hon. gentleman will see that I have not taken advantage of this vote. I consider that the position to be filled require a man of special qualifications, and though I do not think it will be necessary to give $2,000, I think it prudent to ask Parliament to vote this amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see that the Civil Service Act is going to be made simply waste paper if every appointment to be filled in his Department, or in any other, is to be filled by a man coming in and getting the maximum, on the ground of special qualifications. Now that proviso in the Act allowing the Minister to appoint men with special qualifications was intended, as we all know, to meet exceptional cases. There was no intention that half-a-dozen men should be pitchforked into any Department, under the plea of special qualifications. It was supposed to be an almost invariable rule that men would commence at the minimum of their grade, as Col. Bacon, I suppose, is going to do. It was never intended that these special qualifications should be used for appointing third-class clerks, or people of that kind, but it was intended only to give Ministers the benefit, in the higher branches of their Departments, of special qualifications which could not be easily obtained in the Department. That is the ground—it is not distrust of the Minister of the Militia at all. Though the amount is only a few hundred dollars, an important principle is involved, and the principle is that the Civil Service Act is to be maintained, and that it shall not be allowed, simply by a stroke of the pen, or upon the recommendation of the Minister, that so and so shall get $1,000 on entering the service, when the minimum salary, perhaps, is only $400. I believe that the Ministers would consult their own convenience by adhering to the Civil Service regulations. They may be sure that such a case as this will be made the foundation for other applications.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right. It is very important that the Civil Service Act should be carried out in its entirety and in good faith. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that special qualifications might induce the head of a Department to recommend an increase of salary beyond the minimum of a class in which the party enters the service, but except in special cases, the minimum salary should be paid, of course. As to this particular case, perhaps the Committee would allow the order to pass, and my hon. friend, between now and Concurrence, will consider the arguments of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understand the last two items are to come off.

Mr. CARON. It would be impossible for me to carry out the change which has been made in my Department unless we had proper officers. Of course, the hon. gentleman will

understand that at present there is no officer who can assume the control of public works which heretofore were carried on by the Department of Public Works. As it is contemplated to transfer to my Deparment the conduct of certain public works, it is necessary for me to provide a staff capable of carrying on those works. The only appointment which I can strike off is that of a first-class clerk, at $1,800, but the $1,100 for a third class clerk and the $800 must remain.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to know whether this transfer of part of the public works of the country to the Militia Department has been made by Order in Council or under authority of an Act of Parliament. The Act constituting the Militia Department, I do not think authorizes anything of this sort.

Mr. BLAKE. This is, of course, a question of policy which, so far as I remember, has been settled by an Act of Parliament. We have frequently discussed the advantage of having a united management of all the public works under one office. So recently as last Session and the Session before, it was stated that we must go further in this direction, and the Minister of Public Works took charge of the heating of all the buildings. It was said it was important to have them concentrated in the charge of one Department. Now, here we find a plan for the creation of new military buildings, which, with their repairs, are to be handed over to the Militia Department. If so, why should not the Justice Department take charge of the repairs of the penitentaries, &c.? Why should not the Customs Department take charge of the Customs houses, and the Post Office Department take charge of the post offices, and so on? Is there anything so very peculiar in the military buildings that it requires my hon. friend's knowledge of architecture to get these made ready, and his knowledge of accounts and of estimates to assure absolute accuracy of the fulfilment of these works? If it is something personal to my hon. friend, we would all bow with submission; but it is a general question of policy to be adopted.

Mr. CARON. I do not think the hon. gentleman is discussing the question from the right point of view. He is comparing the post offices and Customs houses to repairs of fortifications, for instance. The hon. gentleman must admit that there is a very great difference between those matters and keeping up important military works, which may have cost enormous sums of money—not to Canada, but which have been transferred to Canada. It is necessary that these works should be carried on by some one possessing special knowledge of military works. In England, as the hon. gentleman knows well, and in every other country, these military works form a special Department, under charge of a person possessing special qualifications. It may not be necessary to have so large a Department in Canada, or so skilful officers, but it is necessary for us, in keeping up these military works, to have them under the control of a specialist, and it is for that purpose that they have been transferred to my Department. Although the hon. gentlemen may criticise my expression of opinion on a subject of that kind, I may say that the experience of the past, both in the Department of Public Works and in that of the Militia, has shown that these military works were not carried on as well as they would have been had they been under the control of a person possessing special qualifications and who might supervise these important defensive works which we have in Canada. That is the reason which induced the Government to transfer, by Order in Council, public works appertaining to the Militia Department, instead of leaving them under the control of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I should like to know where the Order in Council is.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman will bring down the Order in Council before Concurrence, and allow full opportunity to discuss this item, it may be allowed to pass. This, however, is an important question of policy, and I should like to see the Order in Council before Concurrence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As regards the fortifications at Quebec, Kingston and other places, ordinary architects, however skilful they may be in erecting Custom houses, are quite inefficient in building walls to resist an attack. In the case of the Marine and Fisheries, the Department erects all the lighthouses, except very large, permanent stone buildings. The Order in Council will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. The First Minister has declared that the military authorities hold that a specialist is required for this purpose. If the hon. Minister of Militia had retained the item for an architect, I could have understood it, but the hon. gentleman struck out the item for a specialist.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason can easily be explained: The hon. Minister was anxious to economise. He thinks he can obtain the services of Col. Hewitt, a distinguished engineer, who is at the head of the Royal Military College, to look after the fortifications for a time. If it is found necessary, afterwards, to have a military architect, an item will be placed in the Estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There have been no new walls or bastions built recently, and all that is necessary is to maintain the old works.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will rise in defence of his Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am always ready to defend my Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware, from personal knowledge, that Col. Hewitt, and the other officers, are a hard working set of men, who have plenty to do in performing the work properly belonging to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no new permanent fortifications. All that is required is to maintain the present works.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There have been no new works constructed since 1846. The same system of carrying out repairs has been pursued for many years.

7. The Department of Secretary of State $41,230 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some alterations here, and apparently an addition in the Queen's printer's branch. The other items seem to have been somewhat reduced.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The change is due to the promotion of an officer who received $1,100; but there is a reduction by the appointment of one third-class clerk at $400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the gentleman promoted?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Mousseau.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to invite the attention of the Secretary of State and the Finance Minister to the cost of this Department. In 1878 the amount asked for, including cost of Mounted Police grant, was $31,990, or about $29,000 for the Department. Over $43,000 are asked for 1884. The Finance Minister publicly stated, when out of office, that the amount expended by the Government was too large by at least $1,000,000. In connection with the Department, the number of employees has increased from twenty-five, in 1878, to thirty-nine in 1884, and there are at present forty-two. This is one of the Departments in which the work does not grow very rapidly; except in the matter of registration of deeds, there is no more work there than formerly. In the present

depressed condition of trade and industry, with the prospect of a very large falling off in the revenue, with thousands of people in all our towns and cities out of employment and obliged to go abroad to obtain that employment which is denied them here, it is certainly very important that the Government should undertake to economise, and that Parliament should see that large sums which are unnecessary should not be voted for the purpose of Civil Government. It is, Sir, perfectly obvious that this Department has grown in cost of management much more rapidly—I do not say in consequence of anything done by the hon. gentleman who is now Secretary of State, because I see that the amount last year was quite as large as the amount asked for the succeeding year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is a reduction of $2,400.

Mr. MILLS. That is for next year; but the amount is apparently $1,000. The amounts are $44,245 for the current year, and $43,230 for the succeeding year. But I still revert to the point to which I called the hon. gentleman's attention before, and that is, that the Department costs now about $44,000, while in 1878 it cost $29,000.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The decrease this year, I said, was $2,400. That is to say, $1,015, and if you take into consideration the statutory increases there will be another decrease of $1,450, making $2,460 less for next year. If I go on at this rate for six years, we will come up to 1878.

8. The Department of the Interior ..... $107,034 00.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In our Estimates, this vote is separated into different branches, and I think it will be better to discuss them separately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Deputy-Head is the same; so is the Surveyor-General. There has been an increase of $50 in the Chief Clerk (Secretary) salary. In the salary of one Chief Clerk there has been an increase of $75. Then, there is an additional Chief Clerk at $1,800. He was brought from the Department of Justice. The next clerks are the same, with but a slight reduction. In the next there is an increase. I suppose some new clerks have been appointed. There is an additional third-class clerk in the Geological Survey Branch. I think the others are merely statutory increases. The additional second-class clerk must have been promoted from the class below. Then there is an additional third-class clerk, at $400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are apparently three or certainly two additional third-class clerks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; there was a promotion of a third to a second, and two third-class clerks were brought in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the total is only slightly less than in 1883-84, but I should imagine that the present work of the Department is not as great as in 1882-83.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The work is increasing annually. The number of surveys is increasing, and the number of clerks is, of necessity, also increasing, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit that it is necessary to have a very full staff for the Department of the Interior, in order to secure promptness in the work. There have been complaints of delays, although a great many of those complaints are unfounded, still there is no doubt that the staff has been greatly overworked.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I notice that there is one first-class clerk, for whom no vote is asked this year. Has some clerk left?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; the hon. gentleman will note that there is a substitution. One at $2,250 seems to have gone, and another gentleman at $1,800 has taken his place. Who is the man who has left.

Mr. MILLS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I forget at the moment, but I know that Mr. Hall was the gentleman who came in his place. He is a valuable officer, especially selected after enquiry by the Deputy-Minister from the Department of Justice, who really begged the Minister of Justice for him, as he was very much required in the Department.

Mr. MILLS. It is impossible that the House can form a proper idea of the expenditure of this Department from the facts put before us. The hon. gentleman should have laid before the House some evidence of the work of the Department, and the particular Branches of the Department in which that extra work is to be found. I find that in 1878, for instance, in the Land branch, there were twenty-five clerks employed; to-day, I observe, the hon. gentleman has sixty-two in that same branch. Then $30,800 was sufficient to meet all the expenditure. Now the hon. gentleman asks upwards of $67,000. Has the hon. gentleman a larger number of persons engaged in the preparation of maps? Is there anything in the hon. gentleman's report to show that the number of letters received and written, the amount of work done, the number of persons who have taken up homesteads, the number of patents issued, have so increased as to justify the large sum asked? The hon. gentleman ought to place before the House some evidence that this large sum is necessary, before he asks us to vote it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is some foundation for the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the report not being submitted to the House. It has almost broken the heart of the Department not to have been able to get the report ready in time. I am glad to say I saw it in galley three or four days ago, and it will be in the hands of the House almost immediately. I regret that, from stress of work, it has not been here before. The hon. gentleman compared the work of 1878 with that of 1883-84. Why, since 1879 there has been more money collected and more work done, I was going to say by ten times, than from the time the country was acquired until 1879. We have received upwards of $4,000,000, and there is $4,000,000 due to the Government and certain to be paid, because we have the land and the present payments as security. It was no fault of the Department that the report has not been down before. It was pressed very much, and it will be here in a day or two. In the meantime, I think the hon. gentleman will not object to the vote, seeing that we are not asking for so much as was voted last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, there is something in that; but the understanding is, that the hon. gentleman will not ask Concurrence until he brings down the report containing the information my hon. friend is seeking for.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I can promise that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On that understanding, and on the statement that the heart of the Department is nearly broken, I think we can concede this point. But before we part from this item, I would like to call attention to an item on page 109, "Dominion Lands chargeable to Income," under which large sums are asked for the Land Board at Winnipeg, which I think collects most of the money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The money is collected by the local agents and forwarded to headquarters; and the Board at Winnipeg grants titles and supervises the actions of the local agents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The final item here reads: "Inside service—extra clerks at head office, Ottawa, publishing maps, advertising, and other similar expenses, $30,000."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That requires explanation, and will be explained fully when we arrive at that item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I merely call attention to it. These two votes are substantially for the same work, and I should think that this $30,000 for additional clerks at the head office ought to be charged to the Department of the Interior.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information now, but when we arrive at the item I think it will be shown that it is in the right place.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not had a great deal to do with the Department of the Interior, and what little I have had has been extremely unsatisfactory. I think I only express the opinion of a large majority of the people of this country, when I say that the administration of that Department, under its present head, is not such as gives satisfaction to the country. I do not propose to enter into the causes of complaint now, because perhaps it is not the proper time. I have placed on the paper a notice for correspondence, and I would like the hon. gentleman to see that the head of that Department—who is not very rapid in furnishing information or carrying on business—sends down that information before we come to discuss the different votes required for the business of that Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will certainly bring down the papers, if the hon. gentleman has a motion for them. I differ from my hon. friend when he says that the country is dissatisfied with the administration of that Department under its present head. My hon. friend may be dissatisfied.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman knows why I am dissatisfied, and when the papers come down, I think we shall show why the country is dissatisfied, too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Geological Survey, the salary of the directors seems to be the same. There is an increase which seems to be the regular annual increase, $7,400 instead of $7,050.

Mr. MILLS. This seems to be about the only Branch in the hon. gentleman's Department that indicates its natural growth. There has been no very great change. Two additional parties are put on the field staff and there is the annual increase under the Civil Service regulations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is acting as Librarian?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Dr. Thornburn, formerly head master, of the Collegiate Institute.

M. MACKENZIE. He cannot give his whole time and services for $600.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; he is a retired officer, and is fond of books and geological studies, and he is there with a nominal salary for the love of the thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He has other employment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is on the Board of Examiners, but he went in there without any expectation of being on the Board of Examiners. He took this office first as he thought he would like to be there, and he is a very useful man. When the Civil Service Board was being established, he was put on it because he was a superior man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are his duties?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose, to look after the books as Librarian, and I fancy he takes a good deal of interest in the scientific and artistic arrangements of the specimens. Then, he is especially valuable for a duty which I think everyone will admit is of great importance in an institution of that kind, that is, the popularizing of it in the public mind. He is always ready, in the absence of Dr. Selwyn, to do the agreeable to the numerous visitors, and the report of the directors will show the wisdom of the transfer from Montreal, by the fact that the visitors instead of numbering hundreds, now number thousands.

Mr. MILLS. I never doubted that it was the proper thing to have this important branch here instead of in Montreal, and I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman admit the propriety of the transfer. I suppose one important duty of Dr. Thorburn is as, Librarian, to look out for the various scientific publications throughout the world, and see that a proper collection is made for the Library in the Geological Museum. This duty is perhaps as important a duty as can devolve upon him, and will no doubt require a considerable portion of his time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then there is the item of North-West Mounted Police, in which there is no real increase. There is apparently an increase of two third-class clerks, but they have been employed temporarily for years and are now on the permanent list, having passed their examination before the Board.

Mr. MILLS. When this branch was connected with the Department of the Secretary of State, two clerks were considered sufficient to do the work, a first-class clerk at $1,700, and a junior second-class clerk at $1,000. That was the cost in 1878 and in the early part of 1879. There are altogether but 500 Mounted Police, and for the Department of management of these, the hon. gentleman has four clerks and a messenger, and the expenditure is to be $7,300, an extraordinary sum. Two clerks would still be quite adequate to do the work. In any well managed business office, two men of ordinary intelligence would be considered ample to do all the work required.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman has twice called the attention of the Finance Minister particularly to this matter of cost. The hon. gentleman understood me to state that $22,500,000 would be sufficient for the expenditure. I stated that I thought $22,500,000, between 1874 and 1878, would have been sufficient, but I never undertook to say—he is referring to the Department of the Interior—that, when that Department was managing hundreds of millions of acres of land, when nearly half a hundred million acres were surveyed and in the market for sale, and when, as the leader of the Government has said, they have received in three years ten times as much as during the whole period the hon. gentleman was in office, I never attempted to assert for a moment that the expenses for the future would not exceed $22,500,000. The hon. gentleman and others have often referred to that statement as if it applied for all time to come, when it was distinctly made with reference to the period between 1874 and 1878, when no such expenditure was required in the North-West; or in the Post Office Department, or in other Departments of the Public Service.

Mr. MILLS. The Police Force, until recently, remained at the same number as it was fixed at before 1878. The number since then has been slightly increased, but the cost of carrying on the Police Branch at that time was less than $3,000, when the hon. gentleman said that the cost of the Government of the country was too high; and here, in a fixed Department, where there was no possibility of the increase of the work of the Department, the cost has been increased from less than $3,000 to more than $7,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says, he is satisfied that, with two active clerks, the whole business could be done.

Mr. MILLS. *So I am.*

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must enjoy his satisfaction, but Parliament did not think so when

they passed the Act, especially after full explanation of the services and the duties, making the new organization of which he complains. He must complain of Parliament for not being as well satisfied as he is himself, that two clerks could do the work. It would require the Herculean powers of labour of the hon. gentleman to do it. In addition to the Force being increased to 200, 300, and then to 500 men, there are stations to be attended, the duties are immensely increased, the necessary supervision is immensely increased since the hon. gentleman was personally acquainted with the affairs of that body. I think the hon. gentleman knows personally the gentleman who now holds the office of Comptroller, and he will admit that he is a very active and zealous officer. I place every confidence in his statement, and he finds and feels that there is not a man too much employed for the efficiency of the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The question would arise in this, as in some other matters, whether all this work had not better be done from Winnipeg in place of being done from Ottawa. It appears to me that, as it is, the Comptroller, who is equivalent to a Deputy-Head, to do his work properly, has to spend half, or perhaps two thirds of his time in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has he not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He makes two trips in the year. It takes not many weeks now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, it does not take anything like the time to reach the principal stations of these people, but, as he has been transferring so much of the other work of the Department over to Winnipeg, it might very well be considered whether the civil head of the Mounted Police Branch should not be there too. It is a question of policy. I merely mention it. I cannot pretend to say whether it would be better or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite worthy of consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I have seen would incline me to think it would be better.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. the First Minister has several times to-day thrown the blame upon Parliament for legislation he himself has initiated, and he thinks he shakes off all responsibility by saying, Parliament did so and so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It appears to me that he did. Of course he is responsible, as Minister, for what he submits to Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I accept the responsibility. I do not at all throw any blame on Parliament; on the contrary, I praise them for having their minds open to the arguments used at the time, and being satisfied with the arguments and reasons given, and with the policy of the Government, and crystallizing it into a Statute.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman had not always such confidence in Parliament. If I remember, not many years ago, the hon. gentleman was not willing to accept the judgment of Parliament as a correct judgment. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman said that the Government at that time ruled by a mechanical majority. He denied that those who supported the Administration had exercised their judgment, or had reasoned upon public questions. He said they followed the Government blindly, and placed the most implicit confidence in whatever the First Minister proposed. It seems to me that what Parliament did on that occasion, in the estimation of the hon. gentleman, Parliament may do on the present occasion, in the estimation of gentlemen on this side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Exactly.

Mr. MILLS. And I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman, if he were on this side of the House, would not be willing to accept an Act of Parliament as conclusive evidence that what the Minister proposed was right. When we are called upon to consider questions of this sort, it seems to me that we ought to consider them upon their merits. When the hon. gentleman asks for a vote of $7,200 for the administration of a Department having the control of 500 police, it is always in order for this House—in fact, it is the duty of the House—to consider the question whether that amount is actually required or not. Now, in my estimation, it is not required. In my opinion, the amount is unnecessarily large. I believe that the affairs of that particular branch could be administered for half this sum, and, holding that opinion, I have thought proper to express it here, and I have given my reasons. I have shown that when the country was more inaccessible, when the cost of that administration must have been greater than it is at the present time, 300 policemen, at all events, were taken in charge by a Department having two clerks, at a salary of $2,700.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will not say that I agree with the hon. gentleman; I am quite satisfied with the action of Parliament when it agrees with me; he is not satisfied with the action of Parliament unless it agrees with him; and if I were over there and he were here, I might attack the Administration of the Government even if it were fortified by an Act of Parliament; but I quoted the Act of Parliament to show that this was sanctioned by Parliament, and any Government must feel strenghtened by having the sanction of the House of Commons, even if that House of Commons be composed of a majority generally supporting the Ministry,

9. The Department of Indian Affairs. $32,310 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The present salaries are $26,350; statutory increase, $860; proposed promotions from one class to another, $1,100; proposed appointments, $4,000, in consequence of the increase of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no increase, to do the hon. gentleman justice, of $4,000. There is a total increase of $1,023, but not an increase of $4,000, There may be variations to that extent, but that is the total increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a Deputy-Head, $3,200, and $50 increase to a Chief Clerk. There is an additional second-class clerk at $1,100, and a promotion from the third-class. He passed his examination. There is a reduction of two in the third-class clerks. I find it necessary to have an officer specially detailed for the Indian Affairs. Mr. White, the Comptroller, acted for me, but his work is so great that he had to give it up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the First Minister has a Private Secretary in his capacity as President of the Council and also as Superintendent of Indian Affairs?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but I do not intend just now to employ a private secretary at that salary. I must have some one specially engaged for that work. I have two private secretaries, Mr. White, Comptroller, and Mr. Joseph Pope. Mr. White can no longer attend to the work, and I must have somebody else to assist me. My hon. friend for East York knows that the political correspondence of the Head of the Government requires a Private Secretary for that branch alone. Then I want an officer to attend to the correspondence, which is sometimes only semi-official, in the Indian Department.

Mr. MILLS. Whatever the hon. gentleman may say to explain the expenditure in the Land Department he cannot put forward the same explanation in respect to the Indian

Branch. The work in that branch is now precisely what it has been ever since the Treaty regulations were made. Throughout the older Provinces, there has been no change. In the North-West, the hon. gentleman has still the same number of Indians to oversee that the late Administration had, but he has this advantage over the late Administration, that they had certain treaties to negotiate; I believe every year there was a treaty negotiated, which involved a considerable amount of expense. But so far as the administration of the work of the Department is concerned, it is now precisely what it was in 1878, except in so far as the hon. gentleman may have increased it by those unfortunate experiments in mining operations. Notwithstanding all this, we find that the expense of the Department has enormously increased. In 1878 there were eleven officers connected with the Indian Branch, whose salaries amounted to $11,880; while there are now thirty-one officers, whose salaries amount to $32,310. That is a threefold increase in the number of employees and in the expenditure. In 1878 we charged the salary of the Inspector of Indian Agencies in the North-West to the Department, he was treated as an officer of the Department, whereas, at present, the hon. gentleman charges the expense of that officer's salary to the appropriation for expendiiure in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. I refer to Mr. McCaul.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman would only enquire a little he would find that the business of the Department has enormously increased, and with respect to some of these salaries it is merely a transfer. For instance, the whole Toronto general agency was broken up and transferred here, and two officers, Mr. Plummer and Mr. Dalton, are transferred here, and their salaries are added to the inside service instead of being, as formerly, charged to the outside service. Mr. Dingman, who has been appointed an inspector, is also added to the number. If the hon. gentleman would happen, in his walks in the morning, to go into the office, I think his old employees would prove to him that the work is so severe that they were obliged to declare, especially in the Accountant's Branch, that they could not get on without further help. In fact, the bookkeeper, the hon. gentleman knows, said he would resign unless he got some considerable assistance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a sort of symmetry, as my hon. friend will see. The cost is three times as much as it was in his time, and the First Minister is expending three times as much on the Indians as my hon. friend required to do.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman wishes to vacate the office, my hon. friend will go there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he knew how much worry these Indians sometimes cause me, I would not congratulate him on the change.

10. The Office of the Auditor-General $18,925 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I perceive there have been some considerable changes. Will the hon. Minister explain?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Barber was superannuated. He was a first-class clerk and received the maximum salary. One person has been promoted from second to first-class, another from third to second, and there has been a new appointment to the third-class, which will make a difference, notwithstanding an increase of $50 in a few of them, of $275 less than the year previous. This was due to the superannuation of a first-class clerk who was at the maximum and filling the position by a clerk at the minimum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What age was Mr. Barber?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. He was not quite sixty, but he was superannuated on the certificate of his medical man, that he had heart disease and must retire from the service.

11. The Department of Finance and Treasury Board..... ..... $57,162 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The clerks seem to be the same, but a messenger appears to have been abolished.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. One officer, Mr. Higgins, has been superannuated. He was at the maximum of his class. A messenger has been superannuated, and we do not propose to fill the position. There was a promotion of one employé to another class. Altogether there is a decrease of $1,162.

12. The Department of Inland Revenue..... $34,212 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that some officers have been dropped and some changes made.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As regards the staff, there is no alteration in numbers. We have appointed an additional messenger. The Inspector of Standards has been transferred from the inside to the outside service. The first-class clerks have been reduced by one. This gentleman was estimated as first-class last year, because he was doing the duties pertaining to that class. This gentleman, Mr. Hall, although he passed the necessary examination, could not, it was held, under the Civil Service Act, rise at once from the third-class to the first-class, and therefore he is estimated this year as second-class. Mr. Devlin, last year, was third-class; this year he is second-class.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there is no increase as between last year and the present year; but I do no think there was any great occasion for the increase which has taken place during the last few years. The expenditure has run up from $26,000 to $34,000, after disposing of the Inspector of Standards and also of a mechanic who used to be attached to that branch. The hon. gentleman is not responsible for that, but the increase is considerable.

13. The Department of Customs $35,430 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a considerable increase in various ways.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see, on looking at the figures, that the principal increase is caused by the proposition to add to the staff two second-class clerks, either by promotion or by appointment. The Commissioner, the Chief Clerk and the Accountant are the same, $50 statutory increase is given to the Clerk of Statistics. The first-class clerk, and Assistant Accountant, are at the maximum. The proposal is, as I have said, to add two second-class clerks. Some of the third-class clerks, instead of having been appointed at $400, as provided in the Civil Service Act, are clerks who have been transferred from the outside service. Whenever I find it necessary to have an experienced man, one whom it would require twelve months to educate for the work, I have a man transferred from the outside to the inside service, under the Act, at the salary he received at the place from which removed; and then I appoint a third-class clerk for the outside service. I may explain to the Committee that these two clerks, at $1,100, may not be appointed. If I find third-class clerks who have passed some of the optional subjects which would fit them for the positions, I will employ the cheaper ones. However, in the Accountant's Branch, where the clerks must have a knowledge, not only of the law, but of mathematics, so as to enable them to make the calculations for drawbacks, &c., a better class of men than you find among third-class clerks in the Department, is required, and I bring them from the outside service. That accounts for the apparent increase in this estimate. I may not, as was the case in regard to my last

estimate, expend the money. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor-General's Report or the Public Accounts he will find that, though we took $32,950 last year, the expenditure was only $30,428. If the hon. gentleman will look at the expenditure of the Department in 1878, the last year of their reign, adding the contingencies to the salary account, he will find that the expenditure was $44,610, while last year it was only $36,735, notwithstanding the fact that there have been about $1,000 statutory increases every year during the last five years, thus showing a reduced expenditure last year, as compared with 1878, of $7,874.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Customs is to be congratulated. He is the sole member of the Government of which so much can be said; but I am bound in honour to say that no complaint whatever can be taken to the increases which the hon. gentleman speaks of in his own Department. I shall be glad, however, to know what are the optional subjects in the Customs Department to which he referred.

Mr. BOWELL. The optional subjects to which I referred are those which are provided for candidates passing Civil Service examinations. Such as *précis* writing, a knowledge of accounts, book-keeping, and various others subjects. I may state for the information of hon. members, that the plan was adopted of allowing a third-class clerk an additional sum of $50 on entering, for each optional subject upon which he passed, and for which he received a certificate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is very reasonable. Is there the same rule in all the Departments?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought that, perhaps, in the hon. gentleman's own Department, they might have varied from some of the others.

Mr. BOWELL. That would be in the case of promotional examinations. Then we have special examinations for surveyors, gaugers and other officers of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice in the fifth item, that the hon. gentleman took, last year, a vote for two first-class clerks; now he asks for one. Is that a death or a superannuation?

Mr. BOWELL. That is the case of Mr. Grant, who, though comparatively a young man, was in such a condition of health, that on the certificate of his physician here, as well as in New York, where he was obliged to go, he was superannuated. The position is not yet filled, though the work he formerly performed is now done by a third-class clerk. Mr. Grant obtained his rank for long service.

Mr. GAULT. I think the Minister of Customs is to be congratulated on running his Department so economically. In fact, I think he runs it too closely, and that if he spent $20,000 more, it would be a great advantage to the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the hon. gentleman might be a little more liberal in considering claims presented to him. I have had something to do with presenting claims to his department, and I find him hard as nails.

Mr. GUILLET. I have the same complaint to make.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest, on the doctrine of averages, that the hon. gentleman's economy will only make up for the too great laxity elsewhere.

14. The Department of the Postmaster-General. $147,330 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I recollect how we were abused for asking $87,000 for this service a few years ago, when we had only ninety-two clerks. No doubt there has been a good deal of increase of business in the North-West, but I think a battalion of 171 clerks, and a vote of $147,330 is more than the increase in the work of the Department in the last four or five years would fairly warrant. I notice by the Public Accounts, that some thirty or forty extra hands were employed in the Department during last year.

Mr. CARLING. There has not been a single extra hand employed in my Department during the last year. Those in 1882-83 were made permanent clerks last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear that. Will the hon. gentleman explain the necessity for the additions in other items.

Mr. CARLING. There are no additions, except junior clerks, who come in at the salary of $400 a year. The addition of ten clerks is on account of the great increase in the business of the Department. No less than 1,000 new post offices have been established within the past five years. This, with the general increase of business, the opening up of new mail routes in the North-West, the increasing number of mail contracts in different parts of the Dominion, and the increase in the savings banks, accounts for the growth of the expenditure. The increased revenue of the Department last year, I may state, was something over $200,000.

Mr. HESSON. I am surprised that the increase has not been greater, and that the hon. gentleman has been able to conduct his Department with salaries so much lower than those of the other Departments. I presume that he requires in his staff as much intelligence and experience as are required in similar officers in other Departments, as his is one whose work is identified with every interest in the country. This state of things is very gratifying, considering the increased work in the Post Office Department, which must have taken place within the last five or ten years, and the increased revenue which is being derived from the Department. I think the Postmaster General is, perhaps, if anything, too close. The officers there, some of them, work very hard, and are very poorly paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not quite agree with the hon. gentleman. Apparently the work of the Department has increased but 25 per cent. in the last five years, while the expenditure has increased 100 per cent., although you ought to be able to manage the larger amount of work for a little less, proportionately, than the smaller amount.

15. The Department of Agriculture.....$44,695 00

Mr. McLELAN. Besides the statutory increases, the only addition is one third-class clerk in the fourth division, at $350.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the duty of the gentleman described as an attaché?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot give a fuller explanation than I have given, but I dare say that the Minister in charge of the Department, who is absent on account of ill-health, will be able to give it on Concurrence. I will make a note of it, and draw his attention to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. Minister of Finance know whether the Statistics and Census Branch has been specially created with the view of looking after the Census affairs? I think the vote first appeared in this shape last year. Some of these titles are rather unfamiliar. Statistical officer and attaché are new terms.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My own impression is that the attaché is a gentleman who understands foreign languages; but we shall give the information on Concurrence. The statistical officer, I think, is employed in obtaining statistics with reference to the public health.

16. The Department of Marine and Fisheries $36,142 50

Mr. McLELAN. These are all increases under the Statute.

17. The Department of Public Works... .....$12,790 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The increase of $1,360 is composed of these two items: $960 for ordinary increases under the Statute, and $400 for increasing the salaries of the Chief Engineer and the Chief Architect by $200 each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these increases made under special authority.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The salaries of these gentleman are fixed by Order in Council, subject to the sanction of Parliament. The Chief Engineer, Mr. Perley, and the Chief Architect, Mr. Fuller, are two gentlemen of very high position, and their salaries are very small compared with the work they have to perform, and with the salaries granted to similiar officers outside of the Government. I would have been disposed to ask for an increase of $500 for each of them, but it was thought that we could not give them more than we give to the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of gentlemen in whom special skill is required, are the increases provided by the Statue, or are they made by Order in Council and by the authority of this House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The salaries of officers who are professional men and occupy a special position, are not fixed by Statute; but of course we cannot increase these salaries without the previous sanction of Parliament. I may say to the hon. gentleman that if these officers were to leave us, I doubt very much if we would be able to obtain as good officers, and with equal experience, for the salaries we give to these gentlemen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have there been any deaths or superannuation, or are the gentlemen of the staff the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. One officer was transferred from another Department, and one vacancy was filled; but the staff is not increased.

18. The Department of Railways and Canals.... $15,227 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the changes here?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is one first-class and one second-class clerk more. These are the only changes, and the increases are simply the statutory increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the first-class clerk who has gone? There were six last year, but there are only five this year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot answer that question. I will take a note of it,

19. Departmental Contingencies.....$171,950 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable increase in this.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In the Post Office Department and the Department of Agriculture, there is a large increase in printing and stationery and other contingencies, owing to increased business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is included in the amount for Departments generally? Does that include the High Commissioner's?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; this is for stationery generally, to the various Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the last Public Accounts, I observe that at the end of Civil Government, the High Commissioner of Canada in England, Sir Alexander Galt, is entered for amount expended in contingencies for his office, $5,452. That was the reason why I enquired whether any allowance in this item of $171,000, was made for the High Commissioner, under the head of contingencies for Departments generally, $18,000. Does this include any such item? In 1883, apparently, a considerable sum was included for the High Commissioner.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is, I think, no such sum included in this sum of $18,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no mistake about this having been included before. It is the only head under which it perhaps could be charged. Does the hon. gentleman know what is included in that, in a general way?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not. It is practically for stationery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the $3,000 for commissions?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will take a note of it and do so on Concurrence.

Resolutions to be reported, Committee to sit again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House; and (at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY LEASE BILL.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the name of the mover of this motion be substituted for that of Mr. Abbott, member for the county of Argenteuil, as the promoter of Bill (No. 32), to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No notice has been given of this motion, and it cannot be made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would come under Rule 31, which says that the Rule requiring notice does not apply after the Bill is introduced. It is on the same principle as that on which the Committee was altered on the Bill of the hon. member for L'Islet.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not a correct application of the Rule. No notice is required by that Rule, because the House has defined the stages through which the Bill must go, but this is an extraneous motion not connected with the progress of the Bill through the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no such intention in the Rule. The rule of notice does not apply to the Bill introduced.

Mr. HAGGART. The former promoter of the Bill is firmly convinced he had a perfect right to move the Bill, but as it is getting late in the Session and an argument may arise, similar to that which arose the other night, he thought it better in the interest of the Bill that his name should be withdrawn and another substituted.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it comes under this rule—that notice should not apply to Bills after their introduction or to Private Bills. It comes under the same ruling as I made with regard to altering the Committee of the Whole for a Bill.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

The following Report was laid on the table:—

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1883.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 111) respecting the Independence of Parliament Act 1878, 41 Victoria, Chapter 5.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Bill is an amendment to the Independence of Parliament Act of 1878. The first clause is introduced in consequence of the discussion which arose as to the meaning of the first section of the Act of 1878, the Independence of Parliament Act, in which some weight was given to the word "attached." It was said that, if a salary is attached in any way to the office, although the salary is not received, the party acting, doing the duties of any commission or appointment of any kind, although, by his appointment and by his distinct agreement, no salary is to be received, but he is to act gratuitously, he is disqualified from holding a seat in Parliament. That appeared to the Government to be unreasonable, and they desire to have the Act amended. The first clause of the Act provides for the disqualification. It is proposed that this sub-section shall be added:

"Provided further, that nothing in this section shall render ineligible any person holding any office, commission or employment of the nature or description mentioned in sub-section (*a*) of this section, as a member of the House of Commons or shall disqualify him from sitting or voting therein if by his commission or other instrument of appointment it is declared or provided that he shall hold such office, commission or employment without any salary, fees, wages, allowances or emolument or other profit of any kind that may be attached thereto."

It is to remove the question that was raised, that, if a Statute attaches a certain salary, although, by positive agreement or by commission or appointment, the party is not to receive the salary so attached, still he is disqualified. The second clause speaks of the case of Sir Charles Tupper. I do not know that the second clause is required. However it has been inserted in the Act, following the precedent of 1874, in the case of Mr. Macdonald, who was Queen's Printer in Nova Scotia, and had a seat in the House, and it was declared in the Act that, by that, Mr. Macdonald did not forfeit the seat.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was not in 1874.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, in 1867-68. The principal object of the Act was to prevent the voidance of our seats by myself and all the Government. It was in 1867 that that Act passed. During the discussion, the point was raised that Mr. Macdonald, the hon. member for Antigonish, if I remember aright——

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; Lunenburg.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend's memory is more perfect than mine in many things, I see. The point was raised that he held an office which disqualified him, and, under the circumstances, Parliament allowed this clause to be put in, declaring that it did not vacate his seat. In pursuance of that precedent, the second clause is inserted The last clause provides for an indemnity:

"This Act may be pleaded as a bar and discharge to any action or suit pending, or which may be brought against Sir Charles Tupper, for any matter, cause or thing mentioned in this Act, and shall also be a discharge of any judgment for any such penalty as is mentioned in the next preceding section, and any costs on such judgment."

The point will naturally be raised that, if an action has been commenced, there is a sort of vested interest in the costs. This clause is an exact copy of the Act introduced in 1877

Mr. SPEAKER.

in the case of Mr. Perry. At all events, I propose that this Act should be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, when they will consider; in the first place, the propriety of altering the Independence of Parliament Act, and will then consider the case of Sir Charles Tupper, a point in reference to which has already been referred to that Committee. It is therefore proper and germane to that reference that this Bill should be sent to that Committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Which is to be taken up first, the reference or the Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the reference ought to be taken up first; the Bill afterwards.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose it would be the proper thing, when a matter has been referred to a Committee to have the Committee report before introducing the Bill. The hon. gentleman proposes now to have the reference and the Bill before the Committee at the same time. The proceeding is most unusual.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would perhaps be proper if that were the only point in the Bill, but I think it is well that the Committee should decide on the first point, which is in reference to Sir Charles Tupper's case, and then whether, in the future, if the Government choose to employ any member of Parliament, for special reasons, to perform duties, to sit on a commission or otherwise, without getting anything for it, that fact of his accepting that commission, when he agrees positively that he shall act gratuitously, shall vacate his seat. That is for the future. That is a point that I desire to have fully considered by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. They can consider it in all its bearings. That is why I propose the reference of this Bill. I take it that the Committee will consider the references in their order, and that the first question to be decided by that Committee will be the reference made the other day, and afterwards they can discuss this Bill at their leisure. If they come to one conclusion, it may affect the Bill very considerably; but, at all events, as far as I am a member of the Committee myself, and I think I can promise, they will be taken in their order, and the Resolutions will be considered first, before the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I do not think that for the last sixteen or eighteen years any important Bill has been introduced in Parliament with fewer and more unsatisfactory explanations than the hon. gentleman vouchsafed to give us upon this occasion. I say it is an important Bill, one of the most important Bills ever submitted to any Parliament, a Bill covering principles that, in my estimation, are of the most vicious character; and yet the hon. gentleman moved the second reading of this Bill without a solitary word of explanation. He vouchsafed no explanation until the hon. member for West Durham drew his attention to the fact, and then I humbly submit that the explanations given by the hon. gentleman are by no means satisfactory. The hon. gentleman stated that this Bill was an outcome, or was due to the discussion of the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, made some time ago in Parliament to declare the seat for Cumberland vacant. But the hon. gentleman knows that notice of this Bill was given on the Notice Paper before that discussion on that motion took place in the House. The hon. gentleman stated in reply to my hon. friend from East York, who objected to a reference of this Bill to the Committee on Privileges and Elections at all until they had reported upon the resolution already referred to them, that the Committee would examine the matter, and especially the first clause of the Bill. Now, I say that the first clause of this Bill is not a question that ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections at all. It is a question touching the independence of this Parliament; it is a question of policy that the Government,

on their responsibility to the House and the country, ought to deal with, and to ask the Committee on Privileges and Elections to formulate a policy for the Government is a course that has never been taken in this House except by the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, I say this Bill is a vicious Bill; it is a bad Bill, and ought not to receive the sanction of Parliament. I am opposed to the Bill upon several grounds. I am opposed to the Bill in the first place because the Minister of Railways, having, with his eyes open, and knowing what the law was, accepted the position of High Commissioner to England with the emoluments, the allowances, the perquisites and the profits connected therewith, his seat for the county of Cumberland thereby became vacant under our Independence of Parliament Act. I am opposed to the Bill because it goes further than that; it not only proposes to indemnify the Minister of Railways for illegally sitting in Parliament, but on the assumption that the seat for the county of Cumberland is vacant, the Bill undertakes to make the Minister of Railways a member for the county of Cumberland by an Act of Parliament. I am opposed to this Bill, in the third place, because it is a direct violation of, and interference with, the Independence of Parliament Act—a direct interference with the Independence of Parliament Act in the interest of one man and to cover one solitary case; and I say that it is contrary to the rule and the practice of this House and of the Imperial Parliament to legislate in the interests of one man. Now, I said the seat of the hon. member for Cumberland is vacant. I discussed that point to some extent some time ago; I propose discussing it again, and as this is an important question, a question that, in its present shape, has never been submitted to the Canadian Parliament before, I make no apology to the House for dealing with it at some length. Now, Sir, I say that the seat of the hon. member for Cumberland, by his acceptance of the office of High Commissioner to England, thereby became vacant. The First Minister contended, when we were discussing the proposition of the hon. member for West Durham to declare the seat for Cumberland vacant, that the acceptance of the office of High Commissioner, with the salary attached thereto, did not vacate the seat; and the hon. gentleman was good enough to refer us to several precedents in England which, he contended, bore out his assertion. He referred us to the case of Mr. Gladstone who, while he was a member of the Imperial Parliament, was appointed to, and accepted the distinguished position of, Lord High Commissioner to the Ionian Islands. He referred us to the case of Sir Stafford Northcote who, while he was a member of Parliament, was appointed by the Imperial Government Lord High Commissioner to Washington; and the hon. gentleman upon other occasions referred to other cases. He referred to the case of Lord Castlereagh who, at one time, was appointed Special Envoy to Vienna; and to Lord John Russell who was also appointed Special Envoy to that Court. He referred also to the cases of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Aylesbury who were appointed respectively Ambassador and Special Envoy to the Court of Berlin. But the hon. gentleman, if he had taken the trouble to examine these precedents and the ground upon which they were justified in England, would have come to the conclusion without the slightest hesitation, that they had no application to the position occupied by the Minister of Railways. Sir, under the Imperial Act, neither of the positions mentioned were disqualifying positions or disqualifying offices; but under our Independence of Parliament Act the office of High Commissioner to England is a disqualifying office, and that beyond all controversy. The acceptance of that office is not only a disqualifying act, but its acceptance and the retention of a seat in Parliament at the same time, are clear violations of our Independence of Parliament Act. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows quite well that the cases he has referred to as justifying the retention by the Minister of Railways of a seat in this Parliament with the office of High Commissioner do not apply to the case of the Minister of Railways. The offices the hon. gentleman referred to were temporary offices; they were special employments for the purpose of discharging special services. It has been held in cases of that kind in England, apart from the law that prevails there, as distinguished from the law in Canada, that such employments would not necessarily, or at all, vacate the seat of a man occupying such position. Mr. Todd lays that rule down in his work on Parliamentary Government in England, page 260:

"Moreover, it has not been considered the practice to consider the employment of members of the House of Commons upon Royal Commissions, or on special services, &c.—which are not regular offices, and to which no stated salary is attached—as coming within the disqualifying operation of the Statute; even when remuneration is received for such services.

There you see the words that are used, "which are not regular offices." Now, in this case, the position of the Minister of Railways is an office created by an Act of Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows further, that the positions held by the gentlemen he has referred to were either of Ambassador to a foreign Court, or of Minister Plenipotentiary to a foreign Court, or employment of a similar character; and the hon. gentleman knows quite well, that in England for over 300 years the position of Ambassador or Minister Plenipotentiary is excepted from the operation of the Independence of Parliament Act. If the hon. gentleman will refer to Hatsell, page 22, he will find there a resolution of the English Parliament passed in the year 1575, a resolution which has become part of the law in England, and is the law of England to this day, and that has been quoted on discussions in this question in the Imperial Parliament as still being part of the law of England. The following is the rule referred to: "On the 9th January, 1575, it is resolved, that any person being a member and in service of ambassade shall not be removed during such service;" and the following cases were decided under that rule:—

"On the 19th of November, 1606, a Committee is appointed to consider of the case of several persons, who had received employment from the King, since the last Session; and on the 22nd they report, and it was adjudged upon question, that Sir Charles Cornwallis, Ambassador in Spain, Sir George Carew, Ambassador in France, and Sir Thomas Edmunds, Ambassador with the Arch Duke, should still stand in their several places.

"On the 24th of April, 1611, Sir Thomas Roe acquaints the House, that His Majesty has commanded him to undertake a service at the Diet in Germany, invited to it by the King of Denmark, and other Protestant Princes. He has leave from this House to be absent; and to continue a member of this House, notwithstanding his employment as His Majesty's Ambassador in Germany.

"'On the 15th of February, 1711, the election of Sir Henry Belasyse is declared void; he having, since his election, accepted the office of one of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the number and quality of the forces in Her Majesty's pay, in Spain and Portugal, and to examine into several accounts relative to those forces.—See the proceedings on the 9th and 14th February upon this question."

Now, Sir, it is not declared void thereupon the ground that it was an office, but an office as distinguished from the high position of Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary:

"On the 5th of March, 1713, several writs are issued in the room of Mr. Herne, Mr. Murray, and Sir Joseph Martyn, they having accepted the offices of commissaries, for treating with commissaries on the part of France, for settling the trade between Great Britain and France.

"On the 17th and 19th of April, 1714, a question was moved, whether this office of commissaries, to treat with commissaries from France, was a new created office, within the meaning of the act of 6th Queen Anne? And was passed in the negative.

"On the 7th of July, 1715, on a question, whether Mr. Carpenter, having been appointed Envoy to the Court of Vienna, is thereby included in the disability of the 6th Anne, ch. 7? It passed in the negative."

Now I say that has been the law of the Imperial Parliament for the last 350 years. There is no exception to that rule in England. It is recognized as the law in England to-day; but it is not the law here. We have no such law in Canada; Parliament never adopted any such rule as was adopted 350 years

ago by the Imperial Parliament. In this matter we are guided solely by the Independence of Parliament Act, and that being so, the hon. Minister of Railways' case comes clearly within the Independence of Parliament Act. The rule that prevails in England has passed into law. A member there can occupy the position of a member of the Imperial Parliament, and at the same time hold the position of Minister Plenipotentiary or Ambassador. Here the law is different. Here we have no such law; here we have a law to prevent any such occurrence. The law in England has never been altered or changed, in that respect, although modified in perhaps a hundred different ways, in the last 350 years, and officials or gentlemen occupying the position to which I have just referred are still exempt from the operation of the Independence of Parliament Act. The hon. gentleman knows that in England the first law passed in the Imperial Parliament with respect to the independence of Parliament was, 23 Edward the Third. That prohibits "taxers, collectors or receivers of the fifteenth then granted" from sitting in Parliament. This continued the law and was practically unchanged up to 1709, when the Statute still in force, 6th Anne, c. 7 (1709), was passed, but through all the changes which have been made in England in the law for 350 years the law is unchanged with respect to members occupying the positions which Mr. Gladstone and Sir Stafford Northcote occupied, and on the authority of which the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) based the retention by the Minister o Railways of his seat in Parliament. This very question came directly before the Imperial Parliament in 1851. The Hon. Richard Lalor Sheil, then member for Dungarvan, was appointed by the Imperial Government to the distinguished position of Minister Plenipotentiary to the Grand Duke of Tuscany. On his acceptance of the office Mr. Sheil's seat was declared vacant, and it was moved in the Imperial Parliament that a new writ issue for a burgess to represent Dungarvan, and a new writ issued accordingly. The very day after the issue of the writ it was discovered that a mistake had been made, and that a writ should not have issued. A motion was made in the Imperial Parliament to issue a *supersedeas* to the writ for a new election for Dungarvan. Let us see on what ground the *supersedeas* was granted, because it was granted and the writ was recalled. Mr. Hayter, in making the motion, said:

"He was in error in moving yesterday a writ for this borough. He had moved it on the assumption that the Right Hon. Richard Lalor Sheil, having accepted the office of Minister Plenipotentiary to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, had vacated his seat for the borough; but it turned out that this was a mistake, for on referring to precedents, it appeared that the seat was not vacated by the acceptance of that office. Therefore the only course now left him was to move that the order be superceded; and with that view he begged to move that the order of yesterday, the 4th instant, in reference to the writ be then read.

"The Clerk having read the order,

"Mr. Hayter begged to move,

"'That the Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out a *supersedeas* to the said writ for the election of a burgher to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Dungarvan.'"

Mr. Roebuck discussed the question somewhat fully, and Mr. Hayter replied, stating:

"The hon. gentleman wished to know whether or not the present course was that usually pursued. Now, he apprehended the usual course was, when an error had been committed, to rectify it as soon as possible. The fact would depend on the commission of the act. On reference to Hatsell, volume 2, page 23, there was this entry:

"'On the 7th July, 1715, on a question whether Mr. Carpenter, having been appointed Envoy to the Court of Vienna, is thereby included in the disability of the 6th of Anne, chapter 7, it passed in the negative.'

"There were several instances where gentlemen who were members of the House had discharged the duties of ambassadors also; there was the case of Mr. Canning, of Sir Robert Adair, and of Lord Burchersh. Therefore it seemed clear that the mere acceptance of this office did not divest the ambassador of the character of member of this House.

Mr. French said:

"He thought the proceedings quite contrary to common sense, that an hon. member should accept an office of emolument and still retain his seat. Here was the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, which would moreover leave the constituency unrepresented—Mr. Canning's was merely a temporary mission. It would be well if the Attorney-General explained."

And the Attorney-General did explain. He said:

"The House would be aware that by the Statute sixth of Anne, the acceptance of any office of profit from the Crown, makes the election void. The question was whether the acceptance of this office of envoy to a foreign court—such as had been accepted by his right hon. friend Richard Lawlor Sheil, came within the disability of the Statute of Queen Anne. Now there were distinct precedents where that House had decided that the acceptance of such office did not come within the disability. A case of inadvertence had occurred in the issue of a writ for the Borough of Dungarvan. In fact the Borough of Dungarvan was not vacant; and therefore no election could at present take place. In case an election did take place under the circumstances the gentleman so elected would not be entitled to take his seat in that House did he present himself at the Table. The Right Honorable Richard Lalor Sheil was at that moment member for Dungarvan; and the question was now, what course they were to adopt to remedy the error. He saw no course but to authorize the Speaker to issue a writ of *supersedeas*."

That was the course taken in that case, and the ruling was based solely on the Rule of Parliament to which I have referred. I say therefore upon these authorities it is manifestly clear that a gentleman holding the position of Minister of Railways cannot hold a seat in Parliament if he accepts the office of High Commissioner to England. The First Minister took objection to the motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) on another ground. He said that if a member of the House held an office under the Crown, such, for instance, as the office of Minister of Railways, which by law he can hold, with a seat in Parliament having first obtained the approval of his constituents, he had a right to hold with such office a political or disqualifying office; that having the right to hold a political office he had, as a consequence, a right to hold a non-political or disqualifying office, and the acceptance of the non-political office does not vacate his seat. The hon. gentleman's argument is, that by adding a disqualifying office to a qualifying office, which the member has a right to hold, the member has the right to hold both offices and his seat; that the offices are cumulative, that having the right to hold one he has the right to hold the other. I challenge the hon. gentleman to point out a single case in the history of Parliamentary Government in England for 500 years where a Minister of the Crown and Member of Parliament, holding a political office, an office which does not disqualify, which is consistent with occupying a seat in Parliament—that a man has a right to hold a non-political and disqualifying office, the holding of which is in violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. I challenge the hon. gentleman to point out one case where that has been done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact while he calls on me to cite a case, he has just stated that English precedents are of no value and that we are governed altogether by the Canadian Statute.

Mr. CAMERON. That only makes my case the stronger. I say that even in England, where the law is not so stringent as here, he cannot point to any such case. The hon. gentleman rests his case solely on English precedents, and yet I repeat that he cannot in the English records find a case analagous to the case of the Minister of Railways. I say there were certain offices created before the Independence of Parliament Act in the sixth year of Queen Anne, and that that Statute did not apply to offices created before 1705. It only applied to those subsequently created. For example take the case of Lord Middleton, who, in 1725, was appointed one of the Lord Justices of Ireland without salary; and the case of Sir William Gifford, who was appointed in 1710 to an office under the Crown without vacating his seat in Parliament. In both cases the Statute of Anne did not apply because the offices were created before it passed. Then again in cases where both are offices of State they can be held together without disqualification, as, for

instance, where a member of Parliament accepted an office of State, and having thereby vacated his seat, and been elected by the people, and appointed to a second office of State. This can be done without vacating the seat on the acceptance of the second office. This doctrine is illustrated by the cases of Sir Robert Walpole, Mr. Pitt, Lord North, Mr. Canning and Sir Robert Peel, each of whom, at different times, filled the positions of First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer, without disqualification. Under the same doctrine, we have the case of Mr. Spencer Percival, who, in 1809, was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and succeeded the Duke of Portland as First Lord of the Treasury, retaining both offices; and by the case of Mr. Bathurst, who, in 1821, held one Cabinet office and assumed the Presidency of the Board of Control. As late as 1873, we find that Mr. Gladstone, First Lord of the Treasury, assumed the office of Chancellor without vacating his seat. But I say these were all offices of State political and non-disqualifying offices, and under the Independence of Parliament Act the holding of both offices was perfectly consistent with a seat in the House. I again challenge the First Minister to point out a single case of a member of the Imperial Parliament holding a non-political, or a disqualifying office at the same time that he held a political office and a seat in the House. So much for the vacation of the seat. Now what does the hon. gentleman want us to do with respect to this Bill? What are the provisions of this Bill? What does the hon. gentleman want to commit Parliament to by this measure? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman wants to commit the Parliament of Canada to a lie. He wants to commit the people of this country to a lie. He cannot get his Bill through Parliament except by committing Parliament to a lie. The second clause of the Bill says:

"That the said Sir Charles Tupper did not by reason of his accepting or holding the said office of High Commissioner for Canada under the said Commission, cease to be a member of the said House."

The hon. gentleman asks this Parliament to affirm that Sir Charles Tupper by accepting an office of profit under the Crown, did not thereby vacate his seat in this House. That is the proposition to which he wants this House to commit itself. I say it is an extraordinary proposition. I say that on the face of it it is a plain untruth. I say that if any man by accepting an office under the Crown ever did vacate his seat in Parliament, Sir Charles Tupper did by the acceptance of this office, and the seat for the county of Cumberland is now vacant and a writ ought to have issued for a new election. I say that the hon. gentleman himself will not get up in Parliament, and on his responsibility as a Minister of the Crown state that Sir Charles Tupper has not vacated his seat. He will not say so; he cannot say so; I challenge him to say so. I say that Sir Charles Tupper himself will not say that he has not vacated his seat. A reference to the Act would convince anybody who is not blind to the truth that by the acceptance of this office, an office in the gift of the Crown, an office received by Sir Charles Tupper with all emoluments, allowances, and profits connected therewith—that he has vacated his seat. If that is the fact, and if we must pass this Bill, let us pass it on proper grounds. Let us pass it with the truth on the face of the Bill, and not a transparent lie. I say that every step taken by the hon. gentleman from the first day this Session opened, from the day he introduced this Bill, down to this hour, is the clearest possible indication that Sir Charles Tupper is not to day a member of this House. Sir Charles Tupper's own conduct from the hour the House met until it closes, unless the Bill in the meantime passes, is a clear indication of the fact that this Bill on the face of it does not tell the truth. If it tells the truth what is the meaning of this Bill? If Sir Charles Tupper did not cease to be the member for the county of Cumberland, why does the hon. gentleman introduce a Bill to make him a member for that county by Act of Parliament. If Sir Charles Tupper is still a member for the county of Cumberland, why was it necessary to refer the motion of my hon. friend for West Durham to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? The hon. gentleman will contend that he never vacated his seat, the Bill says that he did not vacate his seat, and yet on his own motion he refers it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and he introduces this Bill to indemnify the hon. gentleman to justify his illegal, unjustifiable and unwarrantable conduct of sitting in Parliament in defiance of the Act. Still on the face of the Bill we are asked to say that Sir Charles Tupper did not vacate his seat by accepting the office of High Commissioner of the Canadian Government in England. But that is not all that is stated in this clause. It states that not only did not the hon. gentleman vacate his seat, but that he did not become disqualified from sitting or voting in Parliament and did not commit any offence against the provisions of the Act. Yet the hon. gentleman wants to idemnify Sir Charles Tupper. If he did not violate the Act, what is the meaning of this Bill? If Sir Charles Tupper is not to-day open to the penalties for a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, why is this Bill before Parliament, and why is the House asked to vote on it? I repeat, that the whole of the hon. gentleman's conduct, the whole of Sir Charles Tupper's conduct, from the first day Parliament met down to the present hour is the strongest possible evidence we could have that Sir Charles Tupper is not now a member of Parliament, Sir Charles Tupper tells us that he has always the courage of his convictions, and does any man tell me that he is not conscious that he is not a member of Parliament when he has avoided voting from the first day Parliament opened until to-day. I say that he is disqualified; I say it is an outrage on Parliament to ask the House, in the face of these facts to say that the seat is not now vacant. No one believes that it is not vacant, and least of all the First Minister and the Minister of Railways. If we are to pass a bill let us do so with the truth set out on the face of this Bill; let the hon. gentleman pass his Bill honestly, openly, and above board. Let him say to the Minister of Railways: "You have vacated your seat it is true; I want to have you in Parliament, and I will pass an Act making you a member of Parliament by Act of Parliament." This is not the first time this course has been taken by the hon. gentleman. He did it in this House, in this Parliament, when we gave a seat by a resolution of this House, to a member now here, but the hon. gentleman wants to do it more formally this time. To-day he fills a vacant seat by Act of Parliament. I ask the hon. gentleman does he not see how he is lowering and degrading the position of a member of Parliament? I ask if there is any person in this House who does not see how he is lowering and degrading the position of the Minister of Railways by undertaking to make him a member of this House by Act of Parliament. What does he say to his colleague? He says: You have no right, you have no business to sit here, your seat is vacant, but I will make you a member of this House by Act of Parliament, and I will call upon my majority in this House to vote that Bill through for this purpose. Sir, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Railways will stand this—so high spirited and sensitive—a gentleman, as he is, so keenly alive to the honour and dignity of Parliament, that when a vote is about to be taken, he leaves his place in the House and sits at the back of the Speaker's Chair. Will he be satisfied to occupy the position of a member of Parliament by Act of Parliament? I trust that the hon. gentleman will not do that. The position taken by the First Minister is an extraordinary position; it is a scandalous position; it is an outrage on the freedom and independence of Parliament, and on the rights of the people of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, and the First Minister knows where he stands. He knows that he can force this Bill through Parliament, and that our solemn protest will not stop him. He knows that he can make Sir Charles Tupper a member of Parliament by Act of Parliament, and he will do it. These were not always the views taken by the hon. gentleman with respect to the dignity of Parliament. He was once strong upon the necessity, in the public interest, of protecting the Independence of Parliament. When a Bill was introduced for the purpose of indemnifying some members of the late Parliament who had unwittingly violated that Act, the hon. gentleman in the strongest language, opposed the passage of that Bill, contending that everybody was assumed to know the law, and such being the case, if a member committed a violation of it, he had to take the consequences. That was the ground taken by the hon. gentleman in 1877, when he denounced the hon. member for East York and the Government of which he was the leader, for submitting to Parliament a Bill to indemnify members who had unwittingly violated the Independence of Parliament Act I will bring the hon. gentleman face to face with his own declarations on that occasion. I propose to read from *Hansard*, and I am glad we have an authoritative exposition of the hon. gentleman's views on this question. On the motion for the second reading of that Bill, the hon. gentleman, then leader of the Opposition, stated:

"He could quite understand that there might be occasioned when a Bill of Indemnity might pass, when some one had unwittingly committed a breach of the law, in regard to which they had two or three precedents in England. But this Bill sets aside the law of the land, and provided that a person who sat in this House wrongfully, if he had a *bona fide* belief that he had a right to sit there, should still retain his seat. The country would say there was no use in Parliament passing laws to preserve the independence or purity of Parliament, or to protect the people against having improper representatives in the House, persons who had forfeited their seats, if this Bill were to pass. It would be said: what is the use of passing laws of this kind, if the moment persons are found to have violated the laws they are repealed."

I agree with the hon. gentleman in what he said then, but his course to-day is not what he indicated was the proper course in 1877. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

"Such a measure would weaken the moral sense of the people of the country."

Will hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cheer now?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. It will no doubt grieve them to weaken the moral sense of the people of the country. The hon. gentleman continued:

"Here was a Bill of Indemnity, by which not only would men be deprived of the right acquired under the law, but if it passed, no one need trouble himself about penalties hereafter, for no gentleman would be patriotic enough to bring actions against corrupt members of Parliament at his own expense. If a case was inquired into, and it was shown before a Committee of the House that a party had unwittingly broken the law, there might be reason for passing a Bill of Indemnity; but to pass a whitewashing Bill of that kind would be to make Parliament the laughing stock of the whole country."

Sir, the hon. gentleman's chickens have come home to roost. Is the hon. gentleman asking for a Bill of Indemnity only? No, he asks for a good deal more, Sir. I would object to even a Bill of Indemnity in this case, because the Minister of Railways openly and not unwittingly violated the law. An ignorant violation of the law was the ground and the only ground, for the Bill of the hon. member for East York. This Bill goes further; it makes one a member of this House who has no seat in Parliament.

Mr. HESSON. How did you vote on that question?

Mr. CAMERON. That shows the ignorance of the hon. gentleman—how little he knows on this or any other subject. If he knows anything about it, he knows that I was not in Parliament then; but I can tell him how I would have voted if I had been there. The hon. Minister of Agriculture also gave his opinion of the Bill of 1877, in the following words:—

"They should be aware how they made precedents which would last till the end of time. Hon. members ought to be clear and free from any entanglement with influences which the Government might bring to bear upon them. A great principle was at stake. They should not forget the duty which they owed to the people of this country. While it might be felt that the action of the law was harsh, and while they might wish to believe the hon. gentleman in question—and no one could desire to do so more than himself—yet he would not like to infringe upon a great principle. Any person who has, at any time since the passing of the said Act, been elected a member of the House of Commons, and who, acting under *bona fide* belief that he was or continued to be qualified and capable of sitting and voting as a member thereof, has sat or voted therein, shall be and is hereby indemnified, exonerated, freed and discharged from all pecuniary, penalties or forfeitures whatsoever (if any) which may have been incurred by him by reason of having so sat or voted at any time up to the end of the present Session of Parliament. Who was to say whether an hon. member acted *bona fide*, except the hon. member? Ever since he could remember, he had heard that no member of Parliament should have transactions with the Government to the extent of a single dollar. He did not believe there was a single man ignorant of those principles, and that being the case, while he regretted that any hon. member was placed in that position, he felt justified in voting against the Bill. If they allowed the independence of Parliament to be infringed, and if they took the ground that members of this House, who ought to know what the law was, were to be excused, the result would be disastrous, and there was no knowing where the thing would end."

Now, Sir, I agree with every word of these extracts which I have just read. If the doctrine laid down there is a sound constitutional doctrine, if it is in accordance with the rules of Parliament and with the Independence of Parliament Act, then I say that every word uttered by those hon. gentlemen on that occasion is an argument against the passage of this Bill. Now, I say that a Bill of Indemnity can only be justified upon the ground I have indicated, that the violation of the law was committed unwittingly. Do hon. gentlemen on the other side pretend, will the hon. First Minister pretend, that the hon. Minister of Railways violated this law in error and unwittingly. No, Sir; the hon. Minister of Railways is too astute a man for that. He knows the law perfectly well, and he must be presumed to have known the law when he violated it by taking the office of High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman did it with his eyes open and with a full knowledge of all the facts. It is as gross a violation of the law and the rights of the people as was ever perpetrated in this country; and I say that Parliament ought not to sanction this Bill. Had this House been asked to pass a Bill of Indemnity it would have been bad enough; but we are not only asked to indemnify Sir Charles Tupper from the penalties which he has incurred, but to make him a member of Parliament by Act of Parliament; and that I will oppose. But that is not all. We are asked to say what is not true, that the hon. member has not vacated his seat; then we are asked to say that the hon. gentleman should be idemnified and that there is just cause for his being indemnified which is not correct. We are asked to go a step further; we are asked to amend and to change the Independence of Parliament Act—and in whose interest? In the public interest?—for the benefit of this great country? No, Sir; in the interest of one individual and to cover one solitary case. I say there never was, in the whole history of Parliamentary Government, any such Bill as this passed through any Parliament—a Bill changing the Independence of Parliament Act in the interests of one individual, indemnifying that individual and making him an M.P. by Act of Parliament. What will be the effect of this change? The effect will be that the Government can to-morrow appoint one half of the members of this House, if they would accept the appointments, to positions under the Crown, and give them all the emoluments, allowances and profits, but not the salary. That will be the effect of this Bill if it should pass in its present shape. In this way, the hon. gentleman proposes to violate and does violate the Independence of Parliament Act. I am not surprised at this

coming from the hon. gentleman; he has always been opposed to the independence of Parliament; he has always been anxious to have surrounding him, in and out of Parliament, hangers on and seekers after office under the Crown. From the moment he first took his seat in Parliament, he has persistently and consistently opposed every movement in the direction of making more stringent the Independence of Parliament Act; he has constantly and persistently advocated the policy of leaving in the hands of the Government the appointments to high places of trust under the Crown and of giving those places of trust to members of Parliament. I have a right to go further than that; I have a right to say, and I do say, that every change in the Independence of Parliament Act tending to restrict the power of the Government to appoint members of Parliament to office has been forced on the Government by the Liberal party. The only Independence of Parliament Acts that we have, that are worth being called so, are Acts which were forced through Parliament by the action of the Liberal party. In 1843, shortly after the Union, the first Independence of Parliament Act was passed by the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government, and provided that "all officers employed under the Crown receiving annual salaries or allowances should be disqualified" from sitting or voting in Parliament. This would disqualify the nominee or appointee, who had either salary or allowance, from sitting or voting in Parliament. This Act was continued down to 1855. In 1855, the hon. First Minister was in power, he was the ruling spirit in the Government, and he changed the Independence of Parliament Act. He found it too stringent, so he introduced the Act of 1855 which provided:

"That no person holding any office at the nomination of the Crown to which an annual salary, or any allowance, fees or emoluments, in lieu of an annual salary, are attached shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly."

The only disqualification was appointement to an office with a salary or something in lieu of an annual salary. That was a retrograde step; it was going back from the Act passed by the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government. In 1857, this was changed. True the hon. gentleman was in power, but he had fortified his Government by receiving into it Messrs. Spence, Cartier and J. C. Morrison, all of whom had been old Liberals, and the power of public opinion was so strong that he was compelled to pass a more stringent Independence of Parliament Act; and he, therefore, passed the Act 20 Vic., chap. 22, the 3rd section of which provides:

"That no person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, at the nomination of the Crown, to which an annual salary, or any fee, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind or amount whatever from the Crown is attached shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly."

That is the Act we have now; that is the Act which was passed in 1857 and continued in force down to 1868. In 1868, the hon. gentleman was again in power; he was sustained by an immense majority in this House; he had just come from the country triumphantly; he was intoxicated with the marvelous success which attended him in the Elections of 1867; he was surrounded by hungry hangers on, and placemen and office hunters, whom he could not feed with the crumbs which fell from his table, because the Act of 1857 was in force. But the hon. gentleman was equal to the occasion; he changed the Act of 1857, and introduced the Act of 1868, which provided:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, to which an annual salary, or any fee, allowance or emolument, in lieu of an annual salary from the Crown, is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote in the same during the time he holds such office, occupation or employment."

You know what the result of that was. Parliament, to a large extent, was filled with place hunters and placemen, and the evil culminated in the appointment of an hon. member to a position under the Government which he held for two years, in which time he drew $14,000, besides his sessional allowance, and also sat in Parliament during all this time. Public sentiment became aroused to such an extent that hon. gentlemen opposite were compelled to take action. In 1871, the hon. member for West Durham made a motion on this question affirming the necessity of a more stringent law; that motion did not pass, but it had the effect of compelling the Government, during that Session, to introduce the Act we now have on the Statutes and which is practically the same Act as that of 1857. Let us see what the intention of Parliament was in passing this Act. Let us see why it was passed. We are told this acceptance of the High Commissionership is not a violation of the independence of Parliament because there is no salary attached to it; we are told that the Crown has a perfect right to avail itself of the services of members of Parliament so long as it does not give them an annual salary. Let us see what was said on that question when the Act was brought before the House in 1871. Mr. Blake moved:

"That in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient that any member of this House should be engaged in the service of the Government of Canada in any paid employment, such as that in respect of which the Hon. John Hamilton Grey, member for the city and county of St. John, in 1868, entered into the receipt of $300 per month of the public monies."

That motion was voted down; but as a result of public opinion, a Bill was introduced into Parliament, on the discussion of which a good deal was said by some leading members supporting the then Government. The late Sir George Cartier made some observations on it, and Mr. Masson, now of the Senate, made the following observations:—

"He hoped to see the Independence of Parliament Act amended so as to prevent any member from receiving from the Government any emolument, whether yearly or otherwise. At the same time, he thought that the Government were not to be blamed because they did not contravene the Independence of Parliament Act in giving Colonel Grey a monthly salary."

There you will see what the hon. member was driving at—that the law should be made so stringent that the Government would not have it in their power to provide any member of Parliament with any office under the Crown. On the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, the late Sir George Cartier said:

"He would now announce that the Government, having considered the Independence of Parliament Act of 1868, had come to the conclusion to introduce a measure to re-establish the state of things that existed in the old Parliament of Canada in reference to the independence of members."

Under the law of 1857 and 1871 it is quite clear that no member of Parliament could be appointed to any position in the service of the Government, under the Crown, while he occupied a seat in Parliament. That was the condition of affairs until 1868, that condition of affairs was restored in 1871, when the Hon. Sir George Cartier introduced his Bill; and section 1 of the Bill of 1871 and section 1 of the Bill of 1878, which the hon. member proposes to amend, are the same. The hon. gentleman is now proposing to amend the Bill of 1871, because the Bills of 1871 and 1878 are identical. In introducing this Bill Sir George Cartier said:

"He explained that the principal provision of the Bill was to restore the independence of members as it was under the *regime* of the old Parliament of Canada, viz.: that the Government could not employ annually, monthly or temporarily, or at all, any member having a seat in this House."

That is just what the hon. gentleman is violating, that is the ground upon which Sir George Cartier introduced the Bill, that is the promise he made to Parliament, that is his interpretation of the provisions of the Bill; yet we are told now the Government have a perfect right to nominate any member of this House to a position under the Crown, so long as

he does not get an annual salary. And on the second reading of the Bill, Sir George Cartier said :

"The object of this Bill was to place the law on the independence of Parliament in the same position as it had been under the old Act of the Parliament of Canada, rendering it incompetent for the Government to employ any member of the House in any service whatever."

It is quite clear from the interpretation of Sir George Cartier that a gross violation of that law has been committed in the present case. I say that a gross violation was committed openly, above board, wantonly, in the face of the Act of Parliament ; I say the Bill the hon. gentleman is submitting to Parliament is unprecedented in the annals of Parliament, and I challenge the hon. gentleman again to give this House a single instance where, in the Imperial Parliament or in the Canadian Parliament, the Government of the day, or any member of the House, ever succeeded in carrying through Parliament a Bill that not only indemnified the member violating the law, but gave him a seat in Parliament, not for the Session in which he violated the law, but for the whole of the Parliament, and not only that, but amended the Independence of Parliament Act in the interests of one individual, and to cover one individual case. It has been tried in England. A few evenings ago I referred to the case of Mr. Forsyth, who was appointed to the position of Standing Counsel to the Secretary of State for India while he occupied a seat for Cambridge in the House of Commons. Attention was called to his position ; it was referred to a Select Committee. The Select Committee reported that Mr. Forsyth, by accepting the position of Standing Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, had vacated his seat for Cambridge. He had sat during a portion of the Parliament. An Indemnity Bill was brought in. That Bill passed the Imperial Parliament, the three readings in one day. In the subsequent Session a Bill was introduced, at the instance of Mr. Forsyth, to amend the Independence of Parliament Act, to enable him to sit in Parliament and occupy his position as Standing Counsel to the Secretary of State for India. What was the result of the discussion on that Bill? It is worth while considering it. The discussion upon that Bill is to be found in volume 185 of *Hansard*, and some of the first lawyers of the day expressed their opinion upon it. It was not as objectionable a Bill as this. It did not give Mr. Forsyth the seat, as this Bill expressly provides in the case of Sir Charles Tupper, but it proposed to amend the Independence of Parliament Act so as to qualify him in future. Serjeant Gaselee, in discussing the question, said :

"The learned gentleman (Mr. Forsyth) had been returned for the Borough of Cambridge ; the question arose whether he could sit, and a Committee decided that he was excluded by the Statute of Anne. The object of that Act was expressly to exclude persons holding places under the Crown—'placemen'—from the House of Commons. If that Statute was not a wise one, repeal it altogether ; but he did object to repealing it piecemeal and in favour of an individual."

Now, I say that is exactly what the hon. gentleman is doing in this case. He is repealing the Statute piecemeal and to cover an individual case. It was further stated, in discussing the Bill, by Sir Roundell Palmer :

"His hon. and learned friend said it was an accident and an anachronism, and that if the attention of Parliament had been called to the case, provision would have been made enabling the Standing Counsel to the Secretary of State for India to sit in that House. But how his hon. and learned friend was able to divine what would have been the legislation of the House, if a question had been brought before it which never was brought before it, it was difficult to understand."

He also said :

"He protested against legislation which prejudiced the principle of a large and important public statute resting on public policy, by taking a particular case out of it without any sound reasons applicable to that, more that to other cases."

I say every word of the statements of Sir Roundell Palmer is applicable to this case. This is an attempt to amend the Independence of Parliament Act in the interests of one man. More than that, it is giving that one man, who is not now, a member of this House, a seat in this House for the balance of this Parliament, and I shall vote against the Bill. I say it is a vicious Bill. I say it is not justified by any argument or proposition submitted by the First Minister. I say in every feature of it, and in every provision of it, and in every clause of it, and in every sentence of it, it is a vicious Bill. I say it is contrary to the opinion of the best writers upon the subject. I say it is contrary to the principles of representative Government. What does it do? Instead of allowing the people to select their candidates, the Government of the day, if backed up by a majority, select their candidates, and, more than that, they select their members of Parliament and make them members of Parliament. I say it is contrary to the first principles of responsible Government, that the people, who should have a voice in selecting a candidate and returning a member to Parliament, in this case are deprived of that right; and gentlemen on the Ministerial benches are proposing to elect to Parliament by an Act of Parliament a man who is not now a member of this House. I say it is subversive of the rights of the people of this country and ought not to be passed. It is to allow the majority of this House to do what they ought not to do, to put in Parliament a man who has not been elected to that position by the people. At every stage of this Bill, from the first to the last, I shall raise my voice and record my vote against it.

Mr. GIROUARD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this question ought to be considered from a legal point of view. That is what I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite mention several times, but I believe anyone who has listened to the argument or to the speech, the violent speech, of the hon. member who has just sat down, will be convinced that that hon. gentleman has considered this question from every point of view except the legal point of view. I will not follow his course. I will endeavour, as I did last year, when the King's county election case, Prince Edward Island, came up for discussion before this House, to free myself from political sympathy or antipathy. I am going to examine this question, as I did last year, from a purely legal point of view. The hon. gentleman has said that we, members sitting on this side of the House, are going to elect a member to Parliament. I said last year we were not sitting here to elect anyone to Parliament. That was the duty, that was the mission, of the people of this country. No more to-day than last year am I going to give my vote for the purpose of electing a member to Parliament. I differ from the hon. gentleman upon the main question. I believe that, under the circumstances of the case, Sir Charles Tupper never vacated his seat, and it is in this respect especially that I differ from the hon. gentleman. If Sir Charles Tupper had received a salary, which is attached under the Statute to the office of High Commissioner, I would not hesitate one moment to vote against the Bill. I have listened with a great deal of attention to all the precedents quoted by the hon. gentleman, but I believe he has not quoted a single one which is really in point or similar to the case under consideration. All the precedents or cases quoted by the hon. gentleman were cases where salaries were actually received. In this instance I defy them—perhaps they will be able to do it, but I have not been able—to find a single case in England, or in this country, where the salary is removed, not only by a letter or an agreement on the part of the nominee, but also by the very paper of appointment, and when it has been held that a member of Parliament was disqualified. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe I am anticipating the course of my argument. Let us look first at the Act for securing the Independence of Parliament. Section 1 says:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission, or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee,

wages, allowance, or emolument or profit of any kind is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote therein."

In the first place, I contend that all these words—"salary, fee, wages, allowance, emolument, or profit of any kind"—must have the same meaning. All the authorities who have written on the interpretation or construction of Statutes, and among them Maxwell, lay down the rule that when two or more words susceptible of analogous meaning are coupled together the rule is *noscitur a sociis;* they are understood to be used in their cognate sense. They take, as it were, their colour from each other. If these words "salary, fee, wages, allowance, emolument, or profit of any kind" have the same meaning, it is very plain that a member of this House may be appointed by the Government to an office to which only travelling expenses or the expenses of that office are attached. If we look at the dictionaries of Somner, Johnson, Todd, Spelman and Burrill, we will find that they state that the word "fee" is derived from the Anglo-Saxon "*feoh*" which means a "stipend or reward"; it follows that the words "salary, wages, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind," which is the last word used in the Statute, convey the idea of reward or pure profit. Then certainly no one can reproach Sir Charles Tupper because he has claimed the necessary expense attached to the office of High Commissioner. But let us go a little further. Let us look at the Statute of 1880, providing for the appointment of an officer known as the High Commissioner of Canada in England. The Statute says:

"The Governor may, under the Great Seal of Canada, from time to time appoint an officer to be called the High Commissioner of Canada, who shall hold office during pleasure."

Then his powers are defined in clause 2. Clause 3 says: "The High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than $10,000 per annum." I hold, Mr. Speaker, that this salary is attached to the office of High Commissioner, but as the Commission of Sir Charles Tupper, or the paper appointing him, does not provide for a salary, but on the contrary provides that there shall be no salary, I hold that that commission is not a valid one under the Statute; it is null and void under the Statute, and therefore his seat never became vacant and he is still the member for Cumberland.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." Under what precedents, by what legal argument, can they pretend that this Government has a right to violate a Statute more than any one else? This Statute says the Governor in Council may appoint an officer to be called the High Commissioner for Canada, and it says the High Commissioner "shall receive a salary." Under what law has this Government the right to declare in the commission that this High Commissioner shall receive no salary? I say the moment that stipulation is made in the paper of nomination, the nomination thereby becomes null and void under the Statute, and it being no nomination under the Statute, the seat of Sir Charles Tupper therefore never became vacant. I defy hon. gentlemen to controvert that position, or to prove the fallacy of my argument. I can quote precedents which show beyond doubt that the first condition required in order to affect the seat of a member of Parliament, or in order to sue him for the penalties mentioned in the Statute, is that the validity of the appointments must be established. In the case of Rex *vs.* Day Lord Tenterden said, "The mere acting as inspector would not vacate the office of alderman unless he had been duly appointed to that office," so we may say the mere acting as High Commissioner would not vacate the seat of Sir Charles Tupper in Parliament for the same reason in the case cited. The informality consisted only in this, that the inspector was appointed by the justices outside the session, though still by the justices, but as the Statute provided that he could not be nominated out of the Session, his nomination was set aside and it was held, under these circumstances, that he had not vacated his seat as alderman. What is the case here? The Statute says there shall be a salary attached to that office; the Government, in the commission, said there shall be no salary. Is the power of the Government stronger than the power of the Statute? I say no. The consequence is that the commission is not a valid one upon its face, and the seat never became vacant. I mentioned at the outset that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down quoted many precedents to show that a member of Parliament cannot hold an office of emolument under the Crown without vacating his seat. I am not going to deny that principle, which is elementary, but it does not apply to the case of Sir Charles Tupper. Now let us look at the Order in Council making this nomination. In a report dated 30th May, 1883, from the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, it is stated that it would be necessary to appoint a successor as High Commissioner of Canada in London, to Sir Alexander T. Galt, whose resignation was to take place on the 1st of June, 1883; and it is expressly stated that Sir Charles Tupper was to hold and had accepted the office without salary. The commission also provides that Sir Charles Tupper will hold the said office "without salary," but otherwise "with all and every the duties, powers, right, authority, privileges, and advantages, unto the said office of right and by law appertaining during pleasure." It is also stated that the expenses of the High Commissioner will be paid in the same manner as the expenses of Sir Alexander T. Galt. So by the appointment and the very acceptance of the office, no salary is attached to the office, and therefore the commission of Sir Charles Tupper, if valid at all at common law, under the general powers of the Cabinet, has no validity at all under the Statute. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), stated the other day that Sir Charles Tupper would have an action against the Government to-day for the amount of his salary. I would like to know under what law he can claim that salary? Could he claim it under the commission appointing him? No, he cannot. He is not nominated with a salary attached to the office, but he is expressly nominated without a salary, and that is exactly where the fallacy of the hon. member for West Huron lies. I could understand that there might be some difficulty if he had renounced the salary subsequent to the nomination. In that case it might be considered that the salary being given, not as incidental, but as essential to the position, the nominee had no right to renounce that salary. But here the salary has been detached from the office by the commission itself, and therefore it seems to me very clear that Sir Charles Tupper has no such action as was mentioned the other day by the hon. member for West Huron. The hon. gentleman seems to have been surprised at the position I laid down that the Government has no right under the Statute to appoint a High Commissioner without a salary. Let us look at some other offices in the country. Are we going to be told that the Government has a right to appoint a Lieutenant-Governor to any Province without a salary—I always mean under the Statute? Can they appoint a Judge without a salary? The nomination of a Judge without a salary would be against the Statute and would be null and void, and he could not sit in any of the courts created by Statute. It is true the Government can nominate a Commissioner, even a High Commissioner, a Judge and certain other officers under the general powers of the Administration; but these officers will not have the character mentioned in the Statute creating those officers, and therefore cannot subject the nominees to the penalties mentioned in the Statute. I have no doubt hon. gentlemen have noticed the words of the Statute respecting the salary of a High

Commissioner. They are, "The High Commissioner shall receive a salary," &c.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. Yes; in order that the commission shall be valid, the salary must be mentioned in the commission. The words of the Statute are imperative. There is a very well known rule regarding the interpretation of the Statutes, that when the Statute declares that something "shall" be done, the language is imperative and the thing must be done. But here the thing was not done. The Government had no right to do it in that way. Honourable gentlemen opposite admit that. How can we say the commission is valid when the commission is against the provision of the Statute; and according to the authority which I have mentioned, that of Lord Tenterden, the first condition required in order to subject the nominee to the penalty specified in the Independence of Parliament Act is, that you must show upon its face complete and valid appointment. This was not a valid appointment.

Mr. MILLS. The appointment is valid, but the condition is void.

Mr. GIROUARD. The whole paper is void.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GIROUARD. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but I base my argument upon the decision of Judges who understand the law better than they do. The salary is essential; it is an essential factor in the appointment, and as such could not be detached by the Government. I will refer the House to several cases, among others, to one which is reported in the English *Jurist*. That is the case of Liverpool Corporation *vs.* Wright, where it was decided that a recorder, who under the Statute was entitled to fees could not agree with the corporation to take a salary instead, upon two grounds of public policy. It was held that the fees were necessary to the dignity of the office, and in that case the agreement was declared to be null and void. But here the renunciation to salary was not in the paper making the nomination, it was in a separate paper; it was not in the commission itself. I come now to a more recent case decided in our own country, that of Mr. Taillon, the present Attorney-General of the Province of Quebec. The Independence Act of the Province of Quebec is a copy of our own Act. In 1880 the Province of Quebec provided for the appointment of an officer to examine certain municipal accounts. On 24th September, 1880, Mr. Taillon, then, and still, the member for Montreal East, in the Assembly of Quebec, by Order in Council, was nominated with all the powers, rights, privileges, emoluments and advantages attached to the said office. There was a salary attached to this office in these terms—the terms are not imperative, as are the terms of the Statute providing for the nomination of a High Commissioner, but at the same time there is a salary attached to the office.

"The appointment of such Commissioner shall be during good pleasure, and his salary may be fixed by Order in Council, but shall not exceed $3,000 per annum, over and above travelling expenses."

Mr. Taillon received his travelling expenses, but he did not receive a salary; in fact no salary was ever fixed by Order in Council. He was sued by one Laliberté for penalties provided in the Quebec Statute, the same as in our own Statute. A decision was given by Chief Justice Meredith, on March 13th, 1882, in these terms:

"Considering that when the defendant sat as a member of the Legislative Assembly of this Province, as mentioned in the plaintiff's declaration, no salary, fee, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind was then attached to the office which the defendant then held, as mentioned in the plaintiff's declaration; it is in consequence considered and adjudged that the action and demand of the said plaintiff against the defendant, be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs in favour of the said defendant."

Mr. GIROUARD.

I believe that is in some respects a case similar to the present one; but the case nearest to the present one is that quoted the other day by the leader of the Opposition. I have taken the trouble since that time to go over the whole report of the case, and it is apparent that the decision in that case does not bear out the hon. gentleman's proposition or the propositions adduced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—I refer to the Harvey case, before the Imperial Parliament. Let me say that Mr. Wynn, the mover for a Committee to enquire into the charge made against Mr. Harvey, from whose statements the leader of the Opposition quoted so fully the other day, was accused of partiality. In discussing that case, Mr. Harvey, in answer to Mr. Wynn, said:

"I see by a motion of the gallant officer the member for Lincoln, that thirty or forty commissions have been appointed with salaries attached to them. There are several members of Parliament in these commissions to whose names it is true, the remark is annexed to the return, that they have declined salaries.

* * * * * * * * *

In the County Rate Commission I find the names of Mr. Law Hodges, and Mr. Shaw Lefevre, who it is said, 'declined to receive salaries.' Their declining to receive them rather implied that they could take them if they pleased, and the acceptance of this office worked their disqualification, according to the reasoning of the right hon. gentleman. Why the right hon. gentleman has suffered such appointments to pass unnoticed, I cannot conceive, unless it be, that as 'Commissioners' and not found on the Journals of the House, they are a subject beneath his notice. Again, I find, that there has been a commission on Irish fisheries, in which case it was laid down that the Commissioners should receive their salary when they reported, But I see that Mr. Walker, as one of these Commissioners, has, from the commencement, refused to receive any remuneration, That, no doubt, is very creditable to Mr. Walker; but if the doctrine be approved, as agitated by the right hon. gentleman, that the acceptance of office—such paid offices as these paid commissionerships,—constitutes the evil, and vacates the seat in Parliament, I am a little surprised, giving the right hon. gentleman credit for not being actuated in the smallest degree by personal feelings or party motives in bringing forward his motion of this evening, that these commissionerships should have altogether escaped his attention."

Mr. Hume said on the same occasion:

"I can have no objection to comply with the request of the right hon. Baronet. Had I been a member of the Committee, in the case of Mr. Harvey, I should have asked how it was that an hon. member for Marylebone had been appointed to an office of profit, and been permitted to proceed to a foreign country, without vacating his seat, and without any notice having been taken of his appointment in this House. I should have asked how the hon. member for Kilmarnock had been permitted to accept an appointment, and to receive largely the public money without vacating his seat. And I should also have asked how an hon. member for Dundee had been permitted, without a notice being taken of his appointment, to hold another office of profit. That would have been the course I should have pursued had I had the power. There are, in all, about sixteen members of this House who have received offices of profit, and yet no notice has been been taken of their appointment. The first blot was hit in Mr. Harvey's case. But I shall take especial care that such appointments, shall, in future, be rigidly examined; and I shall also consider whether I ought not to bring those who have been already made under the notice of the House."

This shows that Mr. Wynn, whose opinions were quoted the other evening by the leader of the Opposition as sustaining his view, is not, after all, a very impartial authority on a question like this. But I will show that even in the opinion of Mr. Wynn, a case like that of Sir Charles Tupper would not come within the prohibition. Mr. Wynn said—and of course this portion was not quoted by the hon. gentleman:

"But the hon. member, in his letter to the Noble Lord, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, said that he would not receive any emolument or profit from the office, if Parliament should be of opinion that its acceptance would oblige him to vacate his seat."

Mr. Harvey had applied for the salary in the first instance, but when he applied he was told that perhaps he would render his seat vacant, and thereupon he declared that he would not receive any emolument from the office if Parliament decided that his seat would thereby become vacant. Mr. Wynn goes on to say:

"The hon. gentleman's refusal to accept a salary was therefore only a qualified refusal, dependent upon the refusal of Parliament as to the effect of accepting a salary. This, I contend, does not exempt him from the disqualification created by his original acceptance of the office."

Here you have a conditional refusal of the salary. I apply, said Mr. Harvey, for my salary if I am entitled to it, but Sir Charles Tupper says from the very inception to-day, I am willing to perform the duties of the office, and at the very beginning I want it to be understood that I desire to receive no salary, and I want my commission so to state. Now let us see what the Attorney General said on this Mr. Harvey's case; and I presume his words will have more weight than the words of Mr. Wynn, who moved against Mr. Harvey. The Attorney General said:

"The next question to be considered is whether the case is altered by the fact of no salary having been assigned, and in my opinion it is not; because the party holding the office might go to a Minister of the Crown and say (assign me a salary), and if the Minister refused he could go to the court of Queen's Bench and procure a mandamus to compel an assignment of salary, which salary would commence from the date of the appointment. If Mr. Harvey's renunciation of the salary had been absolute and unconditional, a question might perhaps arise as to how far that renunciation was binding, but it was only conditional, it could have no legal operation."

If Sir Charles Tupper had been appointed High Commissioner without saying a word as to the salary, and without having written a paper to the effect that he wanted no salary, and if he never received any portion of that salary, perhaps there would be something in the argument of the hon. gentleman in saying that Sir Charles Tupper might go to a court of justice and ask for a *mandamus* granting him the salary attached to his office by Statute. But this is not such a case. You have a refusal of the salary from the beginning. When the question was before the Council, in fact before the commission was issued under the Great Seal of Canada, Sir Charles Tupper said, I want no salary, and the commission under the Great Seal says that he shall receive no salary. Now this is what I understand to be the law at present. We have before us a Bill which the hon. gentleman who spoke before me said was at Act to elect a member to represent the county of Cumberland in this House. I do not look upon that Bill in that light. This is only a declaratory statute. It is not a Bill declaring a new law, but declaring what the law always has been. It is a Bill to remove doubts, and have we not reason to ask that doubts should be removed? We all know that lawyers do not always agree. They do not agree before they reach the Bench, and they do not any more agree upon the Bench. Has the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act been violated in this case? Not at all. Now can it be supposed for one moment that a Minister of the Crown was appointed to that office for the purpose of being influenced by the Crown? It is not possible to make a supposition of that kind. Then the evil which was intended to be prevented by the Independence of Parliament Act does not exist in this case. That is a sufficient reason why Parliament may say: As there may be doubts whether a member of Parliament can hold any office under the Crown without salary or profit of any kind, without exposing himself to become subject to severe penalties for the violation of the law, which he never intended to violate, and as there is no reason why there should be penalties for anything of the kind, we shall say that for the future Sir Charles Tupper shall continue to hold the office of High Commissioner, which he has done for the last twelve months to his own credit and to the advantage of the country. I had occasion to be on the continent of Europe last fall, and I was very much pleased to hear there that at the Cable Convention, held in Paris in September or October, where twenty or thirty Powers were represented, Sir Charles Tupper was present, not as the servant or representative of the British Ambassador, but as the representative of Canada. For all these reasons, I am in favour of this Bill, and especially because it tends to enact more expressly what I have always considered to be the law of this country.

Mr. LISTER. I shall ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I make such remarks as I think pertinent to the question under discussion. The hon. gentleman who has just preceded me says that he was in Europe during the last season and had the pleasure of seeing Sir Charles Tupper there as the representative of the Dominion of Canada; yet he took a good deal of trouble to argue that Sir Charles Tupper was not High Commissioner in England at all during that time. Sir, I do not propose to enter into the history of Parliament in England so far as this question is concerned. I think that has been fully dealt with by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me on this side of the House. The question before the House is one of a very simple nature. It is a question of the proper construction to be put upon what is known as the Independence of Parliament Act. Before considering that, let us review for a moment the position Sir Charles Tupper has occupied since the time he received his appointment. We know, Sir, as a fact, that he was appointed to the High Commissionership; we know as a fact that he accepted that position; and we know as a fact, by the papers which have been laid on the Table of this House, that during the time he held that position he received from the Dominion Government some $4,000 in one payment, and some $1,500 in another payment, making $5,500 that he received from this Dominion for services or something else during the time he occupied that position. Now, Sir, there is a very great distinction between the law of England and our law on this subject. Hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have pointed out, though hon. gentlemen who have argued the question on the other side of the House have ignored the fact, that in England, there is no Statute similar to the Statute existing in this country; and it is upon that Statute and that alone that the status of Sir Charles Tupper in this House must be decided. It gave me a great deal of pleasure to hear the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) assure the House that he would approach this case in a judicial spirit—that he would look upon it as if he was deciding the case as a judge. I am sure that that expression must have given great satisfaction to hon. members on both sides of the House, and I am sure that if the hon. gentleman was sincere in the statement he then made, he will be found voting against the motion proposed by the hon. leader of the Government. Now, Sir, if we look at the Independence of Parliament Act, we find that it says:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind, is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote therein."

It is contended that Sir Charles Tupper did not vacate his seat because by the commission appointing him no salary was attached to his office; and upon that ground the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me urges that Sir Charles Tupper's appointment as High Commissioner was void. I would say to the hon. gentleman that this being a statutory appointment, and the Statute Statute authorizing the appointment, fixing the salary, and stating imperatively that that salary shall be paid, the moment a man receives that appointment, the salary attaches, and he is entitled to draw it; and I believe that the law laid down by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is correct, that if Sir Charles Tupper brought an action against the Government, he could undoubtedly recover the amount of his salary. But in looking at this Statute, we should ask what induced Parliament to pass it. We know that members of Parliament were sitting in this House while receiving a salary from the Government, and so great had the scandal become that this legislation was forced upon the Government to prevent that sort of thing; and the words of the Statute are so comprehensive that it would be impossible to find words in the English language to cover more than they do. Salary, emolument,

allowance, fee, stipend, everything that it is possible for the English language to express, is mentioned here, so that there could be no possibility of a gentleman in that position holding a seat in this House. The hon. leader of the Government stated the other night that his seat had not become vacant, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has said the same thing here to-day. If the seat is not vacated, why is this legislation asked?—why does the Government come and ask Parliament and say that Sir Charles Tupper is still a member of the House, if he is in fact still a member of the House?—why should the leader of the Government ask the House to pass this measure at all? But Sir Charles Tupper is not a member of this House, and the hon. leader of the Government knows that perfectly well. I will ask the attention of the House while I compare the language used by the hon. leader of the Government in 1877 with the language he used the other night. The hon. leader of the Government the other night stated:

"My hon. friend has been advised that he did not forfeit his seat. He has been advised that he is still the member for Cumberland and has every right to sit or vote; but the question having been raised in the public press, the hon. gentleman did not choose to record his vote and add to the weight of the opinion of this House on the great questions before it.

These are the words the hon. leader of the Government used the other night, and we find, on going back to 1877, that the hon. gentleman then, in the strongest possible language, opposed the measure which was then passed—a measure which proposed merely to indemnify hon. members of this House who had then unwittingly violated the strict letter of this Independence of Parliament Act; and that measure did not provide that they should retain their seats, but that they should go back to their constituents and be re-elected if their constituents still had confidence in them. This Act provides that Sir. Charles Tupper shall not only be indemnified against the penalties provided for by the Act but further that he shall retain his seat in this House. This is a provision directly contrary to the Independence of Parliament Act; it is a provision which declares, in fact, that although Sir Charles Tupper is not a member of this House, he shall, by Act of Parliament, become one. I say that a Bill such as this is of a most pernicious character, a Bill which goes far beyond that which the hon. the leader of the Government opposed in 1878 in the strongest language possible. He said:

"If they allowed the Independence of Parliament to be infringed, and they took the ground that members of this House, who ought to know what the law was, were to be excused, the result would be disastrous, and there was no knowing where the thing would end."

We find further that the then hon. member for Compton used language equally strong. Now, if Sir Charles Tupper, in accepting this position, believed, at the time, he accepted it, that it was competent for him to do so, or if, in other words, he had, in the opinion of the leader of the Government, unwittingly violated the Act, there would be some reason for introducing a Bill to indemnify him. But what do we find? I charge Sir Charles Tupper with knowing that he was violating the Independence of Parliament Act when he accepted the position he had no right to accept, and I charge him with knowing at the time that in accepting it, he was vacating his seat. The hon. leader of the Government read a letter from Mr. Todd whom everybody recognizes as an authority on constitutional questions. In that letter, Mr. Todd gave him to understand that, according to Parliamentary practice in England, Sir Charles Tupper was not eligible for the seat, but he went on to say that he would leave the Canadian Statutes to be the judged by Sir John himself, so we find that at very time the appointment was made, the Government had taken the precaution to consult Mr. Todd about it; and his letters intimated, as plainly as anything could, that, under the Canadian Statute, Sir Charles Tupper had no right to take his seat, because Mr. Todd said to the leader of the Government that as to that Statute the latter was perhaps a better judge than he. That is proof positive that these hon. gentlemen, at the time, had in view the eligibility of Sir Charles Tupper for that position, that they had considered the question, that they had read the Statutes—and there is no man capable of forming an opinion upon the Statute who could fail in coming to the conclusion that the appointment of Sir Charles Tupper was contrary to the spirit and intent of the Statute. Sir Charles Tupper accepted that position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Todd's letter is dated 21st December, 1883.

Mr. LISTER. It shows, at all events, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman had some doubts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will read the first passage:

DEAR SIR,—As I observe in the newspapers, criticisms in relation to Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways, and also High Commissioner for the Dominion, in England, continuing to hold his seat, and as it is probable the question of his right to retain his seat, will be raised in the ensuing Session, it occurs to me that you might like a reference to some English precedents bearing on the points."

He wrote that on his own accord.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. leader of the Government says he never consulted Mr. Todd, nor asked his advice, nor solicited the letter he has read here. I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but I say that a lawyer, as astute as the hon. gentleman, as familiar with constitutional practice as he is, who has the vast parliamentary experience he has had, and in view of the discussion which took place in 1877, in which he then expressed the most decided views as to the right of a member of Parliament to hold a position under the Government, it is somewhat extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should have made this appointment. We find in the Order of Council that the hon. leader of the Government stated it was on account of Sir Charles Tupper's health that he was appointed to this position. Be that as it may, I say that hon. gentlemen opposite were bound to know the law, and the law is as plain as the English language can make it, that a person in the position of Sir Charles Tupper had no right to occupy the position of High Commissioner. Sir Charles Tupper's whole conduct from the time this Session commenced up to the present, has shown an unmistakable consciousness that he is not qualified to occupy his seat in this House. It is a scandal to this Parliament and to this country, that an hon. Minister occupying one of the highest positions in the gift of the Crown, the High Commissionership, should have been found sitting in this House, supporting measures from day to day, advocating them with all the power we know the hon. gentleman possesses, asking his supporters to support the measures he introduced, but which he himself is afraid to vote for—that itself shows the conviction Sir Charles Tupper felt, that he was not qualified to hold his seat in Parliament. Such being the case, he has no right to sit here, and hon. gentlemen opposite are doing a most grievous wrong to this House and the electors of Cumberland in providing that Sir Charles Tupper shall be a member of this House when, in fact, he has vacated his seat. If we look for one moment at the language of this Act, we see it is impossible to come to any conclusion other than that if Sir Charles Tupper accepted any emolument or allowance as High Commissioner, he vacated his seat. It is absurd for the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) to argue that because the word "salary" is used, every word following that must mean the same thing; that allowances must mean salary, that emoluments and fees must mean salary. The word "salary" is one thing and the word "allowance" is another. An allowance may be a salary or it may not,

as argued by the hon. member for West Durham, the other night; and we have proof here in the papers which have been laid on the Table, that allowances were given to and received by Sir Charles Tupper. If those allowances were received by him, there can be no doubt that, under the Statute, that seat has become vacated. If it is vacant, why should hon. gentlemen, why should this House by an Act of Parliament say that he is still a member of it? Why should the independence of Parliament be violated or attempted to be violated in the way proposed here? If he is still a member of this House, as it is urged, why should we pass this Act? If he is not then, I say that the Parliament of this country has no right to make him a member of Parliament by an Act of Parliament. If it is felt that the late member for Cumberland has unwittingly violated the statute, it is within the province of this House, should it believe that statement that he did unwittingly violate it, to indemnify him against the penalties under the Statute; but by no possible argument or process of reasoning can the House go so far as to say, because they do say it under this Act, that because that seat is vacated, Sir Charles Tupper shall be replaced in it. If the seat is not vacated, this legislation is entirely unnecessary, as far as this portion of it is concerned. If the seat is vacated, there is no precedent in England or in Canada or in any other country which has a constitutional Government, for such legislation as this—a legislation to take away from the people of Cumberland county the right to say who shall be member for that county, and by an Act of Parliament say that Sir Charles Tupper shall be a member of this House for that county. Sir, I say that you are doing a grievous wrong to the people of Cumberland county, you are violating a principle of constitutional Government, you are violating a plain Act of Parliament upon our Statute Book, merely for the purpose of putting him there. I say it is better for a thousand Sir Charles Tuppers to lose their seats than for our constitutional law to be violated in a single jot. No ground of expediency can justify the hon. member in introducing legislation of this kind. You are destroying the foundations of our constitutional law and of the liberties of this country. No motives of expediency should have induced the leader of the Government to introduce such a measure as this into the House, even for the purpose of saving Sir Charles Tupper from the consequences of his act. I stated, when I commenced, that I did not intend to detain the House for any great length of time, and I will only briefly review the points I take in this matter. I say that, under this Act, Sir Charles Tupper was disqualified. I say that by no possible construction of that Act can it be said that he did not receive allowances from the Government of Canada while he was acting as High Commissioner. That being the case, he became disqualified. I say then that, while the Government may have a right or may have some colour of justification for introducing an Act to indemnify him against the penalties for the violation of that Act, it can have no justification whatever, for declaring that he has a seat in this House, in view of the fact that the hon. the leader of the Government, the hon. the Secretary of State, every hon. gentleman who has spoken upon this subject, has declared that Sir Charles Tupper's seat was not vacated. If it has not been vacated, there is no necessity whatever for that clause in the Act, and if the House believes he unwittingly violated the law, it is competent for the House to indemnify him against the penalties. But to go further, and by their own act to say that his seat is vacated—because the declaration of the fact, in the Act before the House, that it is not vacated, is an admission that it has been vacated—is to make a dangerous thrust at constitutional Government in this country. I repeat, if a thousand Sir Charles Tuppers were to lose their seats, it is better than that the constitution and the laws of our country should be violated.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to make a few observations on this subject which I think is one of very great moment. The hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill has informed the House, in the first place, that the measure is altogether unnecessary; that it is perfectly clear that Sir Charles Tupper has not vacated his seat as member for Cumberland, that he has not in any way violated the independence of Parliament; and yet the hon. gentleman proposes to proceed upon the assumption that his colleague has done both, that he has violated the independence of Parliament in accepting an office of emolument under the Crown, and that he has thereby vacated his seat. Now, this is a matter of very great moment. In England and in Canada, we have sometimes had cases of parties unwittingly violating the law, and of Parliament undertaking to indemnify them against the consequences; but I think this is the first instance of a case of a clear violation of the law done deliberately, done notwithstanding the fact that public opinion was called to this particular violation, as Mr. Todd's letter shows, and that it was expected that parliamentary action might be taken upon the subject—I say, notwithstanding these facts, we find that Sir Charles Tupper was appointed to this office of emolument under the Crown, and the hon. gentleman now proposes that he shall still retain his seat in Parliament—I say this is the first instance where the seat has been given to a party who has vacated it. We, on two or three occasions since Confederation, have dealt with the subject of cases of members unwittingly violating the Independence of Parliament Act, but, in those cases, while we have protected them against the consequences of that violation, so far as the fine is concerned, we have never undertaken to retain them in their seats. The hon. gentleman knows right well, in the case of Mr. Norris, and in the case of Mr. Currier, and in the case of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail), and in the case of Mr. Jones from Halifax, in all those cases, the hon. gentlemen who had violated the law were compelled to go to their constituents for re-election; but the hon. gentleman proposes, in this case, that, although his colleague has violated the law and although his seat has become vacant, he shall be protected against the consequences of that violation, and shall, by the provisions of this Act be reinstated in the seat he has lost by his appointment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for one moment? In 1874 a Bill was introduced by the Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, indemnifying Stanislaus Francis Perry for having sat and voted as a member of the House of Commons, and the first clause is this. The hon. gentleman said just now they merely indemnified these members for the unwitting mistake, but did not give the seat. Here is the first clause:

"The said Stanislaus Francis Perry is hereby declared to have been and to be, capable of being elected, and of sitting and voting in the House of Commons," etc.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see, from reading the preamble of the Act, that it is not at all a case similar to the one now before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the Act was unnecessary.

Mr. MILLS. In that case, Mr. Perry had tendered his resignation as a member of the Local Legislature. He had done it in the only way open to him. He had taken every possible precaution to divest himself of the seat in the Local Legislature ——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But he forfeited his seat, all the same.

Mr. MILLS—in order to be qualified for election to the House of Commons. He was elected by his constituents with a perfect knowledge of all these facts. He was elected

by his constituents after he had taken those steps, all of which had been taken with their cognizance, and it was after, first, his resignation, and then his election, and after all this had been done, that Parliament passed that Act, a declaratory Act, in which it is stated that the hon. gentleman, having taken all these precautions which are set out in the preamble of the Bill, has not vacated his seat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the same Act.

Mr. MILLS. No; it is not the same Act. If the hon. gentleman could show that Sir Charles Tupper had accepted this position before he was elected as member for Cumberland, if he could show that he had tendered his resignation of the office, if he could show that there was some irregularity in the tendering of his resignation that was altogether beyond his control, if he could show that he had done everything in his power to divest himself of his office, and that, after he had done that, he was elected by the people for Cumberland, then he might quote that Statute in defence of what he proposes to do to-day; but that is not the case. Sir Charles Tupper was elected member for Cumberland; he was not disqualified at the time of his election. He has since accepted a disqualifying office by which his seat has become vacant, and, after that vacancy has arisen, the hon. gentleman proposes that a Parliament, in which a majority of the members sitting in this House are not members for Nova Scotia, shall elect a candidate for one of the constituencies of Nova Scotia. That, Sir, is the position the hon. gentleman has taken in this Bill. Now, I deny that the position is a sound one. I would like, however, briefly to allude to the observations made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). That hon. gentleman reads a commission and says it is a valid commission.

Mr. GIROUARD. No; I say the commission is null.

Mr. MILLS. Then the hon. gentleman argues that there was no appointment at all, that Sir Charles Tupper was not High Commissioner, and that although he received $5,000 for acting as Commissioner, nevertheless his seat has never become vacant by the acceptance of the office, because there was in law no valid acceptance. Well, Sir, as I understand the law with reference to the provision made by Act of Parliament for an appointment to any particular office, if the Government advises the Crown to make the appointment in accordance with the provision of that Act, and they attach a condition inconsistent with the Act, the condition is void, but the appointment is valid.

Mr. GIROUARD. Can you show that by authorities?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman can have no difficulty in finding any number of authorities in that sense. He knows very well, for instance, that two parties cannot agree upon a mode of settling a dispute between them which would divest a court of its jurisdiction. The same rule which applies in that case would apply in this, and if there is a provision made by Statute that there shall be a salary attached to a particular office, and an agreement is made between the Government and a candidate that he shall not receive that salary, it will not change the character of that office, it will not make any difference. Where the Crown, as a matter of prerogative, has the power of making an appointment and where there are certain emoluments, or fees, or allowances, which the Crown has the power to grant in connection with that office, it may separate the appointment from the particular office, as in the case of the appointment of Queen's Counsel or Queen's Sergeant, in such cases the Crown can make an appointment to an office without perquisites being attached to the office. But where the policy of Parliament is indicated by the provision of an Act of Parliament that a certain office shall be an office of emolument under the Crown, it is not in the power of Government to change the character of that office, and it does not depend upon the acceptance of a salary in order to vacate the seat, under the provisions of such an Act. Let me ask the hon. gentleman this question: If the office is accepted, when does the seat become vacant? How much salary must accrue? Is it not the very instant that acceptance takes place that the seat becomes vacant? Then the question arises, did that acceptance takes place? Did it take place when the patent issued, or did it take place before? There are many cases in England where an agreement to accept office is regarded as an acceptance, and the writ issues accordingly. Now there are many instances of that sort. There is the case of Sir Henry Petty, who was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 4th of February, and he was elected for Cambridge on the 6th of February, but the patent did not issue till after the election; and if the view taken by the hon. gentleman was sound, the result would have been that the seat would have become vacant again. But it was held that the very moment he agreed to accept the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer his seat became vacant, and although the patent for the office did not issue till after his election, nevertheless, according to the view of the hon. gentleman his seat was not vacated, he was entitled to retain his seat, and a second election was wholly unnecessary. There was, too, the case of Mr. Addington. Mr. Addington had agreed to accept the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the King became insane and the patent could not issue. Mr. Addington's seat was held, nevertheless, to be vacant, and he was obliged to go back for re-election, although after his re election Mr. Pitt continued to hold the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer and proposed the Budget to Parliament and Mr. Addington did not, until some weeks afterwards, receive the appointment of Chancellor of the Exchequer. So that is is perfectly obvious that when Sir Charles Tupper agreed to accept this office he agreed to accept it subject to the provisions of the Statute, and we cannot look at the patent which he received for the purpose of ascertaining whether he was qualified or disqualified in this acceptance. The fact that there is not a salary provided, or the fact that the patent says that there shall be no salary, discloses nothing in regard to the matter. We look at the Statute itself. We see by the Statute that it is an office of emolument, that it is a disqualifying office by the Statute, and being an office of emolument and therefore a disqualifying office, the moment he agreed to accept it his seat in the House of Commons became vacant. Let me suppose a case. Suppose the hon. gentleman had appointed Sir Charles Tupper as Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. There is a certain salary attached to the office. Suppose Sir Charles Tupper had agreed that in that office he would not accept the salary. Supposing that his patent had been issued, as it has been in this case, providing that he should be Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario without a salary. Does the hon. gentleman say he could have retained that office of Lieutenant-Governor and retained a seat in this House and remained Minister of the Crown? Does he pretend to say that by simply agreeing that something shall be done contrary to the provisions of the Statute, contrary to the policy of Parliament, that therefore the hon. gentleman can accept that particular office? Why, he could do the same thing with the Chief Justiceship. He might appoint the Minister of Justice, or one of his colleagues in this House—the Secretary of State, for instance, who is a member of the Bar—he might appoint him Chief Justice on the same principle, with the understanding that there shall be no salary attached to the office. He might issue a patent, and that hon. gentleman might sit in the court as Chief Justice and sit in this House as a member for his constituency. I say, Sir, that the proposition is a preposterous one; it is one that will not bear investigation; and it is perfectly obvious that the Government do not possess that dispensing power which the hon. gentleman says they do

possess, in this particular instance. Parliament itself has had a policy upon this subject. It has declared that this office shall be held with a salary not exceeding a certain amount, and it declares that the person holding that office shall be the subordinate of a particular Department of the Government, indicating clearly what the policy of Parliament is upon that subject. And taking that view it is clear that the Government cannot adopt a policy which will, in effect, repeal a particular provision of the law and make that a mere volunteer's office which by the provision of the law itself is really a Parliamentary office.

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

After Recess.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY LEASE BILL.

On the Order for Private Bills being called,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before we proceed to the consideration of private Bills, I desire to submit, as a question of privilege the matter which I brought up a day or two ago. The point I submitted was that a Bill before this House cannot be promoted by any member who has advised on the Bill in his professional capacity. I charged that in the particular instance in question, that of Bill (No 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and for other purposes, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) was the paid counsel or solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I charged that as such he had prepared and gone through the Bill in question, and I argued that accordingly he was incapable of promoting the Bill in Parliament. You Mr. Speaker, ruled against the point I took. I think there may probably have been a misapprehension as to the question submitted. I refer you again, Mr. Speaker, to the rule under which I submitted that question. It is a rule passed in 1856 by the Imperial House of Commons, and is referred to at pages 99 and 390 of *May*. The Bill now stands in the name of another hon. member, and of course the question is not of so much importance, except as settling the rules and practice of the House. I do not propose to discuss the question now, although I intended to discuss it at that time. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the question the other night was as to the hon. member having a pecuniary interest in the Bill, and I read the decision of *May* on that point. But there is a rule of the House of Commons in England, which I presume is applicable to this House. It is as follows:—

"That it is contrary to the usage, and derogatory to the dignity of this House, that any of its members should bring forward, promote or advocate in this House any proceeding or measure in which he may have acted or been concerned, for or in consideration of any pecuniary fee or reward."

That is a resolution of the House of Commons of England, which I presume applies to this House.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Before the preamble is adopted, I should like some explanation as to the pecuniary results. Of course the hon. gentleman will understand that the pecuniary results, in so far as they affect the Canadian Pacific Railway, are of public interest, in view of their relations to the country, and also with respect to the question of tolls. This question becomes of still greater importance in consequence of a declaration not long since made on behalf of the Government, that they would decline to accept securities on lines leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, dreading the responsibilities in which they might possibly be involved by reason of those leases. The Bill before us is one which proposes to legalize a lease, and the preamble recites that it is expedient to do so, and the lease is made a schedule of the Bill. Under the lease, as proposed to be legalized, very large but indefinite sums, which I cannot compute, are agreed to be paid. What I should like to know is, what is the gross sum of the rental or annual consideration that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be called on to pay in virtue of this agreement?

Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company guarantee to the Company 5 per cent. on the cost of the road. The cost of the road will be $25,000 a mile, for the number of miles built, together with $2,000,000 of the original stock of the Company.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the mileage?

Mr. HAGGART. It is from Montreal to St. Thomas, and the extension from St. Thomas to Windsor. The distance, I understand, is a little over 400 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the $25,000 per mile include the cost of the bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. No; there is the additional cost of the bridge across the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Then we have not got the full obligation yet.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimated cost of the bridge and approaches into the city of Montreal, is limited to $3,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Is interest paid on that at 5 per cent.?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; after the money is expended.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it will be $25,000 a mile on about 400 miles, and in addition $3,000,000 on the bridge, and in addition $2,000,000 of stock.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that $25,000 a mile would be the cost of the road.

Mr. HAGGART. No; it has been paid at par, in cash, which is part of the cost of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. Part of the cost? Then the road is estimated to cost more than $25,000 a mile?

Mr. HAGGART. Part of it.

Mr. BLAKE. But all over?

Mr. HAGGART. The average price will be over $25,000 a mile, as some of it is $25,000 and some of it more than that.

Mr. BLAKE. We know, from the railway statistics, and I mentioned it formerly in the House, that the cost of the Credit Valley part, over what was paid by the Government and the municipalities, would not have been much more than $10,000 a mile. So the remainder is going to cost a great deal of money, at that rate.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the cost of the Credit Valley is a great deal more than that.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course I feel for my hon. friend's difficulties in promoting this Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. The first clause has been considerably altered in Committee, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to explain the alterations.

Mr. HAGGART. The portion between Smith's Falls and Perth was sold, and the amount of money received for that portion is deposited with the Government, as security.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the mileage?

Mr. HAGGART. Twelve miles, and the amount $300,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the debenture stock of the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company—that is, the portion of the stock that is going to the Canadian Pacific Railway—is the price of the 12 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. As part of the guarantee of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. So the Government will have the guarantee of the Canadian Pacific Railway as security to the Government for the indebtedness of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

On section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will kindly turn to the fifth clause of the lease. The rental there is stated in detail thus:—

"The interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum upon the debenture stock of the lessors, which shall be issued by them in conformity with the said indenture of amalgamation of the Credit Valley Railway Company."

Now we have not had that indenture of the amalgamation laid before us, so I have not been able to ascertain the cost of the debenture stock of the lessors, which may be issued by them in conformity with the indenture.

Mr. HAGGART. It is $25,000 per mile, which is to cover the equipment of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the maximum amount of the debenture stock would be, I suppose, $3,000,000 under section *b*?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the next section simply gives power to substitute bonds for debenture stock?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And Section *d* is an additional sum of $300,000, apparently in excess of the $25,000 per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a part of the $25,000 per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, of course, if you include the twelve miles in the Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; they buy it instead of building it.

Mr. BLAKE. The next section reads:

"The interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum upon the debenture stock of the lessors amounting to $5,000,000, issued, or to be issued, by the lessors for the cost of construction or equipment of their railway from the City of Toronto to the town of Perth."

What is the mileage from Toronto to Perth?

Mr. HAGGART. Two hundred miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Then here is an additional interest at the rate of 5 per cent. on the debenture stock of the extension of the line from Smith's Falls to the Junction to the Atlantic and North-West Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; 112 miles. Under the charter, they have power to extend either from Smith's Falls to Ottawa, or from Smith's Falls to Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. There will be a further rental of $25,000 per mile for that.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not contemplated to build from Smith's Falls to Ottawa, but to Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. That would be how much.

Mr. HAGGART. $25,000 per mile on 105 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. That would be additional to the 400 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. No; it is included.

Mr. BLAKE. Then there is the rental by the lessors agreed to be paid to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway; what is the amount of that?

Mr. HAGGART. It is on an average of about $20,000 per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. At what rate?

Mr. HAGGART. Six per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. And what mileage?

Mr. HAGGART. About 80 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it must be nearly 200 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. I have just been told that it is about 130 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. I think with all its branches it is much more than that, but I do not know. My hon. friend from Bruce says it is about 200 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only 125 or 130 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. The Toronto, Grey and Bruce is a sort of a bifurcated line; it goes several ways. Is it all included?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And the whole mileage is 130 miles?

Mr. HAGGART. So I understand. The lease is printed and shows the mileage.

Mr. BLAKE. Then there is the interest payable to the bondholders of the London Junction Railway. Will the hon. gentleman state what it all comes to?

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount, supposing the whole system is completed——

Mr. BLAKE. To the Detroit River?

Mr. HAGGART. No; to St. Thomas without the Detroit River branch. The total amount it is calculated to cost, if it is all completed, will be in the neighbourhood of $18,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Does it include the capital of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce?

Mr. HAGGART. It includes the bridge, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, the building of the road from Smith's Falls to Montreal, and the $2,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. About $18,000,000?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That is, $16,000,000 bearing 5 per cent. and $2,000,000 bearing 6 per cent?

Mr. HAGGART. Exactly.

On section 5,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what the maximum charge under this clause would be?

Mr. HAGGART. $12,000 per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. But the question is, what is the rate you are going to pay on the $12,000?

Mr. HAGGART. Five per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. And what is the mileage?

Mr. HAGGART. Fifty-two miles are finished, and the rest is to be built—about 300 miles.

Mr. WILSON. I find that this Bill, as presented to the House, does not give sufficient security to the parties formerly interested, in granting aid to the Credit Valley Railway Company before its amalgamation with the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company, which is now amalgamated with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Bill does not, in

my opinion, amply protect any litigation or suit or claim made by the various municipalities which have contributed to the Credit Valley Railway—contributed so liberally that the Credit Valley Railway gave a bond for the fulfilment of these obligations with the municipalities; for I find, according to this Bill, as originally drawn, and as presented here, that the moneys are to be paid directly to the bondholders and the stockholders of the company, thereby preventing any municipality having a lien, or claim, or suit pending, from obtaining redress. I, therefore, beg to move a new clause, to this effect:

"Nothing in this Act contained shall affect any pending suit or litigation or cause of action, or suit, or any contract, covenant or agreement heretofore made between any of the railway companies hereinbefore named, or between any of them, or any other corporation or individual; and any judgment rendered or execution issued against the said Ontario and Quebec Railway Company in respect of any such suit, litigation, cause of action or suit, contract, covenant or agreement, which shall be returned unsatisfied in whole or in part, shall be satisfied by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and shall be chargeable by that Company against the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company."

I think this will cover all the difficulties that I apprehend in the matter.

Bill amended and reported.

Mr. HAGGART moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I have just one observation to make. As far as I can gather from the statement of the hon. gentleman and the informatian we have with reference to the Credit Valley Railway, that road was built largely, mainly I might say, with public municipal money. What money was provided from other sources amounted to somewhere about $10,000 a mile. When we were discussing this subject formerly, it was understood that that road was bonded for $20,000 a mile, which really represented only $10,000 in cash. The statement of the hon. gentleman to-night is in accordance with the reports in the newspapers—which intimated that there was a meeting a short time ago to increase the bonded debt of the Credit Valley Railway—that there are bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile on this road, on which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are paying 5 per cent., that is 2½ per cent. on $10,000 a mile of private funds, irrespective of the public municipal money which has been put into the road.

Mr. HAGGART. The bonds on the road issued so far are only in the neighbourhood of $20,000 a mile, and the power to increase that is for the purpose of completing the road and equipping it.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Before this Bill is read the third time, I have an amendment to propose, which was very fully discussed in the Railway Committee. The original promoter of the Ontario and Quebec Railway was Mr. Hubertus, who spent most of three years in making a survey of the country between Toronto and Ottawa, organized a company and obtained a charter, which was afterwards handed over to the company formed by Sir Hugh Allan to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. That company failed to carry out their contract, and the matter lay in abeyance for a number of years. In the year 1881, the present company applied to this Parliament for a charter for a railway over the same route as that of which the survey was made by Mr. Hubertus. While Sir Hugh Allan's company was in existence, Mr. Hubertus handed over to them the charter and the result of his years of work, and they agreed to pay him $1,000 in cash and $2,000 in paid-up stock of the road. The $1,000 cash was paid but he never received the additional $2,000. The matter remained in abeyance for some years, until the year 1881, when the present company applied to the Parliament of Canada for a charter, and Mr. Hubertus then put in his claim for the additional $2,000 that had been promised him. That claim was entertained by the present Ontario and Quebec Railway, when they applied to this Parliament for their charter, and they agreed to have the matter enquired into and to pay Mr. Hubertus the amount found to be due him. They did make an enquiry. The president of the road gave instructions to two directors to investigate the matter; these two applied to a third to report, and the whole board of directors constituted themselves both judge and jury and found, as might have been expected, a verdict in their own favour, and they declined to acknowledge the claims of Mr. Hubertus. On the matter coming up now, Mr. Hubertus renews his claim for the $2,000, and this claim is re-endorsed by the first president of the company, Mr. J. M. Currier, also by the Hon. Billa Flint, one of the original Directors of the road, who appeared before the Railway Committee and gave evidence proving that Mr. Hubertus had earned by his exertions a far larger amount than that which he claimed. Mr. Alonzo Wright and other directors of the road have also fully endorsed Mr. Hubertus' claims. The Ontario and Quebec Company made an offer three years ago to the Toronto and Ottawa Company to pay them $30,000 or $40,000 to abandon the claims for their work, and we find that the Ontario and Quebec have adopted not only the name and preamble of Mr. Hubertus' road, but they have utilized his exploratory surveys, maps and profiles and all the accumulated work he had done, and have gone on his route from Ottawa to Toronto with very little variation. I move in amendment thereto, that all the words after "that" be left out, and the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with power to add the following Clause thereto:

"That whereas, H. J. Hubertus was the first promoter of a railway line between Toronto and Ottawa, and with others obtained an Act of Incorporation therefor, and a claim for compensation for exploratory surveys, &c., has been made by him against the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company and the said claim has been recognized by the said Company, and it is expedient to provide for a final disposition of the said claim, it is hereby provided that the amount of said claim shall be determined by the Judge of the County Court of the County of Carleton, Ontario, in such manner and upon such notice to the parties as to the said Judge may seem proper, and the said Judge may decide, according to Equity, and his decision shall be final, and not subject to appeal, and may be enforced in any of the Courts of Law or Equity of the Province of Ontario."

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it necessary to make a few remarks, after the statement made by the mover of that resolution and to give a very brief history of the facts in relation to this case. The mover of that amendment states that Mr. Hubertus was the first promoter of that road. Long before Mr. Hubertus came to this country that road was projected, and I am informed that a gentleman by the name of Fowler, a great many years ago, projected a road from Ottawa to Toronto, and spent a fortune in it. A number of other gentlemen projected it after Mr. Fowler thought of building it.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Mr. Fowler came after Mr. Hubertus.

Mr. MITCHELL. Suppose he did, Mr. Fowler lost a fortune. I was never aware that Mr. Hubertus had any to lose. Certainly he did not spend any money, as far as I can learn, on the project. The history of the company of which I have the honour to be a director is this, as far as Mr. Hubertus is concerned. On the passage of the Bill through Parliament, three years ago, Mr. Hubertus made a claim for compensation. That claim, so far as the projectors of the road could understand, had really no foundation, the fact being that Mr. Hubertus got a charter for the road which charter expired by limitation; but prior to its expiry he had sold that charter to Sir Hugh Allan, who had agreed to give him, so far as I could understand, $1,000 in money and $2,000 in stock. I believe he got the $1,000 in money from Sir Hugh Allan, and it is alleged he never got the stock, from the fact that Sir Hugh Allan was unable to float the bonds of the road and go on with its construction. Therefore, that charter fell dead too. Subsequently, another char-

ter was got for that road, over the same line, which came into the possession, indirectly, of the Grand Trunk Railway, through Mr. Cox, of Peterboro', who purchased it, I believe, from Mr. Scott. They commenced to build that road and have laid out in the vicinity of $100,000 on that line almost side by side with the road of the Ontario and Quebec Company. When we were getting our charter, Mr. Hubertus made a claim that because Sir Hugh Allan failed to pay him the $2,000 he had promised, he had, notwithstanding his charter had expired, a claim on our company for the payment of that amount. Hubertus alleged that his plans and specifications and experience and outlays had been of some service to the company. When the matter came before the Committee of the Senate, it was arranged that the directors of the company should enquire into his claim, and if it was found that he had any claim, they should settle it. That was the understanding come to in the Senate at the time. At the earliest meeting of the directors, therefore, the matter was taken up, and I wrote to Hubertus asking him to send in his claim. I got nothing but a long rigmarole, signed by Mr. Currier and by Senators Flint and Skead, stating his services, but with no evidence to show that he had ever done anything, or that his services had ever been utilized by the Ontario and Quebec Company or by any of their officers. There was nothing to show, on which I could base any foundation to pay the claim. I wrote to the engineer of the road, asking him if he had ever got any information from Mr. Hubertus, or had ever seen any of his plans, and he replied that he did not know Hubertus, had never heard of his making a survey, did not believe that he ever had, but that he might have made an exploration, that he had never seen any of his plans and that he had certainly never utilized any plan or specification of his, or at all benefited by his experience. Although I had the greatest desire to do something for a person in his position, I could not find any foundation on which to pay his claim. At the time I felt sympathy for him; when he said that Sir Hugh Allan had not paid him, and I asked, Why do you not proceed against the estate, which is worth millions of dollars, and well able to pay all claims against it? Mr. Hubertus cannot pretend to say that the Ontario and Quebec Directors ought to pay him this claim, because they simply applied to this Parliament, years after Sir Hugh Allan purchased the charter and after it had expired, he having failed to float the bonds of the company. Years after that, when we applied to this Parliament to get a charter to build a road to open up communication between the east and west of this country, Mr. Hubertus comes, as a species of blackmailer, upon us and threatens, if you do not give me this compensation which I claim, I will come time after time to this Parliament—and he does come here time after time—and, endeavour, by opposing you, to force you into paying what I claim as compensation for services which may have been rendered to Sir Hugh Allan, but certainly have not been rendered to the Ontario and Quebec Company. Further than that, this claim came before the Committee of the Senate, and the Senate Committee, hearing Mr. Hubertus' statement, made a reference, as I told you, which was enquired into by Mr. Thibaudeau and myself, the board of the Ontario and Quebec, and our report was made in accordance with that, finding that we could find neither a just nor even an equitable claim for the payment of anything to Mr. Hubertus. But Mr. Hubertus appeared before this Committee of Railways and Canals within the last few days and his claim was discussed, and it was decided by a large majority of the Committee that he had no claim, and the Committee refused to recognize it. So that I cannot think that the House, without a tittle of evidence, without anything to support what is stated in this resolution before the House, will consent to engraft on to a Bill a resolution so unique in its character, one that I have never heard of before in connection with any legislation passed by this House. If the House desires to deal with it, the proper course would be for the hon. gentleman to move that the Bill be recommitted back to the Committee on Railways and Canals for them to again consider any evidence which Mr. Hubertus might choose to supply, if he has any, and not to relegate it to a County Court or any other court for consideration. These are the facts, and I hope the House will not hesitate to pass the Bill, and to tell Mr. Hubertus, and others like him, who attempt to blackmail companies, that they cannot do it.

Mr. BLAKE. We have had the singular advantage of being able to hear, from a director of the Company, what the facts are, and, after hearing them, I really do not see that there is any ground for this motion.

Motion in amendment (Mr. Wallace, York) negatived.

Bill read the third time.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the Bill do pass.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it can pass in this shape. I would direct your attention to the first clause. It seems seriously to affect existing rights of the Crown, and no assent of the Crown has been given to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the point is a good one. The Bill had better be read a third time on Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the third reading be re-considered?

Mr. BLAKE. That is not necessary, I think. It is only necessary to adjourn the motion that the Bill do pass, until Monday.

Motion allowed to stand.

WELLAND RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. BERGIN, in the absence of Mr. RYKERT, moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 44) to authorize the transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and for other purposes.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think that second clause ought not to be finally passed, at all events by the House, until the Grand Trunk Bill is finally passed. I have no objection to its going through Committee, if it is understood that the third reading of the Bill shall not be had until the Grand Trunk Bill comes up for consideration. You will see that the second clause provides for the payment of the money to be taken in payment of the debt due to the Great Western Railway, to the Grand Trunk. Now, until the arrangements contemplated by the Act between the Grand Trunk and the Great Western are carried out, the passing of the present clause, in its present shape, finally seems to me to be premature. I understand that the hon. the Minister of Railways made a statement to-day in the Railway Committee, as to the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to the fusion of the Grand Trunk and Great Western. So far as I have considered that subject, I am not prepared to assent to the correctness of that opinion, so while I do not object to the Bill passing through Committee, so that it may be advanced a stage, I only assent to it on the understanding that we shall not be called on to finally consider the matter until the Grand Trunk Bill is before us.

Bill amended and reported.

Mr. BERGIN moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). For the reason that I stated to the House in Committee, I think the third reading had better stand until the Grand Trunk Railway Bill comes up, inasmuch as there is an important provision in this Bill, which is contingent on the House assenting to the provisions of the Grand Trunk Railway Bill, namely, the application by payment to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of money belonging *prima facie* to the Great Western Company.

Mr. BERGIN. I have no objections to let it stand until next Monday.

Motion allowed to stand.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bill was considered in Committee and reported :—

Bill (No. 9) to amend the several Acts relating to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

The House resumed the debate on Sir John A. Macdonald's motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 111) respecting the Independence of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. An hon. member reminds me just now that the House will now proceed with the election campaign, and Sir, if we are to elect a member by Act of Parliament, of course the observation is quite correct, for we are not now engaged in discussing a question which legitimately and properly falls within the functions of Parliament, but we are actually engaged in an election campaign, and we are about to decide whether a certain gentleman shall be elected member for Cumberland or whether he shall not. I have already called the attention of the House to what I held to be a sound proposition, that the Government cannot make a bargain with any person whom it is authorized to appoint under a Statute to accept the appointment contrary to the provisions of the Statute. It is a sound rule and a very ancient rule of constitutional law, one that was laid down some centuries ago by Chief Justice Fortescue in his celebrated instructions to Edward the Fourth, that the Crown must conform to the law, that the provisions and policy of the law must be pursued, and that in the exercises of it power where the powers are statutory, the Crown is as much bound to conform to the rules of law, in the exercise of its powers as is any private individual. We know very well that, in the exercise of the power, the power itself must be strictly pursued, and if any conditions are attached to the exercise of the power contrary to those provided in the grant of the power itself, the conditions so attached are absolutely void. In order to fully apprehend this question, it is important to look at the provisions of the law itself. If Parliament has enacted a policy on this matter it is the bounden duty of the Government in this matter, where certain duties are imposed on the Crown by Statute, to see that the law itself is strictly pursued and that the Crown is not called upon to do any act contrary to the provisions of the law. If the Government are not satisfied with the law, if they think the policy indicated is a mistaken policy or one that is not in the public interest, it is open to them to propose to the high court of Parliament a measure for altering that policy and that law. But so long as the law remains intact, they must follow its provisions and conform to its policy, as must the humblest citizen in the land. When we look at the provisions of the Act, we see the preamble declares :

"It is expedient that Canada should appoint a representative for the United Kingdom, to watch over those interests which shall be duly accredited to Her Majesty's Imperial Government."

There is one condition on which the office is to be held—"during pleasure." Would any hon. member on the treasury benches seriously argue that the Government might make a condition different from that provided by Statute—that the High Commissioner shall hold office during pleasure. Could the Government provide, in the arrangement with the High Commissioner, that he should hold office for life, for five or ten years, or during good behaviour? It is perfectly obvious that such would be contrary to the provision of the Statute which says "during pleasure;" and an appointment made upon conditions contrary to this provision would render the provision void, because the law itself determines in that respect the condition on which the office shall be held. The Statute further goes on to say. It is his duty :

"To act as representative and resident agent of the Dominion in the United Kingdom, and in that capacity to execute such powers and perform such duties as may from time to time be confered upon and assigned to him by the Governor in Council."

It is perfectly obvious, from this particular provision that, he is an officer subordinate to the Administration, not a member of the Administration—no such idea was intended to be conveyed—but that his office should be one subordinate to the Government. And in addition to those powers specially mentioned in the Statute, he should from time to time receive instructions from the Government here. He is :

"To take the charge, supervision and control of the immigration offices and agencies in the United Kingdom under the Minister of Agriculture."

He is subordinate to the Minister of Agriculture ; the duties of his office are in that particular attached to the Department of Agriculture, and he is to report from time to time to the Minister and be under his control. He is :

"To carry out such instructions as he may from time to time receive from the Governor in Council, respecting the commercial, financial and general interests of the Dominion, in the United Kingdom and elsewhere."

In the third place, it is provided that the High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than $10,000 a year. It is here provided that he shall receive a salary. It is true that a maximum sum is indicated ; a less sum might be given, but some sum is intended to be designated ; and it is not in the power of the Government to provide that he shall receive no salary in respect of a salaried office, and to dispense with this provision of the law, and in fact repeal it—it is no more in their power than to say that it was competent for the Government to make the appointment for five years, or tenable during good behaviour, when the Statute says it shall be held during pleasure. In all these particulars the appointment, if the Government choose to make it, must conform with those conditions. They cannot change the provisions of the law and alter the status of the officer, nor can they make his duties different from those which are indicated in the Statute and beyond the power there given. What is it that disqualifies? It is not the fact of receiving a sum of money. I have already pointed out that Mr. Addington agreed to accept the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. His agreement was held to have affected his seat, though he never entered on his office and though no salary accrued ; the fact that he had accepted office vacated his seat, although he had never received a dollar. The same principle has been applied in other cases. The moment the office is accepted, that moment the seat is vacated, even though no salary has accrued. Suppose the salary was placed at $100 ; the moment Sir Charles Tupper agreed to accept the office and the Government agreed to confer it, his seat became vacant, though no precise sum had actually accrued. It is not necessary to rest this case upon the fact that this is a disqualifying office, one which by Statute a salary is attached. We see from the papers brought down that Sir Charles Tupper has received an allowance of about $5,000, It matters not whether it was to pay expenses or not it was in excess of the sum required to pay personal

expenses. By accepting the $5,000 he was saved expenses which, as a Minister, he would have incurred; so, in fact, he received $5,000 in the shape of emolument and profit. Therefore, upon the ground of having accepted this sum, apart from the other consideration, his seat in this House is vacant. Now, Sir, speaking with regard to the time when the office becomes vacant, I find that in the case of Mr. Phinn, who was appointed Secretary of the Admiralty, it was held that the appointment, being vested in the Board of Admiralty, it was not an appointment under the Crown, and yet Mr. Phinn felt himself called upon to resign his seat, and to accomplish this he accepted the Chiltern Hundreds. It seems, however, that he did not receive notice that the office was conferred on him, and Sir Fitzroy Kelly, speaking of this matter, said:

"According to law and the invariable usage of the House, whenever an office was granted under the Crown and the person had intimated his acceptance of it, from that moment his seat was vacant and a writ was moved for as soon as possible."

So that on every ground it is perfectly obvious that Sir Charles Tupper has vacated his seat as a member for Cumberland, because he accepted an office to which a salary is attached, and the moment he accepted that office he vacated his seat. He vacated his seat because it is an office of emolument, and beyond all doubt in the matter it has been made vacant, if it was not vacant before, by the acceptance of the money he received as profit in connection with this office, to enable him the more efficiently to discharge his duties. Now, I was rather surprised by the observation made by the First Minister, in reply to my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister). My hon friend referred to a letter which was read here, from Mr. Todd, and he pointed out, that the letter showed that the Minister had not accepted his seat in this House inadvertently. The leader of the Government said that the letter was dated in December. It is true that the letter does not show that he had consulted Mr. Todd at the time the office was accepted. That was not the point. But the letter disclosed this fact, that the subject was one of discussion, one which had been brought before the public, that Mr. Todd was so strongly impressed with the serious character of the question that he believed that it would be the subject of discussion in this House, and he addressed that letter to the Minister on the 27th of December. The House did not meet until the 17th of January, and unless we suppose that the Minister had no conversation or discussion with his colleagues on this subject, it is perfectly obvious that for nearly a month before the House met the subject was one of discussion between the First Minister and the Minister of Railways. So he did not take his seat in this House inadvertently. He did know that his right to sit here was questioned. He did know that it was held by many that it was not right to sit here, that the seat for Cumberland was vacant, and that a new writ should issue. Now, Sir, there is no analogy between this case and the case of a casual appointment for a specific purpose. Take the case of Mr. Cobden, for instance, who, while a member of Parliament, was appointed to assist in the negotiation of a commercial treaty with France. Upon that subject, Lord John Russell, when the matter was brought before Parliament for consideration, said:

"It is a specific matter in which he does not act as Plenipotentiary; but if any convention should ensue, Mr. Cobden will be associated with Earl Cowley in that convention. It is very properly said that the British Government ought not to depend on volunteers. There is no salary for a person on a special mission, but it is proposed that the expenses of Mr. Cobden, while on that mission, shall be defrayed out of the public purse."

He undertook certain specific duties, limited in their character, which he was called upon to discharge, and his expenses, his actual disbursements while engaged in the discharge of those duties, were paid for him out of the public Treasury. He received no profits, no emoluments; he was merely protected against absolute loss. But the present is a wholly different case. Here the Government have thought proper to submit a Bill to Parliament declaring that it is necessary to have a permanent officer in England, declaring what his functions shall be, declaring how he shall be appointed, and upon what conditions he shall hold that that office, and declaring that that office shall be an office of emolument under the Crown. To that office they have appointed Sir Charles Tupper, and having so appointed him, it is perfectly obvious that his seat in this House has, in consequence of that appointment, become vacant, and that a new writ should issue for the election of another person to fill it. Then I observe, it is proposed by this Bill to declare that Sir Charles Tupper—to remove doubts in the matter—shall be the member for the county of Cumberland. Let me call the attention of the House to the provisions of the British North America Act on this point. Section 37 of that Act provides, that the House of Commons, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of a certain number of members, which are therein specified, and that Nova Scotia shall elect a certain number of those members. It states the number at that time to be returned from Nova Scotia, and the number of districts into which Nova Scotia shall be divided; and it states the conditions upon which an additional number of members may be given to that Province. Then it goes on to state that each of the eighteen counties of Nova Scotia shall be an electoral district, that the county of Halifax shall be entitled to return two members, and each of the other counties one member. Those are the provisions of an Imperial Statute. That Statute authorizes us to substitute other provisions for these on certain conditions. What are the other provisions? They are that every ten years after taking the Census, the representation shall be distributed in proportion to the population amongst these various Provinces. But it does not give us power to deal with this country as a unit, or to deal with this subject in the same way as it might be dealt with by the Imperial Parliament, which has no such restriction, no such Statute standing above it. It does not give us power to alter the law except on particular conditions and in a specified way. The seat for Cumberland is vacant. By this Bill it is proposed to put a member in that seat. Who elects that member? Sir, it would be those who vote in this House and in the other Chamber. Are they Nova Scotians? Do they belong to Nova Scotia? Are they the constituents provided for by the British North America Act, acting under its authority and subject to the limitations it imposes? Not at all. Those who will vote for the Bill and elect Sir Charles Tupper to the seat he has vacated, are not Nova Scotians at all. Some are from British Columbia; some from Ontario; and some from Quebec. These are the electors who are called upon to elect Sir Charles Tupper to the seat he has vacated by his acceptance of office. Why, Sir, if we can elect Sir Charles Tupper, we can elect somebody else. Were we to strike out the conditions relating to his appointment and his election to the seat for this constituency, we might provide that not Sir Charles Tupper, but somebody else, might be elected to that seat. We might provide that some resident of some other Province shall represent this particular constituency. There is no limitation to our authority in this matter if we propose to depart from the provisions of the law. Then, Sir, there is the question of policy, to which I referred this afternoon. The Government propose by this particular measure to radically change the policy of our law. It is not simply this one case or this particular constituency which will be affected. The whole law, not only with regard to representation, but with regard to official appointment, will be changed. Your predecessor, Sir, I believe, now holds the office of Collector of Customs at Quebec; but, according to the rule laid down in this Bill, that hon. gen-

tleman might have been appointed, on condition that he should not receive the salary attaching to his office, just as Sir Charles Tupper has been in this case; his commission might state so, and he might be Speaker of this House and Collector of Customs at Quebec at the same time. Any hon. gentleman might be appointed a Judge in one of the courts, and if he would agree not to accept a salary he might continue to be a member of this House and of the Government. Take the case of the Prime Minister. We know what his feelings are towards the Government of Ontario at this moment. When the Lieutenant-Governor's time expires, the Government might advise His Excellency to appoint the Prime Minister Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, without salary, and he might accept that appointment and remain Prime Minister of the Dominion at the same time. You see that there is no limitation to the abuse that is possible. This measure completely unsettles the law in this particular; there is no office which a Minister or member of this House could not take under the policy indicated by this Bill, if he would only agree not to accept the salary provided for that office. Now, Sir, let me call the attention of the House to observations which the First Minister addressed to the House on another occasion, which were not so pertinent then as it seems to me they are now. He said:

"As history showed, a constitutional course was sometimes very inconvenient to an arbitrary and oppressive Government. All would remember what Charles Fox said to Napoleon the Great when they were discussing the introduction of trial by jury into France. Napoleon objected to it on the ground that 'the system was so very inconvenient.' 'Well,' Fox replied, 'it is for the inconvenience of the system that the people of England like it.' And it was because of the inconvenience to the Government of the constitutional action of the Senate, which put a stop to their bargain with the hon. member for Selkirk to make him a rich man, and to pay him for his servile support, that an unconstitutional course was proposed.

"Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot say that an hon. member is paid for his support.

"SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then a reward, a gratuity. As Shakespeare said: "A reward is better than a peculium.' All would remember how the hon. member for Selkirk was about admitting that he was interested in the company. He (Mr. Smith) said it was none of his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) business to ask whether he (Mr. Smith) had an interest. But it had to come out at last, and the hon. gentleman who had the astuteness to get the Government into the bargain, had not the astuteness to keep the matter to himself."

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has himself found that these limitations and restrictions are very inconvenient to an arbitrary Government. He has found, for some political or private reason, that it was convenient to appoint a member of this House High Commissioner to England, to appoint him to an office which, by the provisions of the law, vacated his seat. He finds it convenient that the hon. gentleman should not go back to his constituents for re-election, and that he should not resign that office. From our point of view, it is necessary that the hon. gentleman, in order to be elected, should resign his office, for it is one that disqualifies absolutely and renders him ineligible to a seat in this House as long as he continues to hold it. The hon. gentleman has found it inconvenient to return to his constituents and ask them to bestow their confidence in him again. He still holds the office and is anxious to regain the seat from which his acceptance of that office has removed him; and his colleagues press upon the House this Bill, in order that he may, in spite of this disqualifying office, regain the seat which has been vacated. I trust, Sir, that this House will seriously consider this proposition. I trust that they will do no such violence to the law and to the Constitution, in order that Sir Charles Tupper may be saved the inconvenience of returning to the electors of Cumberland, in order to regain a seat in this House in a proper and constitutional manner.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The right hon. leader of the House has moved the second reading of this Bill, accompanied by an intimation that he intends subsequently to move that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. My hon. friends opposite have, in the different speeches to which we have listened this afternoon and this evening, opposed the Bill on principle, which is, no doubt, the proper course to pursue on the motion for the second reading. But they also oppose the referring of the Bill to the Privileges and Elections Committee. Now, in opposing that referrence, it seems to me, that they are quite inconsistent with themselves. We, who have had the honour of sitting in this House in former Parliaments, will recollect that when a motion was made, affecting the seat of an hon. member of this House, at that time occupying the Chair which you, Sir, now occupy, my hon. friend, the member for East York, I recollect well—and I have confirmed my recollection by a reference to *Hansard*—took the ground expressly that inasmuch as that the question had arisen of the right of a member to a seat in this House, that question ought, *ipso facto* be referred to the Privileges and Elections Committee, and ought to be considered there, and there alone, before it was discussed or considered in the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was not a Bill, as this is.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not say that it was a Bill; but I say that that question, in the same way as this Bill, raised a point as to the rights of an hon. member to sit in this House. The principle my hon. friend then laid down was that the question should be at least referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in order that that Committee should make a report to the House, on which report the House should act. My hon. friend says that that was not a Bill; but what difference does it make. Was not the question then, as now, whether an hon. member ought to sit in this House or not?

Mr. MACKENZIE. That has been referred already to the Committee two weeks ago.

Mr. CAMERON. I know it has, and what harm is there in referring this Bill to that Committee which is now seized of the subject? My hon. friend opposite object to this reference to the Committee, and they assume that the case is so clear that it is beyond argument that the hon. Minister of Railways has forfeited his seat in this House, that there is nothing to refer, nothing to discuss, and that in the words of my hon. friend who has just sat down, the thing is perfectly certain and beyond all doubt. I have great respect for the knowledge and experience of the hon. member for Bothwell, but I confess it does not seem to me that the matter is so perfectly clear and beyond all doubt; so far as I have been led to form an opinion, it is in the opposite direction. At any rate, it must be perfectly clear that a question of this kind, involving the citation of lengthy precedents, such as those with which the hon. gentleman for West Huron favoured us to-day and on a former occasion, and involving such a number of precedents as those cited by the hon. member for Bothwell, —it must be quite clear that a question involving points of that kind, involving the necessity to look up the records of Parliament to ascertain what has been done in similar cases when similar questions arose in the Parliament of Great Britain, is pre-eminently a question which this House, as a whole, is not competent to deal with until it has been first referred to that Committee which is specially constituted to deal with questions of this kind—a Committee which is composed of hon. members selected specially for their ability to consider points of this kind, and which will consider the case fully and report their conclusion to this House. This Bill, involving, as it does, the question of the right of an hon. member to occupy a seat in this House, is one that ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and notwithstanding that there is contained in it, in the first clause, a general principle, the hon. member for West Huron argued that the Bill should not be referred to that Committee in consc-

quence of that fact, but surely it is the practice of this House to refer Bills involving general principles to Committees. My hon. friend, I think, has had two or three Bills referred to Committees for consideration, involving general principles; the hon. member for L'Islet had a Bill involving a general principle, also affecting the Independence of Parliament Act and the election of members of this House, and he had that Bill referred to a Committee for consideration; and it is the ordinary routine and practice of the House that all Bills should go to a Committee, whether they involve a general principle or refer to a special Act or a special case. It is true that an untimely fate has overtaken the Bills of my hon. friends, to which I have referred, but that was not the fault of the Committee to which they were referred. The cause of their untimely fate might be found nearer home, by my hon. friends whose Bills have been unfortunately slaughtered. My hon. friends also object to this Bill as being wrong in principle, on the ground that it is not right for Parliament to legislate on a subject of this kind, and, I presume, to remove a doubt or to relieve from a penalty, if that penalty has been unwittingly incurred. Are my hon friends opposite consistent in that position? Do they forget what occurred in the Session of 1877? Do they forget the Bill that they themselves introduced, not a Bill to remove a doubt in one particular case, but a wholesale whitewashing Bill—a Bill to whitewash, as it was alleged, probably about half the members of this House, and a Bill of what I must term a most reckless character. The material clause of that Bill was to this effect:

"Any person who has at any time since the passing of the said Act, been elected a member of the House of Commons, and who, acting under the *bona fide* belief that he was or continued to be qualified and capable of sitting or voting as a member thereof, has sat or voted therein, shall be and is hereby indemnified, exonerated, freed and discharged, from all pecuniary penalties of forfeitures whatsoever (if any) which may have been incurred by him by reason of having so sat or voted at any time, up to the end of the present session of Parliament."

That is the wholesale whitewashing Bill which my hon. friend opposite introduced and carried through Parliament by the large majority he then had at his back, in spite of the protests of the hon. gentlemen on this side, who then occupied seats on the opposite side. Some of my hon. friends who then sat on that side were twitted by the then Ministerial supporters that they themselves would be benefited by the Act, but they repudiated the benefit. My hon. friend who sits before me said, with indignation, that he wanted no such legislation; the hon. Minister of Customs, when taunted by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) with the fact that he himself would be relieved by the language of the Act, repudiated the Act and said he wanted none of it. Every member of the then Opposition opposed the passage of the Bill, yet the hon. member for East York, the then leader of the House, carried the Bill through, and whitewashed wholesale, probably about half the members of the House, who had been charged, at any rate, with having violated the Independence of Parliament Act. Some of them, no doubt, had done so; in some cases it was perfectly clear, but what did that Act say? It whitewashed everybody who chose to say: I acted under the *bona fide* belief that I was entitled to sit. It did not consider the question whether he had or not violated the Act, whether he had done so with his eyes open, or inadvertently, but it said that as long as he *bona fide* thought he had a right to sit and vote, he should be whitewashed and re-established in the future. Yet these hon. gentlemen stand up and say this Bill is wrong in principle, this Bill which is only introduced for the purpose of removing a doubt, if a doubt exists, in a particular case, and removing that doubt particularly in the case of a gentleman having the claims the hon. Minister of Railways has to the favourable consideration of the House and the country, a man who certainly, if he has erred in this matter—which I do not admit—has erred unwittingly; a man who is entitled to be relieved, if anyone is; and when the Bill, on the face of it, shows plainly and squarely what the doubt is, states the specific case and the ground on which the relief is sought. Has any one hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side ventured to say that there has been any actual violation of the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act by what the hon. Minister of Railways has done?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. Have we heard that argument from that side of the House? Has anyone ventured to argue that this case is within the mischief contemplated to be removed and prevented by the Independence of Parliament Act?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. Not one has said it. What is the mischief that is intended to be prevented by the Independence of Parliament Act? It is the mischief of the Government of the day controlling by corrupt inducements the members of this House to support them. Does that apply to this case? Can it be, for instance, said that the hon. Minister of Railways has been induced or influenced, directly or indirectly, by any pecuniary consideration in this matter? Can a man be both a briber and bribee? Can he bribe himself? Because that is the position the case would be in if it can be said that it is within the mischief contemplated to be guarded against or removed by the Independence of Parliament Act. When we come to consider the principles upon which a doubtful Statute, if it be doubtful, is to be construed—the hon. member for Bothwell whose authority, I will admit as a constitutional lawyer, for if not a lawyer long in standing, he is certainly one in spirit; I say so with all seriousness and earnestness, for the hon. gentleman has a legal mind and was quite competent to weigh and consider the legal bearings of cases of this kind even long before he had the honour of being a member of the Bar—the hon. member for Bothwell will admit it is one of the elementary canons of the construction of a Statute that when you consider the extent of its operation, you must consider the mischief to be remedied. When we ask: Is this case within the mischief contemplated? can it be said there is the slightest foundation that the case of the hon. Minister of Railways is within the mischief that act was intended to prohibit? Can it be said that he was affected by any inducement connected with the existence of the office of High Commissioner, in his course as an independent member of this House? That is what the Act was intended to provide for—the independence of members of Parliament. Has the independence of the hon. Minister of Railways been affected, directly or indirectly, remotely or approximately, by the acceptance, on his part, of the office of High Commissioner? Moreover, as far as I can gather, after hearing the terms of his commission read, it was not an acceptance of a permanent character, but simply an undertaking or offer on his part to discharge, for a temporary period, the duties of the office when it was desirable, for reasons connected with his health—reasons connected, too, with the existence of a vacancy in that position and the absolute necessity of having a gentleman entirely within the confidence of the Government in the position of High Commissioner, one with an experience and knowledge of what had been going on during the time when the late High Commissioner, Sir Alexander Galt, had filled the office. When there were special reasons for the appointment of one specially fitted for the discharge of the duties of that high and important office, the Minister of Railways, apparently from the terms of his commission, volunteered his services for a temporary period, and volunteered them without a salary. Now, my hon. friend

from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has argued that the Government cannot change the character of the office, and that there is a change in the character of the office if the person appointed to it accepts it without a salary, and he referred—I think, if I am not mistaken, it was he who referred—to the case of Daniel Whitton Harvey. Now, the case of Daniel Whitton Harvey is entirely distinguishable from this, as anyone who refers to the facts will see. The appointment of Daniel Whitton Harvey was made, he was actually appointed to the position, but, after the appointment was made whereby *ipso facto* his seat in Parliament became vacated, he wrote and said he accepted the position on the condition that he did so without a salary, in order to save his seat. But it was too late; the harm was done; he had been appointed, and the very appointment to an office to which a fixed salary was at that time attached vacated his seat. The Statute creating the office of High Commissioner says that the High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than $10,000. Now, with all respect to the opinion expressed by my hon. friend who sits behind me (Mr. Girouard), I must say I totally dissent from it. I do not think that the acceptance of the office without a salary was inconsistent with the terms of that Act, or that the commission was therefore void, nor do I agree with the opinion of my hon. friend from Bothwell, that the appointment to the office without a salary is an alteration of the character of it. The office is the same, whether a salary is attached to it or not. There was no obligation on the Government to fix a salary, but if none had been fixed, it might be argued that, at some future time, an arrangement would be made to pay the High Commissioner, or he might be entitled to be paid on what we lawyers call a *quantum meruit*. But here a proposition was made by the Minister of Railways that he would accept the office without a salary as attached to that office, and that was the beginning, apparently, as far as the documents before Parliament show, of the transaction that led to his appointment to this position. Well, from the first, there was no salary, *quoad* Sir Charles Tupper, attached to that office. He said, I will discharge the duties without the salary. The Government said on that condition we will appoint you High Commissioner; and he was appointed on that condition, in accordance with the terms of the Act, because I do not read the Act as making it compulsory to attach any salary whatever. Then, my hon. friend from Bothwell has argued that a member of the Government might equally well accept the office of Lieutenant-Governor of a Province, or a Judgeship, or anything of the kind; but surely he must see the inconsistency between the position of a member of the Government, a member of the Privy Council, and one of those offices he has mentioned. But between the position of a member of the Privy Council, a member of the Government, and the position of High Commissioner, temporarily discharging the duties of that office in England, there is no inconsistency. Sir Charles Tupper could perfectly well discharge the duties of both offices, and hold them both, and when in England could act as High Commissioner, and when here could act as Minister of Railways, as he has done. I think, therefore, as far as I can form an opinion on the Statute, that really this Act is not necessary; but, if there be a doubt about it—and, if my hon. friends are so clear on the subject, we may assume that there is a doubt about it—this is a case in which the doubt ought to be removed, and, therefore this legislation is proper, is reasonable, and is fair. Moreover, we are following in the footsteps of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but very far behind them. Where they whitewashed by hundreds, we are only whitewashing by one. We are dealing with a special case, and a meritorious case, a case deserving to be disposed of by Parliament and to have any doubt which may exist removed. For that reason, I have no hesitation in supporting the second reading of the Bill, and when the matter comes before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, my hon. friends will have an opportunity of repeating their arguments; but, if they do repeat them, they can only show that there is a doubt, and if they show that there is a doubt, they show the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My hon. friend has misrepresented the Act of 1877—

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I read it.

Mr. MACKENZIE—very materially. If Sir Charles Tupper, for instance, says that he unwittingly violated the law, and wants indemnity for it, I am willing to vote that indemnity, but I am asked, besides doing that, to seat him as a member afresh. We are undertaking to elect him to Parliament, as well as to indemnify him. The Act to which the hon. gentleman alludes, for which I was responsible, having brought it in and carried it through the House, did not ensure the seats to any of the parties who might have rendered themselves liable to the penalty. It simply removed the penalty from those who unwittingly got themselves placed in a wrong position. There is, therefore, no analogy whatever between the two cases, and he must have seen that perfectly well, though he endeavoured to raise a dust to cover his own retreat. Why is this Act brought in at all? Notice was given of an intention to amend the Act before the case was discussed in the House at all, showing the Ministry were perfectly conscious that Sir Charles Tupper was not entitled to sit after having accepted that office. I was somewhat surprised to hear the argument of the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), but, of course, the logical result of his argument is, that he will vote against the Bill, because he has stated frankly that his opinion is that there was no power to make the appointment, and that, if made, it was illegal; and to be illegal is of course to to be unlawful, and therefore, there is no necessity for the Bill, and, of course, he will vote against it. I did not hear him say that he will vote against it, but the logical sequence of his argument is that he will. If the hon. member for Victoria only desires an indemnity for an unwitting violation of the law, I am willing to vote for it, but I am not willing to accept the responsibility of electing a member to this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The word "unwittingly" is not in the Act, and I read the very words of it, so I do not think I can be accused of throwing dust or attempting to mislead.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that that Act did not confirm the seat to anyone. It left that quite open, and nothing can show more clearly than the fact that one of my colleagues, being interested in a company that had a contract, went to the electors and lost his seat. Let the hon. member for Cumberland follow the same practice.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). He would not lose his seat.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Let Ministers and my hon. friend for Victoria pass a similar Bill to what was passed in 1877, and they will see where Sir Charles Tupper lands, in the same manner as was seen in 1877. The hon. gentleman has endeavoured to raise a cloud of dust, and he is entirely wrong, and has either misapprehended the Act to which he alludes, or has misinterpreted it to suit his own argument.

Mr. BEATY. The question before the House is undoubtedly one of great importance, in connection with the liberties of the people and their representation in Parliament. I do not expect to place the matter in any specially new light, in view of the observations which have already been made on both sides of the House, but I would restate the facts, as I understand them, in connection with this matter. The

Minister of Railways was appointed under the Act of 1880, authorizing the appointment of a High Commissioner in England for certain purposes. He was appointed to do the duties which appertain to that office, as stated in the Statute, without salary. That is the first feature connected with this transaction. He performed those duties, and he also received in connection with that office, as I understand it, his expenses, approximating to $5,000—as expenses and not as salary, not as wages connected with the office, nor as profit. Now I think it as been conceded pretty freely, although it has just now been denied from the Opposition, that the spirit of the Act has not been violated in connection with this transaction. The intention of the Act was that members of Parliament should not be under the influence of the Administration of the day, by reason of offices being given to them with which a profit might be associated. Now, we have already seen, as a matter of fact, not only from the Patent which has been read to the House, but from the Public Accounts, that the hon. Minister did not receive any salary, or wage, or allowance, or profit whatever; that whatever he did receive was in the way of payment of his expenses of living in England during the period he was there. Now, that being the case, I submit, as a matter of law, that not only has the spirit of the Act not been violated, but the mischief intended to be prevented has not been committed; and we have in the very words of the Act itself a provision sufficiently clear, I think, to show that the Minister of Railways, in accepting this office, did not come within the Act at all. Now, if the Minister did not come within the words or the letter of the Act, and did not violate the spirit of the Act, then certainly his seat has not been vacated. I suppose it will not be denied by any hon. member of this House, that before this Act was passed the Minister might have accepted this office. Now, under the Act itself, did he by accepting the office of High Commissioner, in fact violate it? Now, I submit the very words of the Act show that he did not, and if the House will permit me, I will read the words of the Act of 1878:

"1. Except as hereinafter specially provided—

"(a.) No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind is attached; * * * shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons of Canada, nor shall be sit or vote therein; * * *

"2. Provided, that nothing in this section shall render ineligible, as aforesaid, any person holding any of the following offices, that is to say:" Presidents of the Council, Minister of Finance, &c"

"Any person:" holding office like the Minister of Railways is not ineligible—those are the words of the Statute. The Minister of Railways, the President of the Privy Council, or any other Minister is not ineligible by the words of this Statute. They come within the exception. The Minister of Railways may accept or hold any office to which the first section has reference. Those are the words of the Statute, and I particularly point out the fact that the second section comes in and especially protects all such persons. Now, I submit, that the letter of the Statute, as well as the spirit of it, have not been frustrated in this matter, have not been violated by reason of taking this office without a salary. But I should judge that the Crown prerogative would be sufficient to appoint a person to such an office to do such services, without an Act of Parliament. But there is an important feature in connection with this matter that has been strongly pressed upon the attention of the House by various hon. gentlemen, and though the hon. gentleman for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) has alluded to it, it seems to me that sufficient attention has not been given to it; and that arises from the words of the Act of 1880, authorizing the appointment of a resident Agent, or High Commissioner. It has been contended by hon. gentlemen opposite that there is a salary attached to this office which the patent granted by the Crown cannot detach. I think that is the meaning of their contention, that there is a salary attached to this office by reason of the words of the Act of 1880, which the grant from the Crown cannot take away. The fact is stated that it is "without salary," but, nevertheless, because by the Act a salary is claimed to be attached to the office, it is argued the salary must continue. Now, I submit there is no salary attached to this office, unless the Government who appoints the High Commissioner attaches it. Unless the Government in the Patent gives him the right which this Act authorizes them to give, if they withhold that salary then there is no salary attached. If they take the salary away, the salary is not there; therefore, the argument has no force. The Act expressly states that the High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than $10,000. He may receive $1; the Administration may give him $1, $10, $100, $1,000, but they cannot give him $10,001. They may give him no salary; they can give him $1 or they can give him $10,000; but if they give him any sum within the limit, then the Act authorises it to be so, and then by the grant to the High Commissioner, the salary is attached, and whatever force there may be in the position of a Minister accepting the office with the salary attached under these circumstances, it would apply in such cases. But to my mind that is not the real difficulty. The difficulty as I understand it, is the payment of these expenses, the payment of that sum of nearly $5,000. That, it seems to me, is the real gist of the matter. Now, I will read, with the consent of the House, a few passages from Todd's Parliamentary Government in England, vol. 2, page 260, London edition of 1869:

"In regard to the first of these principles, it should be observed that this Statute is invariably construed very strictly.

"Thus, the acceptance of an office from the Crown, accompanied by a formal renunciation of any salary, fee or emolument in connection therewith, does not disqualify."

Does not that exactly meet the case we have in hand?

Mr. MACKENZIE. From what book are you reading?

Mr. BEATY. From "Todd's Parliamentary Government in England," at page 260. Thus I read:

"Thus, the *acceptance* of an office from the Crown, accompanied by a formal renunciation of any salary, fee or emolument in connection therewith, does not disqualify."

"Acceptance" here is italicised to show the importance of the word. The party receiving and accepting office must accept it in act, formally and with the salary attached; he must accept it, not renouncing the salary which is attached to the office, but he must accept it with the salary attached; and when a person has accepted office with salary attached, there can be no doubt that the operation of the Statute shows that such person is disqualified. But it must have been accepted. In the case afterwards referred to, Mr. Pryme accepted the position of Commissioner of Bankruptcy, to which fees were attached. He was appointed, the commission was issued, he accepted the position and held it three months, but he never took any fees and never performed any service. The matter was brought before the Imperial Parliament and discussed very elaborately, and the result was that the whole House, after hearing the discussion and the opinions of the law officers of the Crown, dropped the matter and said it did not come within the Statute. That was a case precisely like this one. He accepted office without fees; the fees were not payable until the work was done; he never did any work; hence, having done no work, though he had accepted the office, and the commission had been issued, he was not entitled to any fees, and he was not disqualified because he did not receive any profit. That is the whole gist of the matter. I read the brief note of that case:

"But where the remuneration is by fees and not by salary, and the disqualifying office was relinquished before the performance of any duties, or the receipt of any fees—though held for a period of three months—it was not considered to vacate the seat.

"Moreover, it has not been the practice to consider the casual employment of members of the House of Commons upon Royal Commissions, or on special service, etc.—which are not regular 'offices,' and to which no stated salary is attached—as coming within the disqualifying operation of the Statute; even when remuneration is received for such services."

Even when remuneration is received for such a casual service, it did not come within the disqualifying operation of the Act. But to come more particularly to the point which I said I deemed the most important issue in this question—that is the receipt of the expenses. Let me turn to this work again, and see what the writer says in regard to members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown becoming Commissioners under the Statute, by Royal appointment or otherwise. The author says, at page 350:

"The persons appointed to serve on Royal or Statutory Commissions are selected without reference to their political opinions as supporters or opponents of the existing Administration, and generally on account of their familiarity with the subject-matter of the proposed investigation, or because they possess special qualifications for the task. Sometimes, at the discretion of Government, members of one or both branches of the Legislature are appointed upon important public commissions, not merely because of their personal fitness, but also for the purpose of obtaining a direct representation of the commission in Parliament."

If it is the case that members of Parliament may be appointed as members of Royal Commissions or Statutory Commissions in England, as is clearly stated, why cannot the Minister of Railways hold this commission, which has no salary attached to it? In a note, the writer says:

"On March 26, 1868, two members of the House of Commons declined to vote on a question before the House, because it was about to be considered by a Royal Commission, upon which they had been appointed.

"Thus, Lord Stanley and Mr. Spencer Walpole having been appointed (by the Russell Administration) members of a Royal Commission, consisting of twelve persons, to enquire into official oaths, and report whether any such could be dispensed with or altered, upon their taking office under Earl Derby, in July 1866, a new commission was forthwith issued, substituting other persons in their places on this Commission. Again, the Schools Inquiry Commission, appointed in 1864, included Lord Stanley and Sir Stafford Northcote. When these gentlemen entered Earl Derby's Ministry they remained upon the Commission, but abstained from signing the report, which was presented in December 1867, as they stated, 'partly on the ground that official duties have prevented us from attending the later meetings of the Commission, or studying with sufficient care the evidence produced; partly, also, because, as members of the Executive, we think is better to reserve our opinion on the points at issue until the time comes when action can be taken upon them.'"

We come to another illustration on the matter. The writer says:

"Thus, in 1853, General Peel, Secretary of State for War, and Lord Stanley, President of the India Board, were placed on a Commission to enquire into the organization of the Indian Army; and in the same year the President of the Council (Marquess of Salisbury) being a Colonel of Militia, was appointed on the Commission on the organization, etc., of the Militia. In 1868, Lord Chancellor Cairns was a member of the commission to consider the state of the Neutrality Laws.

"Thus, the Royal Commission appointed in 1841, and which is still in existence, to enquire into the Decoration of the new Houses of Parliament, and generally into the promotion and encouragement of the Fine Arts in the United Kingdom, has included actual as well as former Prime Ministers, with other leading statesmen."

I take it that these cases and instances show that members of Parliament may be appointed Royal Commissioners and Statutory Commissioners for various purposes, and yet be not disqualified under the English Act, even where such office with profit is accepted; and hence, in the case in hand, it does not disqualify either. But there is another point still, that in reference to the expenses. I find, on page 355 of this work:

"All the expenses attending a Royal Commission are defrayed by the Treasury, out of moneys annually voted by Parliament for such purposes. But it is not usual for Commissioners to incur any extraordinary expenditure without the previous sanction of the Home Office, by whom the application would naturally be referred to the Treasury."

Also on page 352:

"The services of persons appointed as members of a Royal Commission are generally rendered gratuitously; although compensation is occasionally allowed for their time and labour. Actual expenses incurred are, of course, defrayed out of the public funds."

These clauses indicate that in cases of this kind, members of Parliament and Ministers have their expenses paid, and the offices are not considered to be offices with profit. And that is the point which I wish to impress upon the House most particularly, as it seems to me to contain the gist of the whole matter. If, for instance, the Minister of Railways had gone to England and done this service, and returned, and had received no money from any Government source, it could hardly be contended, with any show of reason or common sense, that the acceptance of the office under those circumstances would be a disqualifying act within the Statute of 1878. The actual expenses incurred are defrayed out of the public funds. These cases show beyond any doubt that when persons are appointed on Royal Commissions, or Statutory Commissions, they receive their expenses, whether they be members of Parliament or Ministers of the Crown; and this circumstance does not disqualify them in any sense whatever, within the meaning of the English Act, which reads that the acceptance of "an office with a profit," or the Act of 1878 which practically and substantially means the same thing, because the last words of the clause clearly show that that was the object and the intent and the purpose of the Act. The only word which can have any force whatever in connection with the idea that expenses are associated with the office, is the word "allowance." Now, what does that word, placed in that particular position mean, if not the same idea which is conveyed by the words immediately preceding and immediately succeeding—the words "salary, fees, wages, and profit of any kind." Does it not mean simply that it must be in the nature of a salary or a fee; that it must, in fact, produce a profit to the person receiving it, else it does not bring the person within the disqualifying clause. I am not so familiar, except by means of books, with the history of the country for the last twenty years as to say, with certainty, how many of our Ministers of the Crown have gone on expeditions or enterprises of this character, but I believe there have been some instances. There is, for instance, the case of the Hon. Mr. Macdougall, who, if I am correctly informed, was appointed in 1865, when he was Secretary of State, a Commissioner, duly accredited with power to deal with foreign Governments, and with our own West India Islands for the purpose of aiding trade and commerce between Canada and those islands. I am told that he went there, and that his expenses were paid in connection with that service, but it was never contended by anybody that by reason of his taking that office and receiving his expenses in connection with that service, his seat as a member of the House was vacated. And, if I recollect correctly, the leader of the late Government, the hon. member for East York, went to England and France, accompanied, I believe, by the Agent-General—though on that point I am not quite sure—when he was Prime Minister, and performed services in connection with immigration and other matters, matters connected with different Departments of the Government here, and not with the Department of which he was the head. The hon. gentleman's expenses were also paid. Now, if the rule is to be applied in this way, if it is claimed that when Ministers are receiving their expenses upon expeditions of this kind, they are receiving profits or allowances, then these gentlemen should have been excluded from the House, and the interpretation which the leader of the late Government put on the Act, is not the correct interpretation. We know that our Constitution has been largely made up by precedents of this character; and it is the boast of writers and statesmen and parliamentarians of all classes that the elasticity of our Constitution has been such that it has been able to expand or contract just as the emergency may require; that it furnishes the means, not only of avoiding disruption, but of avoiding any act which would destroy the Constitution or the Government. That

has been one of the boasts in connection with the English Constitution, and a most valuable feature of our Constitution we consider it to be. That is the interpretation which has been put on this Act of Parliament, or practically the same Act, for the last twenty years or more, in this country, by Ministers of both parties, by leading statesmen in England, whose *dicta* in reference to matters of this kind, are received as settling constitutional questions, whose conduct in connection with the determination of questions of this kind are considered as giving the meaning to Acts of Parliament, just as judicial decisions give meaning to Acts of Parliament in the practical matters of life. These *dicta*, these expres sions of opinion, these announcements by Ministers and parliamentarians, give a settlement to the meaning of these Acts, and decide the course which members of Parliament may pursue in connection with similar transactions. I take it, Sir, that hon. gentlemen opposite will not go back on a record of this character, a record which extends for a period of thirty or forty years, during which Ministers have gone everywhere, doing business of every kind, within their own Departments or out of them, and always received their expenses. During all this time no person ever doubted the propriety or reasonableness of their conduct, and certainly no person ever contended that they were violating the Independence of Parliament Act. The point contended for by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a salary was attached to the office, is disposed of, I think, by the words of the Act in connection with the commission. With regard to the question of expenses, I think that the decisions which have just been cited from this work, and whose correctness cannot be disputed, settle that point beyond all question. We come back, therefore, to the point whether the Bill should have a second reading and go before the Committee. For my own part, I consider that it is a wise and proper thing to pass this Bill as a matter of precaution, to save the Minister from that unnecessary annoyance which has already commenced in connection with this matter, by suing the hon. gentleman, and otherwise prosecuting him in the courts. I say it is necessary that the Governmennt who appointed him, the party who supported that appointment, and the country to which he rendered such excellent service, should see that he is not annoyed or harassed by incidents of this character, but that he should be fully protected against them so far as it is in the power of this House to protect him. While I see it quite unnecessary to pass the Bill, except simply for the purpose of protecting the hon. Minister from being harrassed, I think it is the proper course to pursue, to save him from further difficulty, and that as members of this House, following the precedents which have been laid down, following the spirit of the Act, and following, as I contend, the letter of the Act, we should pass this measure of protection. It is claimed that members of Parliament may have been appointed to these offices, and after that go back and be elected, and that they can take their seats in this House after the election, though they have an office with a salary attached. I do not think the Act has such a meaning. I claim that the meaning is, that persons holding these offices are directly and expressly withdrawn from the force of the first section of the Act, and are not rendered ineligible, though they hold the office to which the first section has reference. I submit, again, that the meaning of the words, when read together, clearly indicate what I have stated. The words are:

"Except as hereinafter specially provided, no person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, &c. * * * Provided that nothing in this section shall render ineligible, as aforesaid, any person holding any of the following offices."

That is to say, including the office of Minister of Railways. Holding what? Rendering ineligible what? By taking and holding any other office with a salary attached. That is the meaning, and the clear meaning of the words. Hon. gentlemen may exercise their imaginations upon these words, and the force of the imagination of hon. gentlemen opposite, as I have had occasion for the last two months to know, is very extraordinary. As has been said before, they drew upon their imagination for facts in a great many instances. Their treatment of various questions in this House, such as the National Policy, has illustrated that over and over again, in an abundant manner. But reading this Statute in its plain terms, I find that the hon. Minister of Railways does not come within the first section, and not coming there, is not ineligible to a seat in this House, though he filled an office with a salary attached thereto. I therefore think, under all the circumstances, that it is a waste of words on the part of the Opposition to contend for the position they take, and that this Bill should pass its second reading.

Mr. DAVIES. I shall not detain the House at any length on this question, which has been already argued at such length by hon. gentlemen on both sides. But some views of constitutional law have been taken by hon. gentlemen to-night which I, for one, cannot allow to pass unanswered. I must express my very great disappointment at the manner in which the right hon. leader of the Government introduced his motion for the second reading of this Bill. When the question was first raised, a week or two ago, by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and when he made a speech in which he showed or tried to show that the position he took was a legal and constitutional position, that could not be successfully assailed, the right hon. leader of the Government apologized to the House for not being able to answer him, by stating that the matter had been sprung upon him —which I thought was a fair explanation—and that he was not ready at the moment to answer a very powerful constitutional argument, in support of which were brought a large array of constitutional authorities. But I did think that when the hon. gentleman had an opportunity to think the question over, and to examine the authorities, then when he came down and asked the House to assent to the second reading of this Bill, he would have been able to back up his motion by a reference, if not to colonial authorities, at least to English ones. But the hon. gentleman made his motion in perfect silence; and when he was taunted with having done so, he gave the very best argument which I suppose he had in favour of the Bill, and that was that there was a precedent for it in the case of Mr Macdonald, of Nova Scotia, in 1868. That was the sole and only argument which the hon. gentleman advanced in this House to-day for asking hon. members to give their assent to a Bill which is as gross a violation of the independence of Parliament and the rights of the people as anything which has ever been introduced into this Parliament since it has been a Parliament. Now, before I discuss the case which the hon. gentleman cites, I want to call attention to the position taken by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), who has just resumed his seat. If I followed his argument correctly, it amounted to this, that Ministers of Crown do not come within the purview of the Independence of Parliament Act at all.

Mr. BEATY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman nods his assent; I am glad I understood him correctly. Well, I will venture the assertion that the hon. gentleman will not find another member of this House to assent to that proposition. I will qualify that, and say that the hon. gentleman will not find a lawyer in this House who will give his assent to that proposition. I go further and say that he will not find a Parliamentarian of any standing who will assent to it. Such a proposition, if assented to, would be the destruction of the Independence of Parliament Act entirely. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that a Minister of the Crown can hold other offices of emolument—can be Lieutenant-Governors or Judges of the land?

Mr. BEATY. It is not my fault if that is the law.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, if the hon. gentleman will put such a strained and forced construction on an Act of Parliament, I am not surprised at all at the position he takes. I will not say that his position is ridiculous, for that would not be respectful to him, but I think it is a position which he has come to very hastily, and without reading the Act carefully at all. What does the Act say:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind, is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons."

And then there is a proviso exempting certain officials by name from that clause, viz.: the officials who, by virtue of their office, are members of the Government, and any other person who may be appointed to any office which may be hereafter created, entitling him to be a Minister of the Crown. These are the only cases which the law removes from the sweeping enactment of the first section. The Act goes further. There was a possibility, I suppose, that some ingenious gentleman might suggest a mode of escape by which a blow might be aimed at the Independence of Parliament. The draftsman, I suppose, was aware that a certain class exists, exists in this House and has existed for a long time in Parliament, whose object is to weaken and undermine the Independence of Parliament Act; and the draftsman, in addition to what I have read, went on to say:—

"Provided the Minister of the Crown be elected while holding such office, and be not otherwise disqualified."

That is perfectly plain, and does not afford of a loop-hole for the hon. gentleman to escape through.

Mr. BEATY. Which office does that proviso refer to—an office described in the first section or in the second section?

Mr. DAVIES. Any man can see that it refers to the offices mentioned in the second section. I cannot make it any plainer to the hon. gentleman. Supposing a new office is created, which makes the holder a Minister of the Crown, in that case the person holding the new office shall not be disqualified, provided he is not otherwise disqualified. There is the very case in point. The gentleman whose position we are discussing here to-night, did not hold any one of the offices mentioned in that section, but he came within the latter part. He holds an office which entitles him to be a Minister of the Crown. Now the only question is, is he otherwise disqualified? If the hon. gentleman is right in his contention, he cannot be otherwise disqualified. See how ridiculous the proposition is. He can be a Judge, or a Lieutenant-Governor. He cannot be otherwise disqualified; still the Act says, in so many words, if he is otherwise disqualified, he shall cease to be a member.

Mr. BEATY. If he is not otherwise disqualified by some other Act, he is not declared disqualified by the first section.

Mr. DAVIES. The law does not say so. The hon. gentleman further argued that inasmuch as the hon. Minister of Railways received a commission, in which commission it was stated that he was to hold the office of High Commissioner, without salary, he did not accept an office with a salary attached. But the hon. gentleman will see that the salary is attached to the office of Minister of Railways by Statute, and to the office of High Commissioner by Statute. The Statute says: "The High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than $10,000." It does not matter whether the Government reduce it down to $500 or $5, there is a salary attached to the office, and therefore, it is, in the very words of the Statute, one of those offices within the first section of the Act, the acceptance of which disqualified a man from sitting in this House. "No person accepting any office to which any salary is attached." There is by Statute, a salary of some kind attached to the office of High Commissioner, and therefore it is that kind of office the Legislature intended to provide against, any Minister or any member of Parliament accepting, and in accepting which the hon. gentleman has vacated his seat. The hon. gentleman says: Do you contend that if the Minister travels in the discharge of the duties of his Department and receives his travelling expenses, he thereby vacates his seat? Certainly not, because a Minister in so doing is merely discharging the duties of his office. If he goes to Toronto and has his railway fare paid, it is the same thing as if on a wet day he took a cab to his office, and charged the cab hire to the Department. If, in the discharge of the duties of his Department, he incurs necessary expenses, those expenses are paid by the Government and do not vacate his seat. There is no analogy between this case and the case of a Minister accepting a wholly distinct appointment which involves the discharge of duties not Ministerial in their character, which are statutory in their character, to which the salary is by Statute attached, and which, in the direct words of the Statute, disqualify him from holding his seat. Passing from the hon. gentleman to the hon. gentleman on the same side, who immediately preceded him, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), he argued strongly this was a case which should be referred to a Committee, and I listened with astonishment to the hon. gentleman asking us to take that course. He agreed that this was a most important Bill; that vital principles were involved in it; that it would, should it pass, create a precedent of the most important character for all time; and he asks us to adopt the second reading, to accept the principle of the Bill, and then, after we have conceded the principle of the Bill, to refer the details to a Committee. Why, the hon. gentleman knows well that we will give our case away if we vote for the second reading of the Bill; the hon. First Minister knows well that when you pass the second reading of a Bill, the principle of the Bill is passed upon and agreed to by the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not in all cases.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman will not dissent from that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do dissent from it.

Mr. DAVIES. The principle of a measure is assented to when you adopt its second reading. If we adopt the second reading of this Bill, we will assent to its principle, and the reference to the Committee will be only to consider the details. What is the necessity of referring this Bill after we have agreed to it? It is like locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. We first assent to the principle and then refer it to a Committee. The hon. gentleman said he had one authority in support of this Bill, and that was the Bill passed in 1877 by the Ministry of which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was the leader. The hon. gentleman said he disapproved of that Bill, that it had been repudiated by his friends, that though it was a Bill to whitewash, as he termed it, a large number of the members of this House, yet such was their high sense of dignity, as members of this House, such the personal value they placed on the independence of Parliament, that they repudiated the Bill, that they would have none of it. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), he said, repudiated it. He did not want to come under its cover; he wanted to stand on his own footing, on his own bottom; he did not want its saving effect. I wonder that the hon. member for Northumberland sat silent when his views were so misrepresented. I take up the *Hansard*, and I find that, so far from his repudiating that Bill, that hon. gentleman expressed his cordial

approval of it. He said he was proud that the hon. member for East York had introduced it; that he was glad to come under its operation, because he and a large number of others had, or possibly might have been held to have had, unwittingly offended against the strict terms of the Independence of Parliament Act. I refer to the language that hon. gentleman used on that occasion, and you will see, Mr. Speaker, how utterly reckless the hon. member for Victoria was in his facts. He should have verified his facts before he ventured to make such an assertion in this House. The hon. member for Northumberland then said:

"He approved of the policy, from whichever side of the House it came, of taking measures whereby hon. members would be relieved of responsibility for acts done unintentionally and in ignorance of the construction placed on the Independence of Parliament Act. He was ready to go before a court of law, and he defied anyone to obtain a conviction against him for a violation of that Act. He was, therefore, perfectly free to express an Independent opinion, and that opinion was, that a measure should be passed to relieve hon. members who had, through inadvertance or ignorance, violated the Act, from charges brought against them by social pirates who instituted the prosecutions in order to make money. A dozen members of this House had been served with writs of from $500,000 to $1,000,000, and it was not right that they should be made subject to annoyance, trouble and expense, and even danger, during nine or twelve months, in consequence of a certain construction having been placed on the Independence of Parliament Act. The feeling of justice entertained by Parliament and the country would sanction and ratify the proposed measure. He cared not for party, but he wished for justice to be done."

So that the hon. member for Northumberland, instead of repudiating the measure of the hon member for East York, gladly hailed it as a measure of justice and relief which, he thought, it was proper and prudent should be introduced and carried. I do not know that I need refer any more to that measure of 1877, which has been cited once or twice by hon. gentlemen opposite as a precedent in this case. It bears no analogy whatever; it is not stated here that the hon. member for Cumberland, acted unwittingly or unknowingly, that he slipped into this office by mere error or inadvertance and wanted to be relieved from the penalties. If such a statement had been made, there would be no feeling against granting the relief, as the hon. member for East York stated. Did he accept this office knowingly or wilfully?

An hon. MEMBER. Or maliciously?

Mr. DAVIES. In my belief, he accepted it with the intention of not coming back to take his seat. It was only when the railway policy of the Government was changed and they found it was necessary to have him back, that they brought him back—that Mr. Todd's opinion was obtained. But, long before he took his seat in this House, long before he violated the Act, long before he incurred the penalties the Government had been notified by the authority to whom they applied, the late Librarian, that while there might be some excuse for Sir Charles Tupper taking his seat in this House under the practice and precedents of the English Parliament and the rules of that Parliament, he could give no opinion, and would not give any opinion, as to whether he was not violating the Act of our own Parliament, and therefore, he took his seat without having obtained any opinion that he was doing so constitutionally or legally. He knew, and do not hon. members see from the very silence of the hon. the First Minister himself, that he knows and feels that the member for Cumberland had acted illegally in taking his seat, and that it cannot be defended? Does any hon. member suppose that, with his long experience and with his knowledge of constitutional law, he would not have been ready to give some reason for this Bill, if any reason could be given, when he introduced it? Do you think he would have moved it in solemn silence; do you think after the able arguments which were adduced by his opponent a week or two ago, showing that the position taken by the member for Cumberland was totally illegal and indefensible, that the First Minister would have moved his Bill in silence, and would not have replied to those arguments if arguments could have been adduced by him? No; the hon. member knows well that he could not, and therefore he discreetly and adroitly adopted the other course and moved his Bill, as I have said, in solemn silence. But, Mr. Speaker, further than that, the Bill of 1877, which was cited as a precedent, cannot be invoked by hon. members opposite, and why? Because they have been told, time and again, that if they only went as far as the Bill of 1877, and relieved the member for Cumberland from penalties, if they would state that he incurred those penalties unwittingly and ignorantly, both sides of the House would join in relieving him from them. But they go further than that. They do not stop there. Having acknowledged by their Bill that he has lost his seat, having acknowledged that the seat was void and empty, having acknowledged, in terms almost, that a writ should go out, they come here and say: We will re-elect you; we will not refer to the electors of Cumberland the right to elect a successor, but we will elect you, and, in our omnipotence, we will declare you entitled to the seat. I am afraid we are establishing precedents which, in the near future, perhaps, and certainly in the future, will be found to be most pernicious. Last year you legislated an hon. member out of his seat; this year you are legislating a member into his seat. The hon. member smiles, but I would like to be sitting in this House and hearing him, if such a measure had been proposed by his opponents. How he would have invoked the spirit of our Constitution, and the great necessities, in this the initial stage of our constitutional history, of starting upon fair and just and equitable lines, not laying down precedents from a party standpoint alone, not laying down precedents which can be justified from a party standpoint alone, but precedents which are broad and general in their character, and based upon law and justice and constitutional usage. What are we doing here? The hon. member is not laying down such a precedent. He is going further than ever this Parliament has gone before. He is going further, I venture to say, than the English Parliament ever went. If he is not, let him cite a precedent in support of it. He is going further than any constitutional Parliament ever went, because he is declaring that a man whose seat is vacant shall be elected to fill it without asking the electors whether they are satisfied or not. Now, in order that we may understand this Act of Parliament which we are considering, this most important Act, correctly, let me refer the hon. gentleman to the measure he introduced and passed in the year 1868. He referred to it himself. I looked it up to see if it was analagous or *apropos* to this, and I find it is not, but on reading it over I find that the preamble recites what the hon. gentleman then understood to be the meaning and spirit of these Independence of Parliament Acts. The hon. gentleman, at that time, found there was a doubt as to whether all the Ministers had not violated the law by accepting their offices without going back to their constituents, and they recite that, by the British North America Act, the old laws of the several Provinces, respecting persons holding offices of profit or emolument at the nomination of the Crown, applied to the election of members to this House, and that certain gentlemen, naming them, had held such offices, and it was doubtful whether they were disqualified or not. But what is the recital in the preamble:

"And whereas the said offices, although no salary or emolument was attached to any of them at the time of the acceptance thereof by the persons aforesaid, respectively, or at the time of their said election, respectively, may yet, by reason of the expectation that salaries or emoluments would be attached to them, be considered as offices of profit under the Crown."

Why, the hon. gent'eman then held, and declared in the preamble to an Act of Parliament, that an office, not because there was attached to it money, or profit or salary, but

because there was reasonable expectation that some day profit or salary might be attached to it, was within the spirit if not within the letter of the Act. The hon. gentleman recited, therefore, that statutory relief was necessary. "It is consistent," he says, "with the spirit and intent of the Act," that those parties should be indemnified, and he went on and indemnified them. Now, there is a case, a very strong case to my mind, because it shows what were the views which the fathers of Confederation had as to the necessity of Independence of Parliament Acts, and as to the manner and spirit in which those Acts should be construed. He says, you must not construe an Act of this kind as you would a common Statute, which imposes a penalty for an offence, but you must see what is the spirit of it, and he says, although no salary was attached to these offices at the time, still there was an expectation that a salary would be attached to them, and, therefore, it comes within the spirit of the law, and we will pass legislation indemnifying them. He did; but how far did he go? The Act went on to refer to the case of Edward Mortimer Macdonald, and said he had been elected a member of the House of Commons for the county of Lunenburg; that, after being elected a member, he had accepted, from the Government of the Province of Nova Scotia, the office of Queen's Printer, and he was to be indemnified in the same way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well?

Mr. DAVIES. That was not an office connected with the Government of Canada at all. That was at the beginning of Confederation, when it was not clearly understood whether such an office would disqualify or not, and, therefore to remove doubts, Mr. Macdonald was indemnified from the penalties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Still, he kept his seat under that clause.

Mr. DAVIES. Certainly. I have failed to see why any Act of Indemnity was necessary for Mr. Macdonald.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but the House thought so and legislated him in.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman thought, I suppose, as a matter of precaution, it was better to pass it, and he did pass it, but if it is a precedent, perhaps he will show what particular Statute or section that gentleman offended against. He cannot do so. It was merely from abundance of caution that was put in. How can that be cited as an authority for the position taken to-day, that a Minister of the Crown who has offended with his eyes open, who has taken his seat after notice from the press of the country, that he would be prosecuted, who has taken and held it illegally, and has introduced and promoted the most important Government measures of the Session—in what way can that old precedent be cited as a precedent for this? There is no analogy between them; none whatever.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What about Mr. Perry's case?

Mr. DAVIES. I will come to that, and I will show that that will not help him out of the mire, in the slightest. What was Mr. Perry's case? It was a case when Prince Edward Island was entering Confederation. Mr. Perry had been Speaker of the Island House of Assembly. Mr. Perry had resigned to himself as such Speaker, and, being advised that there was some doubt whether he could do so or not, he resigned to the Lieutenant-Governor, he resigned to the Colonial Secretary, he resigned to all the officials in the colony, I believe, and he went to his election and was elected. After he was elected, the general dissolution took place. Mr. Perry again resigned, and to make matters doubly sure he went back and was re elected by a larger majority. He came before this House, and what was the question? As my hon. friend from Bothwell has mentioned, the electors elected him with a knowledge of all these facts. He came to the House and said: "It is a doubtful legal point whether I could resign the Speakership of the Local Assembly or not, and I ask the House to remove that doubt." What did the House do? The House recited all the facts; they recited that he had:

"Taken in good faith, so far as it was possible for him to do, every step in his power to divest himself of his position as a member of the Legislative Assembly; and that according to the spirit and intent of the Act"—

Meaning the Act for the abolition of dual representation he was not disqualified from being a candidate. And it went on to declare that he was:

"Capable of being elected, and of sitting and voting in the House of Commons of Canada, notwithstanding any irregularity in his said resignation as a member of the Legislative Assembly."

That is all the House did—notwithstanding any irregularity in his original resignation, they declared him capable of being re-elected. But the facts connected with his resignation were all known to the electors. He never accepted office after he took his seat in this House. There was no analogy between the two cases at all, because the only question in Mr. Perry's case was, whether he had legally resigned a local office which he held in the Province before he came here at all, and while the Province was separate. He was not accused of offending against the Independence of Parliament Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Wasn't he?

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then he was, after that Act was passed.

Mr. DAVIES. He was not accused of offending against the Independence of Parliament Act; nor did he think at the time, nor do I think now, that the Act was necessary. It was done as a matter of precaution, because he was being persecuted, as the hon. member for Northumberland stated, by a lot of political pirates, who thought they would ruin him with suits. But the hon. gentleman declared him to be capable of being elected notwithstanding any irregularity in his resignation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, he was a qualified candidate. He went before the people and they elected him, with all the knowledge as to the resignation. There was no vacancy then. The hon. gentleman might declare his seat to be vacant; I will undertake to say that he would not have done so, and I will undertake to say there is not a gentleman on either side of the House who would have voted for such a harsh Bill. What is the hon. gentleman doing in this Bill? He not only relieves from penalty, but he says that Sir Charles Tupper ought not, by reason of his accepting or holding the office of High Commissioner, to cease to be a member of Parliament. But he had ceased to be a member of Parliament. If the Bill has any object at all, he had ceased to be a member of the House, and therefore, the hon. member for Bothwell argues it is a doubtful question whether you can make him, by a mere vote, a member of the House—whether he must not be re-elected by the people. Now, there is another point, and it is outside the salary question. It has always seemed to me very clear, as a lawyer, that when Sir Charles Tupper, as High Commissioner, went to England, when that commission authorizing him to discharge all the duties and exercise all the powers, to possess, and retain, and hold all the advantages which attach to that position, and when he accepted $5,000 of advantage, he clearly violated the first section of this Act. Supposing he accepted the office without salary, the question is, did he come within the meaning of the words "fees, wages, or allowances"? Now, when you come to construe that section, you must consider its history, and what do

you find? Do you find, as an hon. gentleman opposite contended, that these words are all to be construed in the same sense as a salary. Not at all. If you go back you will find that when that section was first passed it said that no person accepting or holding any office or employment in the service of the Crown to which an annual salary, or any fee, or wages, or allowance in lieu of a salary, is attached, should be disqualified. Very well. We had, after a time, the scandal in this House of a gentleman being paid—I forget how many thousand dollars—by an evasion of the Statute; he was paid monthly instead of yearly, and it was argued that he did not come within the strict words of the Statute; and the Legislature, to prevent the repetition of such scandals, to prevent the moral sense of the community from being shocked by seeing men who were believed to be independent retained by the Prime Minister at so much a month, came in and declared that hereafter no person accepting any office or employment, whether it be permanent or whether it be temporary, whether there be a salary attached to it or not—leaving out the words "in lieu of a salary," and adding the words "fee, wages, or allowance," these words being used distinctly as opposed to salary; because in the original Act it reads, "in lieu of salary" showing that they meant the same thing. The words "in lieu" were left out, and they used here—"any fee, any salary, any wages, any allowance, or emolument or any profit of any kind;" and I challenge any hon. member to suggest, in the English language, any words which could have covered the receipt of $5,000 in the way and manner in which Sir Charles Tupper has received it, better than these words used in that section. But you may argue that it is not a salary; so you may argue that it is not an allowance, or emolument; that it is not profit of any kind. Why, he took his commission with a clause inserted in it that he was to have all the advantages pertaining to the office. He knew, the Government knew at the time, and the public knew, because it was enacted in the Supply Bill, that the High Commissioner was to get $4 000 or $5,000 a year. He knew it was one of the advantages the commission was to give him, and he took it with his eyes open, and he took the money too; therefore, he directly violated the Act. When we turn up to see what the meaning of these words is, as given in the dictionaries, we find they mean "that which is allowed for expenses of maintenance." I think this $5,000 was allowed for that very purpose, or "something conceded as a compensation"—as a compensation for his expenditure, house rent, fuel, and other incidental expenses of that kind. Therefore, I say that when he took that commission, with all the advantages attached to his office, and when it was by statute declared that one of the advantages was to receive $4,000 or $5,000 a year, he directly and wilfully violated, not the spirit alone, but the letter of the Act, beyond all doubt or peradventure; and you cannot, by twisting the Act or the meaning of the word salary, get around the fact that he receives as part of his perquisites, as part of the advantages of his office, as an advantage that was allowed by Statute to him—it being in the Bill of supplies passed every year—the sum of $5,000 as an allowance for his expenses. I do not think it is creditable for hon. gentleman to contend that Sir Charles Tupper's services have been so meritorious that this House is justified in violating the Independence of Parliament Act in his favour. Sir Charles Tupper stands in no better position as regards this Act than any other hon. member of the House. If he was seeking to be relieved from a penalty only, then he might plead, not only that he sinned in ignorance, but his meritorious services. But when he is not pleading to be relieved from penalties, but is pleading to be legislated into his seat, it is not creditable to the lawyers of the House to use the argument that this should be done because his services are alleged to have been meritorious as High Commissioner. I do not reply to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), because all the lawyers on his side of the House have repudiated his arguments as untenable. The hon. gentleman's position is like the old trick of the thimble and the pea. One moment he is High Commissioner; at another moment he is a member and Minister of Railways; one moment he is here, another moment he is there. And the hon. member for Jacques Cartier could not find him at all. He was not High Commissioner because he said there was no salary mentioned in the commission; he was not a member because his seat was voided; and an effort is now being made to put him back in his seat by virtue of an Act of Parliament. These are not arguments which should commend themselves to the sober sense of the House, and although the Bill may be carried, it will establish a dangerous precedent, a bad precedent, one not based on justice, and one which is in violation of the Statute law of the land, and which some day or other, I fear, may rise up in judgment against hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I only ask the patience of the House a few moments, to state the impression I received from the debate of to-day, as well as from the debate of the other day, on the question now before the House. I have been astonished, and I am sure hon. members of the House have felt as I have done, at the amount of ingenuity displayed, at the great efforts that have been made, at the great professional talent that has been exercised on the other side of the House to prove—what? That the hon. gentleman has done something which he himself said he did not do, and would not do; to make him say yes when he said no; and by technicalities, by hair-splitting and by taking clauses of the Statute and placing one against the other to say—what? That an hon. member of the House, and a member of the Government, had accepted, according to the terms of the Statute, an office of lucre, of profit and gain to him, when it is well known, when it is perfectly accepted by every one, that the hon. member did not accept an office of gain; but that before even the proposition was made to him to take that office and perform the duties for the country and the Government, the hon. gentleman said he would not accept an office of lucre, profit or gain. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have been kept here several hours—doing what? Discussing a clause in an Act, although the whole question is contained in a nutshell when we come to discuss the principle of the Act. When we come to the principle of the independence of Parliament, we find it is the acceptance of some position of gain and profit by an hon. member, destroying his independence and disqualifying him from acting in an independent manner in the House and outside of the influence of the Crown. Have we not had it proved, and have not hon. gentlemen admitted it, not only that the office, and duties of the office, were performed without salary, but that the Order in Council which was passed provided that the law should not be evaded, but complied with; that the spirit which must pervade the action of the Government and the conduct of hon. members should be maintained; and that this spirit of the law should not, any more than the letter of the law, be put aside. The Order in Council has been read, and I may be allowed to read a line of it. It says:

"And whereas Sir Charles Tupper has kindly consented to proceed to England, and there to perform the duties of the office for the present and without salary."

Has the hon. gentleman whose integrity, whose honour, whose name, whose fame, should be as dear to hon. members as the independence of this House, been properly treated in this discussion? During this discussion, I will not attribute it to party feeling, for I am sure the question has been discussed in this House in a non-partizan manner, though I do not know whether the public will judge of it in that light, but such is my opinion—I say it is very extraordinary that hon. gentlemen opposite have thought more of the

technicalities of the law in preserving the independence of Parliament, which has not been threatened, and not destroyed by the act we are discussing, than they have thought of the dignity of the House and of the duty of every hon. member, on both sides, to try and preserve, before the world, the honour, integrity, name and good fame of every one of our colleagues. Where do all the Statutes and precedents which have been quoted tend? They all tend to show that, in some instances, hon. members had unwittingly placed themselves in a position where doubts existed as to whether they had become disqualified; all those precedents and Statutes quoted showed that the parties in question had actually done something which they did not intend to do but which had disqualified them, and an Act was passed either to indemnify them against penalties, or an Act was passed to remove any doubt that might exist, in giving them seats to which they were entitled. In the present case, the House has the uncontradicted evidence that the office accepted was without profit or gain and that it was intentionally and expressly declared that the duties of the office would be performed gratuitously and *pro bono publico*. The argument used by hon. gentlemen opposite has been this: You cannot, by an Act, take away the privilege from the people of Nova Scotia of electing any of their representatives in the House of Commons. You cannot, by an Act, declare that a man is not a member of Parliament, and re-elect him. This is very well for a popular argument to go before the public. But the Acts quoted cover cases where doubts existed, as in the case of Mr. Perry, as to whether gentlemen were duly members of the House or not, and in that particular case, the Statute declared that he was a member of the House. He was made a member of the House by the Statute passed, not because the people did not think he was really a member, but because it removed all doubts on the subject. And this is the main feature of the present Bill. The First Minister does not say: I affirm that the hon. gentleman is guilty, that he is not a member of this House; I admit he has lost his seat, but I want Parliament to declare, at my dictation, that he is elected by this Parliament as a member of it. The right hon. gentleman has never thought of it—no man of common sense would ever think of such a proposition. But the right hon. gentleman says in his Bill: "Whereas, such an office has been held and such duties have been performed by a member of this House, who was also a member of the Government, and whereas, those duties have been performed without any salary, or profit, or gain to him, we propose this Bill, not because we think that he is disqualified, but to remove all doubts in the minds of those who might have doubts—and I give credit to hon. gentlemen opposite that, judging by their arguments, they at least have doubts—I say that by the express language of the Bill he shall not be disqualified, he shall not be any more tainted with the accusation, he shall not be any more suspected of having been disqualified or of having offended against the Independence of Parliament Act." The hon. Minister of Railways has not been in the position to be unduly influenced by the Crown, and by passing this Act we shall not cease to cherish the privileges of Parliament and shall not be suspected of being subject to influence of the Crown, light as that influence is in this country. We must cherish those principles and liberties, but we must not carry our jealousy of our rights to such a point that it would be injurious to members of the House who, under such circumstances as those which surround this case, have been performing duties of a high character, and who, in advance, have declared that they would only perform them for the sake of their country, for the good of the Government, and for the good of the people. Hon. gentlemen have been speaking of the $4,000 special expenses in the previous debate on this subject, but I must give credit to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), for having to-night lifted the discussion to a higher platform, and for not having taken into consideration the fact of whether a few hundreds, or a few thousand dollars, had been spent in personal expenses. I put this question to hon. gentlemen who have spoken of these personal expenditures: Suppose a member of the Government should leave here and go to England and perform the duty of another officer who would have been appointed by the Crown; supposing that in his travels, and not having a salary, he is obliged to spend a few dollars out of his own pocket. When he comes back he is asked: Well, you have been doing duty for the Government; have you been spending any money for travelling expenses? He would reply: Yes; I have disbursed so much. He is repaid the amount he has disbursed; I would ask hon. gentlemen would that hon. member be in any way, would he be to the extent of a cent or a dollar poorer or richer by his appointment when he comes back to his duties as a Minister of the Crown in Canada? Has he had any profit, any lucre, when he returns to resume his duties? I say that he has received no consideration for his services, and that, pecuniarily, he is in the same position that he was when he left the seat of Government to perform those duties. I have been reading to-day some precedents from an old book written by Hatsell, from which we can learn what was the origin of the Acts for the protection of the independence of members of Parliament. They originated at a time when the Crown was misusing the power of the Crown to corrupt members of Parliament, either by giving offices or money, or decorations, or other things of that kind. It was then that these Acts began to be inscribed in the Statutes of Parliament. We find that it was considered that certain officers in the army and navy, ambassadors, and others, accepting offices of that kind, were not considered as having violated the Independence of Parliament when they accepted these offices, with payments from the Crown attached, and that long before the Acts exempting them from disqualification, were passed. And why? It was because their services were required for high public duties, or for the procuring of special information for the general good of the community; and it was not right to put them on the same level as those who accepted sinecures or offices of emolument for the purpose of obtaining profit for themselves. These offices were exactly similar to the duties performed by members of the Government holding portfolios under the Crown. This old writer says:

"It is not a question proper for me to discuss here, where the line should be drawn with respect to the degree of influence which the Ministers of the Crown can safely be entrusted. The idea, on the one hand of excluding from the House of Commons every man who holds an office in the Government of the country, and who, from that situation, is the best qualified to give the best information relative to the Department which he belongs to, is too absurd to be maintained for a moment."

A precedent is quoted to the effect that on the 18th and 19th of April, 1714, a question was moved, whether the office of Commissaries, to treat with Commissaries from France, was a new created office, within the meaning of the Act of Sixth Queen Ann, and it passed in the negative. The office of Commissary was nearly the same in title, and very much the same in its duties, as the office of High Commissioner, and it was decided that the holders of that office were not excluded from their seats in Parliament. On the 17th of January, 1717, Lord Middleton, Lord Chancellor of Ireland:

"Desires the sense of the House whether he is incapacited to sit, in respect to his being continued in a Commission for Ireland, which Commission has been renewed since his election, but it is an office of no profit. The House are of opinion that he is not within the meaning of the Sixth of Anne, chap. seven, and he accordingly came into the House."

I might quote a number of other cases of a similar kind, but I will not detain the House. It may be asked what have all those cases to do with our Act of Parliament. But I say that when a principle of this kind is involved, we should refer to what has taken place in other countries in

which the same questions have arisen under similar circumstances. I say we must be guided by precedents in England when the principle involved is the same. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was, I think, rather indiscreet in his argument. I believe that nearly all the precedents he has cited point to exactly the same conclusion to which I have arrived, on the Bill now before the House. Who is exempted from that disqualifying clause if we take the strict letter of the law? The members of the Cabinet are exempt. If I wanted to go as far as my hon. friend opposite, I would argue that Ministers are altogether exempted from the clause which declares that office holders are ineligible to hold seats in Parliament, not only the members of the Cabinet, but also any other member occupying an office which may hereafter be created to be held by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, and entitling him to be a Minister of the Crown, are exempted. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had argued that disqualification is the holding of an office of emolument under the Crown. It cannot be, since, according to the proposition of the hon. gentleman, Ministers of the Crown are exempted from the operation of the first clause.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. member for West Durham may laugh, but he must not carry my argument farther than it goes. I am only enlarging the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's, and with him, I say that, taking the strict letter of the law, those whose names are mentioned in the second clause are exempted from the first clause, they are eligible, and not disqualified, provided they are not disqualified otherwise, from sitting here as members of the House. It cannot be argued that disqualification means, in that case, the holding of an office as contemplated in the first section. No; there are other disqualifications. The Act for the election of members says that a certain class of people cannot be elected members of the House. A man who is not a British subject, a man under a certain age, a Judge of the land, a minister of the church, cannot be elected to this House. I understand the hon. member for Queen's does not admit that his proposition went further than to say that Ministers of the Crown are only exempt from the disqualification enacted by the first clause of the Act *quoad* their Ministerial offices. However, I say that the argument which was put forward by the hon. member for West Toronto was not, after all, to be scorned, or set aside with such contempt as it was. Whenever you want to impose a heavy penalty, you must interpret your Statute in the strictest and severest sense of the letter, as well as the spirit of the law. Every interpretation of the law, favourable to the accused, must be accepted with deference. But, Sir, I do not support my argument in favour of the Bill upon that pretension. My argument stands upon a broader basis. I say that the spirit of the law has not been contravened by the action of the hon. Minister of Railways. I say that the letter of the law has been complied with by him with great care, and by the Minister who recommended that Sir Charles Tupper should be appointed to go to England and perform the duties of High Commissioner, temporarily and without salary; and I say that the Government, as well as the recipient of the office, had well weighed beforehand what they were doing. They did not want to act against the spirit of the law, against the principle of the independence of Parliament; and if we do not want to restrict the question to the narrow, trifling aspect of a few dollars paid for personal expenses—and this aspect of the case has been abandoned to-night—I say it is not because the statute has said that the salary might be attached to the office, that the person accepting that office without salary should be disqualified. The Act creating the office of High Commissioner, says that the Government may pay a salary, provided it is not above $10,000; they may pay less; they may pay nothing. And I say that a member of the Administration cannot be regarded as in the same position as a member of Parliament, so far as independence or the influence of the Crown is concerned. Ministers of the Crown are in receipt of money from the Crown, and are in a certain manner, under the influence of the Crown, if influence it may be called; but it is not undue influence, because the position they occupy, and the high duties they have to perform for the country, prevent them from being suspected of being subject to any influence except the lawful influence of their own constituents and the honour and prestige of the Crown and the country. I challenge my hon. friends on the other side of the House to contradict me when I say that there is not a man in this Parliament, on either side of the House, who believes, for a single moment, that the hon. Minister of Railways accepted the office with a view to any personal profit. In accepting it, he acted according to the spirit of the Constitution and the privileges of this House. This question should not have been discussed here but should have been left for discussion to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and in that view I say the hon. gentleman was wrong in saying that at the second reading of this Bill we would adopt the principle. That is the ordinary rule, but that is not the case when on the second reading of the Bill the promoter announces that he only puts the facts of the case before the House in order that they may be referred to a Committee. The case is laid before the House frankly and squarely. After the affirmation of the legal position assumed by the hon. Minister of Railways, and solely to provoke a vote of this House, a doubt is expressed whether the fact mentioned in this Bill implies an infraction of the law, and to solve that doubt it is asked that it be referred to the proper Committee. In concluding my remarks, I must say that I wish the hon. members on the other side, in treating this question, had considered a little more our dignity and the duty we owe to respect and protect the honour, the dignity and integrity of our colleagues in this House. This should be our first thought, and then we should think of our privileges and independence as members of this Parliament.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I rise with great diffidence to say a word on this question. After the able way in which it has been discussed by those hon. gentlemen who may be considered, from their legal attainments, to be most competent to give an opinion on it, I will not attempt to make any lengthy remarks, but I do not wish to give a vote without a few words of explanation. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, not because I believe the second clause has been at all established by anything yet said in the House, but because I think we owe it to the hon. Minister of Railways to ensure to him the most ample protection against any liability he may have incurred, but which this Bill declares he has not incurred. This, I admit, is not a logical proposition; it is hard to find anything logical about this measure, and even those prepared to accept it in perfect faith must come to the conclusion, that after this House, by its solemn vote, shall have declared the seat to be not vacant, we refer to a Commiteethe question whether, after all, the seat is vacant or not, and I cannot conceive any proposition more indefensible. I vote for this Bill because I believe that a protection should be given the Minister of Railways. In discussing this question, no man appreciates more highly than I the service this hon. gentleman has rendered, whether as High Commissioner or as Minister of Railways; but having carefully considered the debates, having studied the authorities and precedents cited, I must say I am not convinced that the second clause of this Bill is established.

On that simple proposition, I should feel constrained to vote against the second reading of the Bill, were that the only question before the House; and therefore, in giving the vote I intend to give, I wish it to be understood that I am not supporting the proposition that the hon. Minister of Railways has not vacated his seat. Driven by some current not understood, the ship of State has drifted into shoals and quicksands, so far that the pilot finds that he cannot avoid Scylla on the one side and Charybdis on the other; he therefore calls upon his crew to jump overboard, and by main strength lift the vessel over the breakers and land her safely in the harbour. But that, I think, is an ignominious way of getting into a harbour. If there is a doubt, there is a constitutional way of solving it. The hon. Minister of Railways should have taken the course of going to his constituents, and then, with a full knowledge of all the circumstances, those whom he has hitherto represented would have sent him back to Parliament with a larger majority than he had before. I cannot conceal my conviction that that would have been the proper course to pursue. Although I am a young member of the House and have not the legal attainments of many hon. gentlemen who have spoken, yet I think on this question every man is bound to vote according to his convictions of what is right, and not according to what his party say he ought to do. This is not a question of policy, but a question of right or wrong, and I feel bound, in giving the vote I intend to give, to state my convictions with regard to one on the principles involved in this measure.

Mr. WELDON. This question, put as the hon. gentleman from Muskoka has put it, is simply an Act of Indemnity for an act which, the hon. Secretary of State says, has been committed unwittingly and unknowingly, not by the hon. Minister of Railways, but by the Government themselves. In that case, I think there would be very little difficulty in passing the Bill, for it would receive general acceptation at the hands of the House. This Bill however involves three propositions. The first is one which makes a radical change in the Independence of Parliament Act and will involve serious consequences; that section ought not to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If the Government choose to change the Act providing for the Independence of Parliament, it is their duty, as responsible Ministers of the Crown, to bring down that measure to Parliament. So far as my parliamentary experience goes, this is the first instance of a Bill in which so grave a principle is involved, has been referred to a Committee. With regard to the other portions of the Bill, it has been pointed out that the second section declares the hon. member for Cumberland shall continue to be a member; and the third clause indemnifies him for what he has done. That is practically how the Bill stands. By the first section, the Government wish the Act to be amended, to make some improvement in it so as to make parties eligible to the House; the second declares that section is unnecessary because the hon. gentleman did not violate the Act; and the third declares that if he did, he shall be indemnified. The hon. Secretary of State contended that the Order in Council was the agreement by which Sir Charles Tupper accepted the office of High Commissioner, and that he accepted it without salary. That is practically to contend that an Order in Council may override the law. But you cannot override the law. We have had this week an Order in Council declared by the Supreme Court to be of no effect, because it did not comply with the law. It must do so. If the law declares that a salary is attached to the office of High Commissioner, no Order in Council can alter the law. The hon. Secretary of State and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beaty) put forward this proposition, that any Minister of the Crown can accept any office that is exempt from the operation of the first section, but without salary.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That was the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said that a Minister of the Crown, as such, was exempted from the provisions of the first section; that the Minister of Railways, as Minister of Railways, we exempt from the first section.

Mr. WELDON. As I understood my hon. friend from Queen's, the acceptance of a specific office as a Minister of the Crown by a member of the Privy Council, was exempted from the operation of the first section. It was the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beaty) who said he could hold any other office while a Minister of the Crown. The logical conclusion from that is that, assuming the contention of the hon. member for Toronto is right, the hon. the Minister of Railways can, while he holds that office, hold also the office of Commissioner and be a member of this House; but, if he resigned as Minister of Railways, *eo instanti* he would cease to be a member of this House. But hon. gentlemen, in arguing from that section, forget the last words of the section. There are two provisions with regard to a Minister. First, when he accepts the office, he vacates his seat. He stands precisely in the same position as an officer under the first section, but he has the right to be elected again, if his constituents will return him, and to retain his seat and his office as a Minister of the Crown; and also, provided that he is not otherwise disqualified. It has been put forward that perhaps that might mean that he might be an infant or an alien, but neither an infant or an alien can hold office as a Minister of the Crown, and we must look and see what were the other disqualifications. One of these is that no Minister of the Crown should hold any office under which he is disqualified from holding a seat in this House. The first section is general in its provisions, and declares that no person shall hold a seat in this House who holds an office to which a salary, allowance, and so forth, or profit of any kind is attached. The second section cuts that down by allowing members of the Privy Council, who are Ministers of the Crown, as such, to hold their seats, unless they are otherwise disqualified; that is, if they came within the operation of the first section in any other way, the position of Minister of the Crown will not remove that disqualification, and they are not entitled to hold a seat in the House. That is the proposition. It is a question under the statute, and the whole purview of this Bill is the best evidence to show that that Act has the meaning which has been put forward by hon. members on this side. In order to construe an Act, we have to look to the Act which it repeals in order to see the mischief it was intended to remedy, as put forward by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron). What was the mischief? The previous Act had the words, "salary or in lieu of salary," and upon that a case did occur which was held not to be within the Act, and this Act was passed to make it salary or wages of any kind. Now, there is another proposition I put forward. By the Act of 1880, the High Commissioner is by law to receive a salary. Then, by law, by that Act, to that office a salary is attached. No Order in Council can dispense with that. Nothing but the Act of Parliament can remove that, and I say that no formal renunciation of that can do away with the express directions and provisions of the Act. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beaty) read this from Todd's "Parliamentary Government":

"Thus, the acceptance of an office from the Crown, accompanied by a formal renunciation of any salary, &c., does not disqualify."

But read what follows:—

"The disqualification, however, attaches immediately upon accepting an office of profit under the Statute, so that the subsequent resigna-

tion of such office before the meeting of Parliament, and the refusal to accept of any salary, involving the question of disqualification arising out of the same, will not save the seat."

Now, we must see to what authority Mr. Todd refers. Any lawyer who has any experience will know that frequently, when we refer to the authorities upon which the propositions in text books are put forward, we find that the propositions are not borne out. We find that Mr. Todd refers, in the portion read by the hon. member for Toronto, to Mr. Bathurst's case in May's "Parliamentry Practice." On turning to *May*, we find he puts forward exactly the same language, we find that this is, in fact, copied from *May*, and we find that *May* refers to a passage in the life of Lord Sidmouth as the authority upon which he formulates that principle. In turning up that book, we find it was not a question that was brought before Parliament, it was not a solemn decision of Parliament, but we find that in consequence of a difficulty which occurred in Lord Sidmouth's Government, when he could not get Mr. Robert Peel, afterwards Sir Robert Peel, to accept office at that time, finding it was important that the office should be filled *ad interim* by a member of the Government, he wrote to Mr. Bathurst asking him to accept the office *ad interim*, and he says:

"It is the opinion of Lord Liverpool and Lord Castlereagh, and I confess it is mine, that the office of President of the Board of Control should be associated at present with that of some other person now a member of the Government."

The note at foot of page says that, after much persuasion and suggesting various objections, which were all overruled, Mr. Bathurst consented to the arrangement, on the understanding that he was not to receive any emolument. He accepted the office on the 30th January, 1821, and it was not until the 5th February, 1822, that he was succeeded at the Board of Control by the right hon. Chas. Williams Wynn. That is the only precedent cited, and the question was never raised in Parliament, and his legal right was never tested; but, upon the fact that he did hold that office, it is put forward as a principle, as if settled by some case, that a member can hold an office without profit. I say that this office had a salary attached to it by the law of 1880, that it was intended for the purpose of keeping up the dignity and importance of the office that it should have a salary, and the very case is in point which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier cited from the *Jurist*, the corporation of Liverpool against Wright, where an agreement entered into between the Corporation and the Recorder, that he should be paid a salary instead of fees, was held to be void; not that the appointment was void, but the agreement was void. Among the grounds put forward were: first, that there should be no bargain in respect of an office of trust, because a person accepting an office of trust can make no bargain in respect of that office; and, secondly, because the law presumes that all the fees are required for the purpose of enabling him to uphold the dignity and perform the duties of his office. So in this case, the law did provide a salary to enable the High Commissioner to uphold the dignity and perform the duties of his office, and the Order in Council, so far as regards that salary, was of no effect, not to the extent my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier would carry it out, but to the extent of these words being repugnant to the meaning and intention of the Statute. I will assume, it is true, that Sir Charles Tupper has taken no salary; I will assume that the argument of the hon. member for Queen's, in regard to the allowance, is not a sound one. Assuming that it was still an office of profit, and was created by Statute as an office of profit, the principle is that the acceptance of that office affects the seat, according to the proposition I have read from Todd, following the quotation made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beaty). Then the disqualification follows immediately on accepting an office of profit under the statute. Now, there is no question about that. A case occurred in 1840 or 1841, when Sir Edward Sugden was appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He was at that time member for Ripon. It was said he had accepted the office of Lord Chancellor, but he took his seat in the House and continued to vote. Attention was called to it by Sir Thomas Wilde, who was a member of the House, and a discussion took place. Sir Robert Peel endeavoured to continue to Sir Edward his seat, that the patent had not issued, and that it was necessary the patent should issue before he vacated his seat. There was great doubt that the proposition put forward by him was correct, and the general feeling in the House of Commons was, that it was a strained construction of the Act, that Sir Edward, after accepting the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland, had not vacated his seat as member for Ripon. We find that principle is laid down in several other cases which have been referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell. Now, Mr. Speaker, all that is with regard to the second section, of which so much has been said. I think the attention of the House has not been sufficiently called to the first section. It makes a radical change in regard to the Act concerning the independence. It reads as follows:—

"Provided further, that nothing in this section shall render ineligible any person holding any office, commission or employment of the nature or description mentioned in sub-section (*a*) of this section, as a member of the House of Commons, or shall disqualify him from sitting or voting therein, if by his commission or other instrument of appointment it is declared or provided that he shall hold such office, commission or employment without any salary, fees, wages, allowances or emolument, or other profit of any kind that may be attached thereto."

That at once changes the position of every member of this House and every member of the Government. According to the argument of the Secretary of State, and of the member for Toronto, any member can be appointed to any office, and have his expenses paid, and still hold his seat in the House. It strikes me that the whole principle of the Act is that when members become Ministers of the Crown, when a change of Government takes place, the members who take office must go back to their constituents to see if they approve the course they have taken. That is the principle; but if it is the case that any Minister of the Crown, without any exception, can take an office without salary and hold his seat, not only during one Session but during the whole Parliament, and have a vote every year in the Estimates to reimburse his expenses, then any member of this House, simply with a commission, may travel across the water, or go to any portion of the world he pleases, and have all his expenses borne by the country. I ask hon. members opposite if they are prepared to make that precedent. It is outside the case of Sir Charles Tupper. It is with a principle that we are dealing now. It seems to me that if the Government had represented to this Parliament, before this Bill was brought in, that under a mistaken view of the law, Sir Charles Tupper had unintentionally violated the Act in accepting this office, the Government might and should then have brought in a Bill of Indemnity relieving him from penalty; but at the same time, to tack on to that Bill a whole general law with regard to this subject, is quite another thing. and we have got now, in accepting this Bill, to make the radical change contained in the first section and to accept the two propositions of the hon. member; first, that although Sir Charles Tupper has accepted the office, he has never ceased to be a member; and second, that he is not liable to penalties. This Bill is different from any other Bill ever brought forward. To tack this on to the Bill is to strike at the whole principle of the independence of Parliament, both in the Act passed in 1867 and the Act of 1878.

Mr. BRECKEN. My hon. colleague, in his argument, instanced the case of Mr. Perry, in Prince Edward Island. Now, the great objection that has been raised to this Bill is not so much that it attempts to indemnify the Minister of Railways—if he has violated the Independence of Parliament Act—

as that it is legislating him into this House; that we are discharging the functions that properly belong to the electors of Cumberland. Now, with respect to the case of Mr. Perry, I happened to be a member of the Government at the time, and the case, as I now recollect it, was this: There was no provision in our Local Acts for a Speaker to resign. Dual representation was not permissible. Mr. Perry went to his constituency and was returned to this Parliament at the Dominion Election, in 1873. Before that time, he was ineligible—there is no doubt about that. The question was thoroughly looked into, and there was no doubt about the question in that Province, and that opinion was backed up by the action taken by this Parliament, when they thought it necessary to pass an Act of Indemnity. They actually made him a member of Parliament by an Act of the Dominion Parliament, because no one doubted that he was ineligible at the time. There was no provision in our Island laws, by which the Speaker of the Local Legislature could resign: it is true that his constituents elected him, knowing that to be the fact. I suppose every man is assumed to know the law, but practically, and in fact, it was not known. The question did not come up until after Mr. Perry was elected, if I remember aright. I was Attorney-General of the Province at the time, and the question was not brought to the attention of the public until after he was elected for this Parliament. At that time he was ineligible; still, Parliament passed an Act to confirm him in his seat. I am not going to say whether Parliament was right or wrong. Dual representation was illegal, and they might have looked upon that as a technical violation of the law, but not a violation of its spirit, inasmuch as Mr. Perry had resigned. I think my colleague is hardly correct in saying that Mr. Perry went all around the political compass before resigning. I think he made an attempt to resign; however, he was not eligible. Now, Mr. Speaker, assuming that there is a grave doubt in this case, all the analogy I see between this case and Mr. Perry's is, that Mr. Perry was altogether ineligible under the law; that there was a defect in the law under which Mr. Perry was elected—a law which permitted dual representation. What is the case in regard to the Minister of Railways? Will hon. gentlemen say, when they look at the spirit and intention, that it was a gross and flagrant violation of the principles involved in the Independence of Parliament Act? I say, no. If hon. gentlemen will look at the matter in the calm, impartial spirit recommended by the Secretary of State, they will come to the conclusion—I am assuming, for argument's sake, that the Act has been infringed—that if there was an infringement it was a technical one. What is the spirit and intention of the Independence of Parliament Act? It is to prevent the Cabinet of the day from using undue and improper influence and inducements to lead members to sacrifice their independence, that members shall be placed beyond the reach of temptation, and that the Government of the day shall be powerless to tempt them, either by offers of office or distribution of patronage, to withdraw from the allegiance to the party which they think it their duty to support. But here is the Minister of Railways, a member of the Cabinet himself, a prominent member, and while we are not supposed to know what takes place in the Cabinet Council, we are satisfied, from the prominent position he occupies in the country and on the floor of Parliament, that he is one of the members who largely moulds the policy of the Government. How can it, therefore, be said that the Minister has violated the spirit of the Act, or that the principle established by the Act, for protecting hon. members from being unduly influenced, has been in any way infringed. If a doubt exists, it is a technical one. How was the appointment made? Here is a Canadian statesman offered the position of High Commissioner. In the most open manner possible he accepts one of the most public positions in the gift of the Government, and he goes to England as High Commissioner to represent the Dominion. Can any hon. member think that he was actuated by a desire that was unpatriotic and discreditable to him as a public man. Whatever he did, whether it was right or wrong, he did openly and above board, and in such an open and public way that if the Independence of Parliament Act were infringed, the Minister could not expect to avoid the matter being brought up. It is a case quite different to that of a member who takes a contract on the sly, for this was done most openly. Then hon gentlemen have raised a very nice point, saying that the Act declares that the High Commissioner is to receive a salary not exceeding $10,000 a year, and that the commission under the Great Seal which appointed Sir Charles Tupper, sets forth that he accepts the office without salary. It may be a very nice point whether taking the appointment under such a commission, Sir Charles Tupper could not afterwards claim the salary specified in the Act. What was stated by the First Minister? He said the Minister of Railways was in ill-health, and was going home to England for a short time, and his colleagues thereupon suggested that he should fill this office for a time. When the hon. gentleman accepted the office on that suggestion, he specially stated that he took it without salary. It is no argument, in construing the Act, to allude to the very valuable services which that distinguished statesman has rendered to the country. It is a reason, however, why the question should be discussed solely on its merits, and no reflection be attempted to be cast on that hon. gentleman, for I am sure the duties which he performed as High Commissioner—and I read them this morning in one of the journals of the day—were very onerous, and saved the country an immense amount of money. I admit, as I have said, that this is no argument in construing the Act; but we cannot forget the case of Mr. Perry, who was ineligible to sit here and yet who sat here in 1878, by virtue of an Act of the Dominion Parliament, emanating from hon. gentlemen who then held the reins of power. The present case may be looked upon as a technical violation of the law. Assuming the Minister of Railways to have been guilty of a technical violation of the law, the spirit of the law has not been encroached upon; there has been no attempt to interfere with the independence of Parliament; but the hon. gentleman's course has been above board and rebuts the presumption of attempting to act in a manner which the Act is intended to prevent. I think Parliament will not be establishing a dangerous precedent in saying that if a doubt exists that doubt should be removed. My colleague (Mr. Davies) stated, and I was sorry to hear him say it, that perhaps one reason why the Minister of Railways adopted this course was, because he did not intend to come back and take his seat in Parliament. What is the use of imputing such a motive, when an hon. gentleman, whose constitution was impaired, owing to the great length of time he had devoted himself to public duties, went to England under such circumstances. There is another point which I wish to mention. If this Act does pass, I do not think that the most out-and-out opponent of the measure will be able to impute to this side of the House, or to the Conservative party, that they find it necessary to legislate Sir Charles Tupper into Parliament. I admit that that is no argument to apply to the consideration of the Statute, but still it has an important bearing upon the motives which influence hon. gentlemen in voting for the Bill. Sir Charles Tupper is a statesman who occupies as prominent a position in Nova Scotia as the position occupied in Ontario by the right hon. First Minister, by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, by the late hon. George Brown, or by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He represented that Province for twenty-nine years, and he came here the sole Conservative and advocate of Confederation from that

Province, and he has reaped a reward that has fallen to the lot of few public men. He has seen his most able and determined opponents, year after year, sitting side by side with him, and as I heard an hon. gentleman say a few years ago, in alluding to his political career, if he commands a large majority he owes it to his great abilities as a statesman. Under these circumstances, I say that no hon. gentleman can say that we had any fear about the re-election of Sir Charles Tupper, for the county of Cumberland. Therefore, I say, that those hon. gentlemen who may think proper to vote for this Bill, vote for it as hon. gentlemen voted to sustain Mr. Perry in remaining in Parliament, because there was a technical objection in the Act.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dodd,	McLelan,
Allison (Hants),	Dugas,	McNeill,
Amyot,	Dundas,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	Moffat,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Bell,	Foster,	Orton,
Belleau,	Gagné,	Paint,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Benson,	Girouard,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hastings),
Brecken,	Hall,	Ross,
Bryson,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hesson,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Smyth,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Taylor,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Temple,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Tupper (Pictou),
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Tyrwhitt,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Valin,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (Albert),
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Coughlin,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Coursol,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Curran,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	Wigle,
Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	McGreevy,	Woodworth.—105.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	Mills,
Allison (Lennox),	Forbes,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Barnier,	Gunn,	Ray.
Blake,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Somerville (Bruce).
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Casey,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Cook,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Wells,
Fairbank,	McIsaac,	Wilson.—56.
Fisher,	McMullen,	

Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to on a division.

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed Resolution (page 825) to authorise the acquisition for the Dominion, from the Government of Nova Scotia, of the Eastern Extension Railway from New Glasgow to the Gut of Canso, and the Steam Ferry in connection therewith, together with the rights of the said Province in the Truro and Pictou Branch Railway. He said: After having had the honour of occupying the attention of the House at its present stage for so long a period, I shall trespass as briefly as possible on the attention of the House in moving the resolution which I have in my hand. I may say, Sir, that it will be in the recollection of the House that several years ago, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was leading the House, the policy of appropriating the Pictou Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, for the purpose of providing for the extension of the railway system of Nova Scotia, was submitted to the consideration of this House. On that occasion, Sir, I gave that proposition my very hearty and cordial support, as I believed it would be a measure which would be advantageous to the country. It will be also recollected that the Manager of the Intercolonial Railway, at that time, took very strong exception to the proposal to transfer the Pictou Branch—to cut it off from being part of the Intercolonial Railway. Mr. Brydges, who is thoroughly acquainted with the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, took the ground that the Branch from Truro to Pictou was not only the most profitable portion of the Intercolonial Railway, but that it was, in fact, the only portion of that railway that was profitable, and that yielded a net profit in return for its operation. The objections to severing that portion of the Intercolonial Railway from the Intercolonial system was urged also on other grounds than its being the most valuable portion of the road. I must confess, Sir, that the further experience in connection with the operation of the Intercolonial Railway has proved the soundness of the view which Mr. Brydges urged, as to the importance of its being retained as a portion of the Intercolonial Railway system. The Branch from Truro to Pictou involves the connection between the large coal mining districts of Pictou and the city and harbour of Halifax; and from its important connection with the transport of coal, and the coaling of steamers at the port of Halifax, and the development of the various industries which largely depend upon the coal region, from a variety of causes, it was found that it would be attended with great inconvenience and disadvantage, and that, in fact, parting with it would, to a large extent, dislocate the railway system as it had been carried on. The Government, however, of which the hon. gentleman was the leader, having put an Act upon the Statute Book under which the Pictou Branch was to become the property of the parties who would extend the railway system in Nova Scotia, that of course, required to be carried out. It was hoped, in the first instance, that it would not only promote the construction of a railway from the town of New Glasgow to the Gut of Canso, but an extension of the railway system in the Island of Cape Breton. It was subsequently found that the best terms that could be obtained by the Government of Nova Scotia to secure the extension of the road to the Gut of Canso, involved not only the necessity of taking over the Branch from Truro to Pictou, but of paying some $600,000 over and above the value of the Pictou Branch. The House is familiar with the difficulties that arose between the contractors and the Government of Nova Scotia; and also with the facts of the transfer of the Pictou Branch. That was finally settled here, I think, by an Act of 1879, which provided that the Branch would be handed over when the contractors had completed the line. That line has been practically completed from Glasgow to Pictou, and the question came up as to its transfer. The Government acquired the right to the Pictou Branch; negotiations ensued between the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government here in regard to that question; and looking to the difficulties that the Government of Nova Scotia would encounter in

operating a comparatively short line of railway, looking to the increased expenditure that would be involved, looking to the necessity that would arise of increasing the rates upon these roads, and looking to the dislocation of trade that was likely to result from the severence of the Branch, from Truro to Pictou, from the Intercolonial Railway system, it was finally agreed, between the present Government of Nova Scotia and this Government, that we should practically take the position of the Government of Nova Scotia and pay the amount of money they were obliged to pay to the contractors for the Eastern Extension, and that, subject to the sanction of the Legislature of Nova Scotia and this Parliament, this Government should retain the Branch from Truro to Pictou, and should acquire the Eastern Extension Railway from New Glasgow to the Gut of Canso. I may say that although in that particular I believe I entertain a different view from that of a large portion of the party with which I am connected in the Province of Nova Scotia—I refer to that in connection with the administration of local affairs—I am of opinion that the arrangement that has been arrived at is in the interest of the counties through which this portion of railway runs. I believe this policy is also in the interest of the Province of Nova Scotia as well as of the Dominion of Canada. I believe it will not involve any additional expenditure on the part of the Government of this country. The portion of the Intercolonial Railway, between Truro and Pictou, is the only portion that pays a considerable amount of net profit over and above the expenses of operation; and I think the result of this transaction will be that we shall stand in quite as good a financial position at the end of the year as we should if we had lost the Pictou Branch. Regarding, also, the interests of the various industries of Nova Scotia, especially the connection between the coal mining interest of Nova Scotia and the harbour and city of Halifax, I think it will be found that the policy propounded in this resolution is a policy not only in the interest of Nova Scotia, but in the interest of Canada. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is necessary to discuss this question at any length, because I believe the policy which the Government have adopted will meet with the cordial approval of both sides of the House.

Mr. VAIL. I do not intend to oppose the passage of these resolutions; but, as I was a member of the Government in 1877, when the Act was passed authorizing the Government to transfer the Pictou Branch to any company that would construct a road from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, with a steam ferry accross the Strait, I feel that I may be permitted to refer to a few circumstances which have occured since that time, and which have led up to the legislation now proposed. In the first place, it must have been the object of the Government in 1877, in making a transfer of that property, that the property so transferred would result in a benefit to the company constructing the road: and I hold that if it had been intended to hamper the transfer in any way, so as to make the road valueless to the company, after it became possessed of it, it would not be carrying out the object for which the Government intended the road in the first place. The Act of 1877 not only contemplated the transfer of the road after the construction of the line from New Glasgow to Canso, but it contemplated the transfer of the road after $400,000 had been expended upon its construction if the company demanded it; and the object of that was to further assist, if possible, the company, and to enable them to complete the road. A company was formed soon after the Act was passed; they commenced the construction of the road and went on with it until 1879; when there was some difficulty in carrying out the arrangements. Either the work was not being done in a manner satisfactory to the Government, or there was some defect in the charter, or some other difficulty, which resulted in a combined arrangement and agreement being entered into at Ottawa, between the Dominion Government, the Local Government, and the company. Under that agreement, the road was not transferable until its completion from New Glasgow to the Straits of Canso, and it was provided that: "in the event of the said two lines of railway and ferry becoming the property of the Nova Scotia Government." The Eastern Extension Railway should be completed by that Government. Sub-section C of clause one of the agreement reads:

(c) That in the event of the said two lines of railway and ferry becoming the property of the Nova Scotia Government under the preceding subclause before the said Eastern Extension Railway and ferry are completed, equipped and established, the said last named railway and ferry shall, with all reasonable despatch, be completed, equipped and established by the Nova Scotia Government and the said two lines and ferry shall be thereafter efficiently and continuously operated by the Nova Scotia Government to the satisfaction of the Governor General of the Dominion in Council, at a fair and reasonable tariff of charges which shall be made and established by the Nova Scotia Government, subject to the approval of the Government of the Dominion, and which shall only be altered or amended with the assent and approval of the said last-named Government."

It will be observed here that this agreement especially provides for the road falling into the hands of the Government before it is completed, and that on the extension of the road between New Glasgow to Canso, and its equipment, the Local Government, having become the successors of the company, shall be entitled to receive the Pictou Branch upon certain conditions. Under an arrangement subsequently made with the company, the Nova Scotia Government took the power to take over the road from the company, including all their rights and privileges in the Pictou Branch, before a certain day. Before the day named in that agreement, the Government of Nova Scotia, which was then in accord with the Dominion Government, was defeated at the polls. A new Government came in; they took the necessary steps, before the date named in the agreement, to take over the road, and carry out the arrangements with the company. After the Act was passed, two members of the Government came to Ottawa. While here, as the papers show, they had a conference with the hon. Minister of Railways, and they were led to suppose, at that time, that no obstacles would be thrown in the way of a transfer of the road as soon as the Local Government were in a position to receive it. While the two members of Government were in Ottawa, resolutions giving certain subsidies to railways in different parts of the Dominion were under discussion in this House, and the question was put across the floor by the leader of the Opposition to the Minister of Railways, as to what arrangements had been made in regard to the Pictou road, and what position it was in. On that occasion, the hon. Minister of Railways used the following words, which may be found in the *Hansard*, page 1332:

"The Committee are aware that under the legislation which has already taken place, the Government of Canada agreed to hand over the branch from Truro to Pictou, for the purpose of securing the construction of the line eastward. The Government of Nova Scotia, with an additional subsidy, secured the construction of the line of railway to the Strait of Canso. Under the existing legislation, the whole of that property is therefore the property of the Eastern Extension Company; but the Government of Nova Scotia made a contract with that company, which bound the company in case the Government, by a certain time, paid them their actual expenditure, irrespective of the subsidy which had been given to them, to hand over to the Government of Nova Scotia the whole property. The arbitration provided for in that contract between the company, and the Government of Nova Scotia, is now taking place. It is expected that in a few days the road from Truro to the Strait of Canso will be in possession of the Government of Nova Scotia, and the Government of Nova Scotia are anxious to utilize that for the purpose or securing the extension of the railway system to Sydney or Louisburg, in Cape Breton."

That is the plain statement the hon. Minister of Railways made in this House last year, and it shows, I think, and ought to convince this House, that it was his intention to hand over the Pictou Branch as soon as the New Scotia Government were in a position to receive it. Nothing more was done in reference to this matter, except that the Local

Government proceeded under the authority of the Statute to borrow the money to pay for the Eastern Extension, about $1,250,000; they proceeded to close the arrangements with the company and paid them $500,000 on account; they agreed to take over the road on the first of October and pay the balance, and early in August I think. On the 11th August, the Commissioner of Public Works in Nova Scotia, informed the hon. Minister of Railways that arrangements had been made for the transfer of the Eastern Extension; and on the 20th of the same month, the Manager of the Railway, Mr. Scott, was sent to Ottawa to arrange the details with the Manager of the Government road for the transfer of the branch. Mr. Scott was then informed that no action could be taken until September; but on the 6th of September the business would be taken up. He consequently returned to Nova Scotia, and it was not until the 4th of October that any action was taken. In the meantime, the Nova Scotia Government was obliged to take over the road from the company and raise the money to pay the balance, and of course they had to work the line of railway between New Glasgow and Canso without the Pictou Branch. Two members of Government came to Ottawa in October, in hopes to get the matter settled; and, notwithstanding this conversation had taken place with the Minister of Railways, that I have referred to, in May last, and notwithstanding his utterances in the House at that time, and notwithstanding that the Dominion Government knew all through the summer that these negotiations were going on, that they were perfected, and that the Local Government was bound to take over the road on the 1st October, still they never gave the slightest intimation or hint that they intended to throw any obstacles in the way of the transfer of the road, until an Order in Council was passed on the 4th October, and I think it was not until some few days after that, that the Government of Nova Scotia were made aware that such an Order in Council had been passed. That Order in Council is based upon an opinion of the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Justice recites the Act on which the Order in Council is based, and he states that:

"The only obligation of the Government of Canada to the Government of Nova Scotia, in respect to the Pictou Branch, is to be found in the Act above recited, and whether into the hands of "the company" or of the Government of Nova Scotia, it is, in my opinion, contemplated that the Government of the Dominion shall only divest itself of the Pictou Branch after the Eastern Extension and ferry shall have been 'completed, equipped and established,' and the tariff of charges settled. This, it is represented to me, has not been accomplished; the ferry and the appurtenances have not been 'completed and established,' the railway has not been 'equipped,' and the tariff of charges has not been submitted to the Government of Canada and approved. A memorandum, specifying what rolling stock was necessary to the 'equipment' of the road, is stated to have been furnished to the Nova Scotia Government so far back as last spring. It will be observed that, under the language of the Act as quoted above, the two lines of railway and the ferry are to be 'efficiently and continuously operated,' by the Nova Scotia Government, at a fair and reasonable tariff of charges, to be made and established by the Nova Scotia Government, subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council. The steps which it would seem necessary for the Government of Nova Scotia to to take in the matter now, in order to become entitled to the transfer of the Pictou Branch are—first, the providing of the necessary equipment for the two lines of railway; second, the completion and establishment of the ferry and appurtenances; and third, the submission to the Government of Canada of a tariff of charges, to be approved by His Excellency in Council."

Now, there is no such thing to be found in either of the Statutes or in the agreement, that the Government of the Dominion would require from the Nova Scotia Government that both lines should be equipped before the line was transferred. The Act and the agrement state that the line from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso was to be properly equipped and worked and completed to the satisfaction of the Nova Scotia Government, but there is no place to be found in the Statute where it states that the Pictou Branch should be equipped, and equipped to the satisfaction of the Dominion Government, before it was transferred.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand my hon friend to mean that the Government of Nova Scotia could have taken over the Pictou Branch and not operated it—could have taken it over without being able to operate it and maintain it? The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that is not the case.

Mr. VAIL. No; I mean that, reading the agreement and the Statute based upon it, it was not necessary even for the Eastern Extension to be completed before the Nova Scotia Government, as successors of the company could call upon the Dominion Government to hand over the Pictou Branch, because it says they shall go on to complete it according to the original arrangement with the Government, so that it could not have been contemplated——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, if the hon. gentleman admits that the Government of Nova Scotia were bound to operate the Pictou Branch, he must necessarily admit that they must be provided with rolling stock, and that the Government had a perfect right, knowing that they were bound to operate the road, to take care not to dislocate the whole traffic of the country by putting that line in their hands when they could not operate it.

Mr. VAIL. I do not admit that. The Dominion Government could in that case fall back upon the Act, which provides that, if they did not work it to the satisfaction of the Dominion Government by giving three months notice, they could become possessed of the road again. That was the remedy, but there is nothing in the Statute to say that the Local Government must put the rolling stock on the road before asking that it be handed over. If it was intended, in the first place, when the first enactment was made, authorizing the Government to transfer the road, that they were to put such conditions upon it as were required by the Dominion Government, before it was handed over, the object would have been frustrated; the property would have been useless, it would have been an elephant on their hands—they could not have done it. Now, the Minister of Justice states that this road was to be completed and equipped between New Glasgow and Canso. But previous to that time, the Manager of the Government railways, Mr. Schreiber, as long ago as the 28th July, 1882, after having examined the road, states in an official letter that the road was completed:

"I may say I went over the works some time ago, and so far as a cursory examination admitted of it, it certainly appeared to me that they had built a good, substantial road, and upon enquiry at the Straits of Canso I learned that the steamer employed had performed her service fairly well. If I am right in my views, it would appear as if the company were entitled to receive the road."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman aware that this same Government had declared that the road was not finished?

Mr. VAIL. That does not touch the case at all. My hon. friend seems to think that my desire is to say something that will prevent these resolutions being passed. That is not my intention.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I should fancy not.

Mr. VAIL. But I think it is well that the House should have the history of the whole case, because having taken authority to borrow money, and having to borrow it in the English market——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where the hon. gentleman himself had rendered it impossible for them to get a dollar.

Mr. VAIL. I did not interfere with my hon. friend when he was making his speech, and he should not interrupt me now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I imagine it would be a case of "save me from my friends."

Mr. VAIL. There would have been no difficulty if they had returned the £52,000 deposited by Barings as security for the syndicate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That you have since admitted you have to return.

Mr. VAIL. The Local Government admitted that they have to return the money——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. VAIL—in consequence of an unknown agreement made by the hon. Minister's friends before they went out of power.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They had better return it before they lost their credit.

Mr. VAIL. This is beside the subject, and I should not have diverged if the hon. gentleman had not interrupted me, and I have been obliged to follow him. He has made the divergence, not I. So that really the company had complied with all the requirements of the Dominion and Local Government when Mr. Schreiber was enabled to make that statement, and the conditions spoken of by the Minister of Justice had really been complied with. In October, the members of Government, finding that the Dominion Government did not intend to transfer the road without coupling such conditions with it as to make it valueless to them, returned to Nova Scotia, determined not to do anything, and it was not until late in December that they were finally obliged, in consequence of the obstacles thrown in the way, and I think I may properly say, unfairly thrown in the way of their obtaining the Pictou Branch. The Order in Council refers to a statement of the rolling stock that would be required on the Pictou Branch before the Nova Scotia Government would be entitled to receive it from the Dominion Government, and it was referred for a report to the Manager of the Nova Scotia road, a man who is well known in Canada, at least in the Province of Quebec, as very well qualified to give an opinion on what would be required on a road of that kind. I refer to Mr. Scott, who was the General Manager of the Nova Scotia road, and he states that:

"In compliance with your instructions, I beg to submit to you my views respecting two of the main conditions named by the Dominion Government that, from their standpoint, they consider necessary your Government should fulfil, before transferring the Pictou Branch Railway.

"In the report of a Committee of the hon. Privy Council, dated the 20th October, 1883, the first condition reads as follows: 'That the assignees agree to a tariff of rates upon a mileage basis, framed on the intercolonial Railway tariff of charges for traffic to and from the Pictou Branch.'

"Now, in assenting to this condition, as I interpret it, your Government would, of necessity, be obliged to accept the present tariff in force on the Intercolonial Railway as the basis upon which to calculate the proportionate rates to accrue to the 'Nova Scotia Railway.' The Eastern Extension Railway showing a mileage of eighty (80) miles, and the Pictou Branch fifty-two (52) miles, gives a total of 132 miles to be operated by your Government, as against 840 miles of the Intercolonial system. As the bulk of the traffic, coal, is confined to only forty (40) miles of the Pictou Branch, viz., from New Glasgow to Truro, I consider it equitable to compare the mileage of the two railways, as forty (40) is to 618 miles (Truro to Chaudière).

"On the conditions imposed your Government is bound to carry freight over the forty miles on a proportionate basis. It must be remembered that the traffic having its chief source at New Glasgow and Stellarton (coal districts), the heavy charges for terminal expenses, such as employees, heavy wear and tear of siding track and motive power in shunting, and all contingent terminal work, will fall upon the Nova Scotia Railway, with its small mileage. Apart from this, the Branch has heavy and long grades, with severe curvature, to contend with, as against comparatively easy grades and fair alignment. These are the practical difficulties to be met with in operating the Pictou Branch.

"Your Government being asked to accept a pro rata on a mileage basis, the question arises as to the margin of profit left for the Branch. From my experience, rates are established between connecting lines (were the bulk of traffic consist of coal and iron ores) on an equal mileage basis, or virtually on a local tariff, where the difference in mileage is so great. The local rates for freight on the Intercolonial Railway, as far as ordinary merchandise, lumber, etc., are concerned, are far out of proportion to those of roads of a similar character to the Pictou Branch, in point of competition. Had the conditions been pro rata on the tariff now in force between Pictou Landing and Halifax, the question would be one difficult to solve. But, to ask that a road of forty (40) miles (bearing all the heavy terminal expenses) should pro rata with a railway of the length of the Intercolonial, upon a large coal traffic, is a proposition totally impracticable, and at variance with all past usage.

"To illustrate the position, I beg to submit the following figures, showing what proportion the Pictou Branch would receive, taking the present tariff and last year's traffic as a guide:

1st. Shipped to Halifax, 1882, 60,000 tons (about) average 9-10th cent per ton per mile on 40 miles (Pictou Branch)	$21,630 00
Shipped to Londonderry, 1882, 70,000 tons, at 1-2 cent per mile, 40 miles	14,000 00
Shipped to Chaudière, 35,000 tons	4,500 00
Total	$40,150 00

This would give about 6-10ths of a cent per ton per mile on 40 miles of road (Pictou Branch).

2nd. Shipped to local points between New Glasgow, Halifax and Moncton, 52,000 tons, at 1 1-4 (average) cents per ton per mile on 40 miles	$27,400 00
3rd. Shipped to Pictou Landing, 63,000 tons, at 2 cents per ton per mile	$10,080 00

SUMMARY.

Lots Nos. 1 and 2—217,000 tons x 40 miles=8,680,000 tons moved one mile, at average 778-1000th cents per ton per mile	$67,530 00
Lot No. 3—63,000 tons x 8 miles=504,000 tons moved one mile, at average 2 cents per ton per mile	10,080 00
Total receipts (gross) for moving 280,000 tons.	$77,610 00

Now the House will see at once that it would be quite impossible for any Government or any company to take over the road and be obliged to run it upon a tariff of that kind. Then, as regards the rolling stock the Dominion Government required from the Local Government, I will just refer to a table comparing the two railways. The Intercolonial is 840 miles long, and the Nova Scotia road is 130 miles. On the Intercolonial there were 1,018 coal cars, and the Dominion Government required on the Nova Scotia Railway, 550. The total rolling stock at present on the whole Intercolonial is put down as worth $3,580,000. They wanted the Nova Scotia Government to put rolling stock on their road to the amount of $843,000. The gross earnings per mile on the Intercolonial road have been $2,500, but on the Nova Scotia road it would only be $1,800; so the House will see that the conditions that were required of the Nova Scotia Government, in taking over this road, were entirely out of proportion to anything that is required elsewhere. Mr. Scott's report shows clearly that it is quite out of proportion to any rolling stock or rate that is required on any road, either in Canada or in the United States, and it will be seen that in Pennsylvania, the roads charge 1¼ cents per ton per mile for carrying coal, but the Dominion Government actually wanted to oblige the Local Government to carry coal over the Pictou road for ⅝ of a cent per mile. That was a condition that no Government could have accepted. I do not think that the Local Government received fair treatment from the Dominion Government. I do not believe the Dominion Government would so have treated the Local Government of Nova Scotia, if they had been in accord with the Dominion Government instead of being politically opposed. The hon. Minister of Railways has asked the House to adopt these resolutions. It is better, I think, in the interests of the coal mines of Nova Scotia, it is better perhaps in the interests of the counties through which the road passes, and it is better I am sure, in the interests of the Dominion Government, in a pecuniary point of view, that these resolutions should pass, and that the Dominion Government should hold the road. I only hope that now as they are taking over this valuable property, they will carry out the obligations that I think rested upon the Local Government when they took over the Eastern Extension, and expected to get the Pictou road, and that was to extend the line through the Island of Cape Breton. I hope that the Dominion Government will remember this, and that they will feel bound to do what is neces-

sary to complete the line from Canso to Louisburg, or to the eastern end of Cape Breton.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Owing to the lateness of the hour, I will not speak on these resolutions to-night, but reserve my remarks for another stage.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have a word or two to say about this matter. I am not going to reply to the remarks of the hon. member from Nova Scotia, because there is always a Nova Scotian ready to do that from this side of the House. I want to call the attention of the House to what transpired when this Bill, transferring the Pictou road to the Nova Scotia Government, was passed. It will be remembered, at that time, when hon. gentlemen who are now in Opposition held the reins of power, they brought in that Bill, and at that time—perhaps the Minister of Railways will excuse me for referring to the fact—that Minister seemed to be in perfect accord with the Government in the transfer of that very important Dominion property to the Nova Scotia Government. It was one of those strong evidences of the strong desire he always has to serve Nova Scotia interests, even at the cost of the Dominion Government. I admire him very much for it; he is exactly the kind of Minister we want for New Brunswick. I only wish that the course pursued by the Minister of Railways were followed by some other Ministers a little nearer home. I called the attention of the Government to the course pursued at that time. There were in the Government, at that time, four members who united with myself, and I was then their leader, because there were three parties in the House then, as now: the Government of the day, represented by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the regular Oppsition, led by the present Premier, and a kind of guerilla Opposition mainly led by myself. If there ever was a measure brought before the House that I fought against, it was that for the transfer of the Pictou Branch from the hands of the Dominon Government. I will not occupy the time of the House by reading my remarks on that occasion; but at every stage I opposed the Bill; on its second reading, in Committee, and on its third reading I moved a rider and divided the House on it. I predicted that the time would come when the road would be retransferred, and I declared that the Dominion Government had allowed to pass out of its hands one of the great feeders to the Intercolonial; and I am proud to see that my warning on that occasion proved correct, and that there are four hon. gentlemen who have received a proper reward for their foresight, now in a position to help to get back into the hands of the Dominion Government that property which never should have left it.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I cannot allow these resolutions to pass without offering a few remarks. I have taken some interest in this railway question from its inception to the present time, and I have watched it very carefully. I do not intend to go into it in detail; but I find myself almost unable, from a Nova Scotia point of view, to give my vote for these resolutions. From a Dominion point of view and as a member of the Dominion Parliament which is entrusted with the interests of seven Provinces, I can vote for them. Looking at the matter merely from a Provincial standpoint, I think the Dominion Government has not driven a hard bargain with the Government of Nova Scotia, as was said by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail); but owing to the unbusiness like way in which the Local Government approached the Dominion Government, owing to the want of business tact, owing to their own neglect, they threw away an asset worth $4,000,000 for $1,200,000. I do not think the Minister of Railways is to blame. I think the acting Minister of Railways, who represented the Minister of Railways, who was in England when the negotiations were going on, was not to blame. They were acting with the Local Government under a proposition made by that Government, and no man ever heard of any person offering more than the other party to a bargain chose to ask and accept. The hon. member for Digby forgets that on 30th May last, the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia sent a dispatch asking the Dominion Government if they would take the Pictou road and the Eastern road and pay them what they had paid out, and the expenses of the arbitration. That was the foundation of the proposition. The Local Government came here last fall and perfected the arrangement. Now, the hon. member for Digby says he is going to support the resolutions. He finds himself between the old boy and the deep sea. In his anxiety to serve his friends in Nova Scotia, whose servant he was and delegate he was, and who charged for his services the small sum, but the very large sum in view of Nova Scotia's financial distress, described by him, $2,000, for his trip to England last summer, in conducting these negotiations, the hon. gentleman finds himself compelled to vote for these resolutions. If he does not, he stabs his friends, the Local Government, and he is well aware that the Province is very much excited over this matter at the present time. He knows the very great difficulty experienced by the Reform Local Government in holding together, because their own friends are annoyed at the wilful neglect of public duties and the unbusiness-like way in which they, the Local Government, conducted this transaction, handing over a property worth $4,000,000 for $1,200,000, and their offer is in writing and has been brought down with the correspondence. The hon. member for Digby has said that if the Local Government were the friends of the Dominion Government they would have been differently treated. I do not believe so. I expected to hear the hon. gentleman give some reason for the vote he is about to give. But he said, no; he merely wanted to show—and I could not see from his speech how he did show it—that the Dominion Government had dealt hardly with the Nova Scotia Government. I do not blame the Minister of Railways for saying that the Dominion Government had made a good bargain. I believe the Local Government, constituted as it is, had better be rid of it and have the $1,200,000 in their pockets, if they possess no better business qualifications than they have displayed in this transaction, for it is quite apparent they could not have run the railway successfully. The Minister of Railways is too much of a statesman to attack and cast slurs at anyone unless attacked, and he therefore said nothing about the Local Government; but I thought I detected, by reading between the lines, what his opinion was. What was the hon. gentleman to do. Fourteen members of the Dominion Government, representing the whole country, received a proposition for the sale of the whole line. It was presented by the members of the Nova Scotia Government, and the proposition was to hand over the road on being refunded the outlay. Looking to the Province of his birth he might have wished to have given them more, and he might have felt sore with these men, this Local Government, for having acted in such an unbusiness-like way. But it was impossible for him to ask more from the Dominion Government, of which he was a member, than the Local Government requested they should have. He is obliged to defend his resolution and he could not do it; for, as the hon. member for Digby said in closing, it is a good bargain for the Dominion Government. It is a good bargain, and he, the hon. member from Digby, may thank his friends in Nova Scotia that the Dominion Government made a little more than $3,000,000 from that Province.

Mr. BLAKE. I had not intended taking part in the discussion, but the statement of the hon. gentleman is such, that a word is required to be said about it. The hon. gentleman says that $4,000,000 is the value of this asset, and it could be sold to the Dominion Government for $1,200,000.

I think the whole question may be put in a nutshell. The Government of Nova Scotia felt, as I understand, that unless with a considerably increased tariff of freights, and especially for coal, they could not make money out of this enterprise if they owned it, the Government of the Dominion declined—rightly or wrongly I will not now discuss—to allow the transfer except a tariff should be settled, and they proposed as a general principle, the application of the existing tariff, which was a low tariff and a tariff over a long line to a short line. Now, presumably, that policy is the policy which is to be continued to be adopted by the Dominion Government. But the hon. Minister of Railways has said that he believes that the general result of this transaction will be to leave the work of the Intercolonial system, with this addition, just about where it was before; that is to say, I suppose, that there will be some loss on the Extension line, and considering the interest on the purchase price; but that that is made up by retaining the Pictou Branch, which has been profitable. Well, if the line is to be administered—and I am not now discussing the policy of administering it on those principles—on the policy of the Intercolonial, if these results which the Minister of Railways expects from this transaction are to be the results, I think it is quite clear that the Dominion has not acquired a very profitable asset, it has acquired an asset which will leave the result of working the Intercolonial just about where it was, and we will not make a large profit out of the investment. On the other hand, Nova Scotia will have derived this advantage from the transaction, confessedly, that whereas the Local Government stated that their intention was to make this road pay, more by high tariff than by the extent of the trade, the Province of Nova Scotia will not be burthened by that high tariff. The tariff will be kept lower according to the very point of difference between the Minister of Railways and the Government of Nova Scotia. The Province of Nova Scotia states that this is an asset which may be made valuable by raising the operations and the tariff, which will make the road more profitable. The Minister of Railways says: We insist on the tariff being kept where it is at present. The Government of Nova Scotia says: We want to make a profit out of the road at that rate. The Minister of Railways has said about as much to-night, and taking all the considerations together, he thinks it will pay its way, and no more. Well, if it is going to pay its way, as he proposes to raise it, it is going to pay its way to the advantage of Nova Scotia, because the country will be benefited by the lowness of the freights, and therefore the arrangement is one which, if the Province of Nova Scotia was to make profitable, it would do so by burdening the country, by maintaining the rates; and if the Dominion is to be benefited, it is because the tariff is to be kept low. For those reasons, I think the observations of the hon. member for King's are not justifiable.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have filled in the blank with 6½ per cent, as that was the amount of interest which the Province of Nova Scotia was paying the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. It is for a short time?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Resolution to be reported.

ADJOURNMENT—SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC.

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

Mr. COURSOL. I beg to ask the Government whether they will bring down a measure, which it was understood would be submitted to Parliament, for the relief of the Province of Quebec, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway eastward from Ottawa.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention of the Government to bring down a measure on that subject.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:45 o'clock, a. m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adoption of the Second Report (page 704) of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, of course, whatever is necessary to be done in order to get up within a reasonable time the French translation, must be done, but it was arranged at the time an additional French reporter was agreed to be engaged, that both French reporters should be employed, in the very long intervals when they are not engaged in the service of reporting, in translation. As far as I can understand, the work of the French reporters is not more than one-tenth of the ordinary work of the House. It is perhaps less than one-tenth, but I cannot conceive that it is more. It is perfectly obvious, therefore, that nine-tenths or more of their time would be unoccupied, and the distinct understanding was that that large portion of their time would be devoted to translation. Now, if I am correctly informed, up to the period at which the report was presented, no work of translation had been tendered to the French reporters, and consequently no translation had been done by them. I would ask the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Committee as its chairman to say whether this is the fact, or what is the fact as to the amount of work of translation that has been done this Session, or had been done up to the time this report was presented.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that the hon. gentleman is quite right in his statement. It was rather a surprise to the Committee when the fact was stated that the two French reporters had not been employed in translation. The statement was made that the French reporters, although very excellent reporters—and I may say here that it is very difficult to get good French stenographers—were not good translators. But orders were given immediately that they should be employed. I may say, however, that, even with that additional assistance, from a closer examination made of the duty of translating by the Committee, we think the work still requires a larger number if the French copy is to be got out in anything like reasonable time. I am quite satisfied that some other method will have to be adopted, because the present method is going to be expensive. I think the Committee will probably see whether something cannot be done before the close of the Session, and to recommend some other method to the House. I may state that up to the 8th of February we had no night sittings, and up to that time there were eighty eight pages translated of the revised English edition of *Hansard*. Since that time night sittings began, and from that moment the French copy went behind. The Chief Translator says:

"To come now to the night sittings. We were translating report from the first one of them (8th February) on the 18th. From that date (the 18th) to this day, we have received copy (revised edition) to page

400, and sent manuscript translation to page 317 from 118. This makes—striking out two Sundays and one legal holiday—199 pages for 13 days of work. Adding to this several pages translated into English from the advanced sheet, and also Sir Charles Tupper's second speech on the Pacific loan, we have about 214 pages of manuscript translation in 13 days. If we now take into account the fact that 214 pages of English *Hansard* mean about 234 of French, we have 18 pages of manuscript translated per day, since the midnight sittings' reports commenced to come in, by a staff of five translators, which I consider over the average that could be reasonably expected from us unless requested to work on Sundays."

I believe that statement is sustained by those who are engaged in the work of translation. Three pages per day of *Hansard* by one translator is considered very good work. Of course, everyone understands that translating is much more difficult than mere transcribing, that it requires sometimes a good deal of care to render the exact meaning of the speaker. The ordinary number of pages per day of *Hansard* for one of our long sittings, lasting, say, till midnight, is about thirty pages; consequently at the rate mentioned it would require ten translators to do the work, and to keep up with the English copy. Now, we propose by this report to add two gentlemen for the balance of the Session, who will be paid at the rate of one translator, and by that means we hope the balance of the work will be got out in such a way as at the end of the Session there will be no further French arrears than there is to-day. I know that a good deal of dissatisfaction exists among the French members of the House as to the French copy, and I may say that one of the difficulties in connection with it has been that the translators have been accustomed to translate only from the revised edition of the English *Hansard*, and that although by the rules the revised English reports have to be handed in to the reporters within twenty-four hours from the time the speech was delivered, as a matter of fact, in practice, owing, probably, to the circumstance that leading members of the House—Ministers and leading members of the Opposition—have not much time for revision, considerable delay takes place, and I think at this moment the revised edition is thirteen or fourteen days behind. With the staff of reporters we now have at the table—and I can say with some knowledge of what I am talking about as to that matter, that I do not believe there is to be found anywhere a more efficient and a more thorough staff than we now have—with that staff I believe we could go on with the translation into French, of the daily edition, without any trouble whatever, with the understanding, of course, that the French members who speak in English shall have an opportunity of revising their report before it is put into type. So far as the English members are concerned, I do not think they would require that privilege. If that were done, we would be able to get the French copy out a great deal sooner than we have been able to do in the past. I may say, however, Mr. Speaker, that even though the service of the two French reporters were utilized for the balance of this Session, these two extra translators will still be required.

Mr. BLAKE. I should be sorry myself if the last suggestion of the hon. gentleman were adopted—that is to say, that the permanent French record should be taken from the unrevised English *Hansard*. I think, probably, the result would be a good many complaints arising out of a misconception of what hon. gentlemen have said, especially when we are told that the revised *Hansard* not unfrequently is quite a different document from the unrevised *Hansard*. That there are still materially important alterations required may be assumed from what the hon. gentleman has said, that the staff is unable to get the revised copy back within the prescribed twenty-four hours. My impression is if that rule were rigorously adhered to, and if it were thoroughly understood that as soon as the clock indicated that the twenty-four hours had expired the unrevised copy would be set up, that much of those difficulties would be got rid of

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

All that the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the subject matter of my enquiry renders it only more pressing that the services of the French reporters should be utilized. I think the House and the Committee are entitled to some further explanation—because I presume the hon. gentleman and the Committee assume that the orders of the House have been carried out—but I say I think the House and the Committee are entitled to some further explanation than has been given, why the Chief Translator, or whoever is in authority, did not obey these orders of the House and did not hand the copy over to the reporters to be translated. The hon. gentleman says the Chief Translator did not do it because he did not think they would do it well—he thought they might be good reporters, but not experienced translators. He had no right to judge of that. This House has ordered that they should be so employed. If they were found inefficient then other persons ought to have been obtained. These were obtained on the understanding that they should be employed to do translating as well as reporting. They were engaged for that purpose, and I presume that it is not from any unwillingness on their part that they have not done so, and I am quite unable to understand on what principle it is that an officer of this House should have deliberately disobeyed the orders of the House and declined to hand over the work, that ought to have been handed to these reporters, until this time, when we are now called upon to pay the consequence of that neglect by an additional expenditure on work which, if it is to go down, it is to go down, very likely, on the ground of its financial cost to the country.

Motion agreed to.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DALY. As it has been the custom of this House to adjourn on St. Patrick's Day at six o'clock I beg, Sir, to move, seconded by Mr. Massue, that when the Speaker leaves the Chair at six o'clock this House do stand adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock p.m.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria). If another Monday is to be allowed for the disposal of ordinary private business and not taken by the Government as Government day, I would have no objections to paying that respect to the observance of St. Patrick's Day, by an adjournment at six o'clock, which has been usual, especially as I have no doubt many members of the House will desire an opportunity of listening to what, I have no doubt, will be an eloquent address of the hon. leader of the Opposition which is to be delivered this evening. But if the Government intend, as I have heard stated, to take next Monday, and the following Mondays of the Session for Government business, I shall be obliged to oppose the motion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Daly); because there is a long list of private business in the hands of private members which has to be disposed of, and that would be defeated if the House were to adjourn at six o'clock. I hope the Government will give another Monday for the disposal of private business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This not being a Government day, we are in the hands of the House. If the majority think that an adjournment should not take place at six o'clock, the Government will graciously submit. I really do not know what is the feeling of the House on the matter. I however express to the House the desire of the Government, if the state of public business will permit, that the House should rise before Easter; time seems to be flitting away on account of the weighty measures and discussions before the House, and these cannot be interrupted either for the convenience of the House or members of the Government, nevertheless I hope that prorogation will

take place at or before Easter. However, that is for the House to consider. If it be not the desire of the House to adjourn at six o'clock, and if there is strong opposition, it will be manifested by hon. members speaking against it; but unless that is the case I will consider that a majority of the House desire that we should follow the usual practice of adjourning at that hour. I do not know that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) can force the Government's hand by asking their intentions for the future; but I take it that all Private Bills will have every opportunity of being discussed and going through or being rejected during the present Session.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that the motion can be put without notice having been given. As the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) has chosen to make reference to myself, I may say that I think it inexpedient to adjourn the House at six o'clock in view of the present state of public business. The First Minister has, for the first time in my Parliamentary recollection, made the announcement in regard to the time he desired prorogation to take place, five or six weeks before that period. That announcement was calculated to accomplish the hon. gentleman's object, no doubt; but it was also calculated to render it extremely difficult to engage in proper and legitimate discussion of public business. The hon. gentleman has referred three times to-day to proroguing at Easter, and if prorogation is to be settled so long in advance, and so utterly irrespective of the condition of public business, it is desirable that we should husband our hours now. There is a very large amount of business in the hands of private members who have had less opportunity this Session of dealing with their measures than any previous Session I am aware of. The hon. gentleman cannot have intended to adjourn at six o'clock to-day, because he proposed on Friday last to fix for this day the motion of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), with respect to License Laws, and it was, no doubt, intended not to discuss the question for about three hours but to conclude the debate. I find that in 1881 the House sat on the evening of St. Patrick's Day and considered Supply until a quarter past one a.m. In the subsequent year the day fell on a Saturday or non-sitting day, and of course the question did not arise. Under ordinary circumstances when the House met at an earlier period and was not doing much work, it was fitting that it should adjourn at six o'clock on St. Patrick's Day. Now, however, we are in the thick of the Session, and are told we shall have a very short time to consider private business, and our duty to the public therefore requires us to labour and not to play to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I deserve censure of the hon. gentleman for having announced prematurely the desire of the Government, if public business will permit, to prorogue at Easter. We met on the 17th January, and Easter will occur on the 14th April, and this will give about a Session of the usual length, three months. As regards the motion respecting License Laws, it is quite true I stated that the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) should have to-day to discuss the question. It is not my fault that it was not set down as the First Order of the Day. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) appeared to think, judging by the tone of his argument, that I had made some arrangement with the hon. member to adjourn at six o'clock. I had no communication directly or indirectly with the hon. gentleman, and I was not aware that he was going to move the motion until I heard it. The first thing I did on being foiled in my attempt to fix the discussion on the motion of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) to-day was to give notice that to-morrow the Government would ask to have the matter taken up and fully discussed. That I thought was fair to the hon. gentleman and was due to him. The hon. gentleman opposite took the point of order, which he had a right to do, and my motion was thrown over. I thought it was right and fair to the hon. gentleman who had postponed the motion at my convenience, and not his own, to give him to-morrow to discuss it. He will not lose his motion; I will take care as leader of the House that he shall have an opportunity and lose nothing from his kindness in meeting my views.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion to adjourn at a future period is not in order now. A motion of that kind is only in order when it is to adjourn now. The motion must therefore be renewed.

Mr. DALY. I give notice that I will renew it at six o'clock.

THE CASE OF DANIEL McCOURT.

Mr. BERGIN. The leader of the Opposition some time ago asked for papers to be brought down in connection with the dismissal of Daniel McCourt, a labourer on the Cornwall Canal, and in common fairness—I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of not being fair—he should place a motion on the paper, that I may have an opportunity of discussing the matter with him.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 123) to amend the Customs Act, 1883, 46 Vic., chap. 12. He said: This is a short Bill of three clauses. The first clause is simply to add to the Courts having jurisdiction to try cases of violationof the Customs Act, the Vice-Admiralty Court. It will be remembered that at the time when this law was consolidated and amended, theCourts in NovaScotia had decided that the Federal Parliament had not power to confer jurisdiction on the Admiralty Courts. On an appeal to the Supreme Court it was decided that the Parliament of Canada could confer jurisdiction in any case in which they thought proper to act. A clause was contained in the Inland Revenue Act, and it has been thought advisable that it should be re-enacted in the Customs Act. The second clause repeals clause 84 of the Customs Act, which prevents any evidence being given in cases of dispute as to the correct value of goods other than that which is borne on the face of the invoice. Under the old section of the law the same provision existed, with this addition, that no evidence could be given as to the correctness or the incorrectness of the invoice except by the Crown. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) thought it was unfair that in cases of contested invoices the only parties who should have the right to give evidence should be the Crown. He thought that all parties should have the same right—that the person importing the goods should have the same right to establish the correctness of his invoice as the Crown had to give evidence as to its incorrectness, and on that hon. gentleman's suggestion those words were struck out, without, I am bound to say, paying proper attention to the effect of striking them out. By striking out these words the clause simply provides now that no evidence can be given, and hence an invoice would have to be accepted, whether correct or not, as to the value of the goods. My proposition is to repeal the clause altogether, leaving the question of evidence as it exists in all cases which come up before Courts. If the Crown contests the invoice they will be bound to show that it is incorrect, and on the other hand, the party importing will have an equal right to give evidence as to its correctness. The third clause simply adds these words to the end of the 153rd clause of the Customs Act as it exists:

"And any such conviction may be had in a summary manner, before any two justices of the peace, or before any judge or magistrate having the power of two justices of the peace."

The same provision will be found in section 174 of the Act.

Bill read the first time.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY LEASE BILL.

The Order for resuming the adjourned debate on Mr. Haggart's proposed motion that Bill (No. 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and for other purposes, do pass, being read,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said: I may inform the House that the assent of the Crown to this measure has been obtained.

Bill passed.

WELLAND RAILWAY TRANSFER BILL.

Mr. BERGIN moved that Bill (No. 44) to authorize the transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and for other purposes be discharged and referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the words "to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council" to section 5.

Motion agreed to; and Bill recommitted, amended, reported and read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—
Bill (No. 9) to amend the several Acts relating to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company, was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported and read the third time.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the Bill do pass.

Mr. WILSON. Before this Bill is passed, I wish to call the attention of the House to some of its clauses, especially the fourth clause, in which the Company ask power to construct a road from some point at or west of Ingersoll to the town of Windsor. In a previous discussion in this House, the Government urged very strongly the importance of constructing a national railroad which might in every way in future serve the purposes for which we require a railroad to the North-West. Perhaps the strongest argument that was then used to show why we should advance the very large sum of $30,000,000 towards that object, was that immigrants from the old country would be retained in Canadian territory without the necessity of passing through any portion of a foreign country to the North-West, lest we might lose a large number of them. No sooner has that been done than we find this same Company asking us now to enable them to construct a branch line which will to a very great extent divert the traffic from the Canadian line to lines through a portion of the United States. I could understand the propriety of granting a charter for this branch line if it was necessary to serve any want in the section of country through which the Company desire to construct it; but that section is already most thoroughly supplied with railway facilities, and it requires no further accommodation of that kind. We have first the Grand Trunk running from London to Windsor; then we have what used to be the Great Western road, having two branches running from the city of London one to Detroit, and the other to Port Huron; then we have another road, and a very important one—a road that has hitherto worked harmoniously with the Canadian Pacific Railway—the Canada Southern division of the Michigan Central. not aware that anything has been done by that road against offering every convenience and facility for traffic between it and the Canadian Pacific Railway. In addition to those roads, we have a branch running from the city of St. Thomas to St. Clair, besides other branches through that section; so that altogether there is a complete network of railways in that section. I ask therefore what is the necessity of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company asking for this charter? It is not for the purpose of conveying freight from the western section of Canada to the east, or from the east to the west, because all the necessary facilities exist at present. The only desire of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in asking for this charter, is that, if the line running through Canadian territory north of Lake Superior should not prove to be a success, if they should not be able to keep it open during the whole of the year, they may have a road for conveying freight from the western peninsula of Ontario through to Chicago, and from Chicago to the North-West. Their object, if they intend to build the road, which I greatly doubt, is to obtain means of ingess to the North-West Territories through American territory. If that be the case, if that be the course the Company are going to adopt, I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Immigration to the fact that he will find that by taking immigrants through the American territory, more especially through the Western States, we will lose a very large number; a very large portion of the expenditure incurred on immigration will be useless; and the Government will defeat *in toto* the policy which they declared to be the motives which influenced them to spend a large amount of money for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have every reason to believe that if the Canadian Pacific Railway reach Windsor, they will have an opportunity of uniting with the Wabash Railway or with other roads reaching Chicago; and as soon as they reach Chicago, they will have no difficulty in connecting with their own road and reaching the North-West Territory by that means. I have no doubt that the Wabash road extending and holding out inducements to-day to the Canadian Pacific Railway to reach Detroit, will give every facility to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we will have an American line through to our North-West; so that the road along the northern shore of Lake Superior will be, to a great extent and through the greater portion of the year, comparatively useless. Feeling that to be the case, I would rather no charter had been granted for I cannot see any necessity for granting any charter, unless it be the desire of the Company to reach the North-West through American territory. I wish, to as great an extent as I possibly can, to curtail their opportunities of using this as a lever to do injustice to other roads which are perfectly willing to unite with them on fair terms and give them reasonable running rates. They are asking to construct a road from Ingersoll or from some point south or south-west of Ingersoll to Windsor. If the road is to be extended from the Credit Valley westward, it is proper that the section of country through which it will run should receive benefits accruing therefrom, if there be any. We know perfectly well that when the Credit Valley was first chartered, it was intended to be a road in the interests of the farming community, that would afford facilities and advantages to those who felt that too high rates had been charged; and almost every municipality which granted aid to the Credit Valley, entered into an agreement with that Company that certain rates of freight and no higher should be charged. We know that the municipalities contributed very liberally to this road; almost every municipality through which it passed contributed. Not only that, but the Ontario Government acted very liberally and granted a very large amount, and since this House thinks proper to take this road out of the hands of the Province of Ontario, I contend that the Ontario Government has a just claim against the Dominion Government for the amount they have contributed towards the construction of the road. After reciving the grant of $2,000 per mile,

in the first place, the Company found they were unable to build the road, and they came back to the Ontario Government with an appeal for aid, and the Ontario Government granted them a further subsidy of $1,500 per mile, making in all $3,500 per mile. This aid was granted in the interests of that section of the country through which the road ran, to enable the people there to get their various articles to market at cheaper rates than those they previously had to pay. The road was constructed to Ingersoll; it remained there for a length of time, but it was comparatively useless at the time it had its terminus there; and feeling that it did not accomplish the object the promoters of the road had in view, the promoters came to the city of St. Thomas and made overtures for the extension of the road to that city. They urged upon the people of St. Thomas that they should give liberally to the road in order that St. Thomas might be made the terminus. Under this inducement, with the full understanding and belief that their city would be the terminus of the Credit Valley and Ontario and Quebec road, the people of St. Thomas granted the Company the unusually large amount of $50,000 in the way of a bonus, but what is the Canadian Pacific Railway now asking? They are asking, although we treated them so liberally, to extend the road from some point west of Ingersoll, between Ingersoll and the town of St. Thomas, to the St. Clair river, thus leaving St. Thomas comparatively a way station. I feel this House should hesitate before doing an injustice to any municipality situated as is St. Thomas, and having contributed as liberally as did that city. Further, I believe, and I think those who are acquainted with that section of the country will agree with me, that if the extension of the road is to be made, if the Canadian Pacific Railway should feel a desire to build a road there, no better alignment of road can possibly be obtained than that alignment lying between the Lake Erie and the River Thames. They will get a straight road, a road with perhaps the best grade that can possibly be obtained on the continent of America, and yet, for some reason unknown, they want to start from Ingersoll or some point west of Ingersoll. This House should hesitate before enabling the Canadian Pacific Railway to use this charter as a lever, not only upon the Michigan Central but upon the Grand Trunk Railway, to offer them better terms than they would be able to obtain under any other condition. Not feeling desirous to detain the House any longer with reference to this matter I beg to move in amendment thereto, that the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with power to amend the same, by leaving out all the words after the word "from" in line 47, section 4, to the word "Ingersoll," inclusive, and to insert the words "St. Thomas" instead thereof.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). Before this motion is carried, I wish to say a few words with reference to it. I was one of those who were opposed to the building of the Credit Valley in the first instance because I thought we had all the roads required for the purpose of conducting the business of the country in the western part of Canada—I have reference to the competing lines at that time, the Grand Trunk and the Great Western. The road, however, was built; and built, as my friend the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) says, to the town of Ingersoll, and it remained there, for that was the terminus for a very considerable period, until the people west of that point and between that and St. Thomas, and the town of St. Thomas concluded that it was desirable that it should go to St. Thomas, and they therefore granted a bonus of, I believe, the sum of $50,000. At that time, they forced and insisted upon the road having its terminus in a certain point in the town of St. Thomas. That, I believe, has been done. It has been carried out to the very letter, or, if not, a lawsuit is going on at the present time by the people of St. Thomas against the Credit Valley Railway to compel them to carry out to the letter what they say was originally intended. Now, had there not been an amalgamation of the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways, my hon. friend might have been correct in his assertions, but he knows he is as far wrong as any one possibly can be in the assertions he has made on this occasion. It is true that, as far as the town of St. Thomas is concerned, there is all the competition that is necessary or that is desirable, all that is wished for in any part of the country—that is, the old Great Western, or the Great Western division of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canada Southern Railway. These run through from that point to the town of Windsor, and the consequence is that they are competing lines there, and he has every reason to be thankful for the competition that exists there. But what are the facts with reference to a much more important part of the country than he represents? I have reference to the part between the town of Ingersoll, north of the Canada Southern Railway, and the old Grand Trunk Railway. We have no competition there at all. The amalgamation of the roads has passed the main lines and all the branches under the control of the Grand Trunk Railway. We have, therefore, no competition whatever. Now, I think it is very desirable that competition should exist in that part of the country, and I believe that this Bill has a tendency to create that competition that is very desirable. It is rather amusing to me to see this hon. gentleman taking such a very great interest in this road, and giving as his reason for it that we have granted such an enormous amount of a bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think, if you look over the Votes and Proceedings, you will find that my hon. friend from Elgin voted against it, and did everything he possibly could against it, and was not at all desirous that that grant should be made in any way whatever. Therefore, I think he at least is one of the last persons in the world that should ask to have this road terminated at his town of St. Thomas. As I said before, there are many important localities between Ingersoll and the Detroit River. There is the city of London, Strathroy, Glencoe, Chatham, and points all along there, which are much more thickly peopled than where his roads go; and where the Canada Southern and the southern branch of the Great Western go, there is competition the whole way, whereas, from the point I have spoken of, from Ingersoll west, there is no competition whatever, but all these places are under the control of the one great ruling railway. As it is asked here that they shall run from a point in the town of Ingersoll west to the Detroit River, it must pass very nearly, if not quite, through the localities of which I have spoken, and give the competition which is desirable to all the points of importance on that line. I think, under the circumstances, the House will see fit, as the Canadian Pacific Railway has been supported as it has, to support the original portion of the Bill and pass it as it was originally brought into this House. As far as regards my hon, friend's extraordinary interest in the western States, or his fears in reference thereto, I think he has really no thought or care in connection with that whatever. If the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be a railway of importance to that part of the country, they have to seek a connection with the western States, and they have to seek it through the most important part of the western peninsula which they can find; and, in the road they are projecting at the present time, they come to a point where they connect with either of these competing lines to the city of Chicago, in case they have no desire to build a line of their own, thereby creating not only the competition which is so desirable to the western peninsula of the Dominion of Canada, but also to the United States, to the city of Chicago. They must have feeders from the west as well as from the east if they wish to be an important line, and it does seem

to me that it would be like a jug without a handle if that road were to run to the town of St. Thomas or the city of London and there terminate. As to their making running arrangements over the Canada Southern or the Great Western or Grand Trunk, we know, in relation to the Grand Trunk, what is the feeling that exists between the two roads at the present time, and we know that no running arrangements could be made. And as to the Canada Southern, the very reason why they are building this line there and extending the Credit Valley as they propose is to have an independent line to connect with either of the three great roads running from Detroit westward to Chicago, so as to create the competition which is so very desirable.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoke.

Mr. WILSON. I am rising to a point of explanation, and I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that my hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) said I had stated in this House what I knew to be wrong. I emphatically repudiate in strong terms, as strong as I possibly can repudiate, any insinuation of my hon. friend in that respect. I attempted to state what I actually believed, and I might say that I am responsible to this House and to my own conscience whether I speak what I believe or what I do not believe; and I therefore repudiate *in toto* the remarks made by my hon. friend.

Mr. MACMILLAN. Just one word in explanation. When the hon. gentleman said that was the best line through to the western peninsula, what I say is that I differ with him in that, and I believe I am correct in stating that the other line is the more direct and the better line.

Mr. BLAKE. No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman used the very unparliamentary expression that the hon. member for East Elgin knew he was stating what was not correct. I attempted to call your attention to it at the time, but did not succeed, as you were otherwise engaged.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman's recollection is not perfect. He did not say that.

Mr. WILSON. I took his words down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You could not have taken those words down. What he said was that the statement was as erroneous as it could possibly be. Well, the statement may be erroneous, without——

Some hon. MEMBERS. He said he knew it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He said nothing of the kind.

Mr. HAGGART. The Ontario and Quebec Railway Company do not wish the amendment made to their Bill which is proposed by the hon. gentleman opposite. They wish to have the opportunity of extending their line at any point they may think proper from Ingersoll westward, and which may be found, by the engineering survey of the country, to have been the most feasible route. They are not at all anxious to build that portion to Detroit, but they have had some additional correspondence with the Canada Southern Railway Company, in which they found they could not make arrangements with the Canada Southern Railway Company for the carrying of their freight from St. Thomas to Detroit unless the Ontario and Quebec, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, made a promise to the Canada Southern Railway Company, that what freight was delivered to them at St. Thomas and carried down to Brockville, would be delivered to that Company for the purpose of being taken to any port in the United States. They want to be at liberty to carry freight to any port which they may think proper in the United States, and by any means which they might think proper, and for that reason they want an extension of their line westward to Detroit. They are not at all anxious, as I said, to complete it, and they only build it for the purpose of carrying out the arrangement and the promises which the Canadian Pacific Railway made to Parliament awhile ago, and they were anxious to have a line for the purpose of securing a certain amount of freight to the western peninsula, and also for carrying on the business of a railway company if necessary, or, if freight was offered them, for the purpose of carrying that freight to Detroit or any point westward.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). When this matter was before the Committee I remember that the hon. member spoke very strongly indeed, because the Company asked for the right to start from anywhere west of Toronto, and the hon. gentleman who had charge of the Bill stated Ingersoll, and I took it for granted that the mover of this resolution was satisfied with Ingersoll, and that it was a compromise. At least I thought they were all perfectly satisfied in Committee.

Mr. WILSON. I said St. Thomas.

Mr. WHITE. He said St. Thomas, but he said Ingersoll at the same time, and I took it for granted the hon. gentleman accepted Ingersoll.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill passed.

ROMAN CATHOLIC EPISCOPAL CORPORATION OF PONTIAC.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to ask whether this application is based upon the difficulty which arose from the decision in Dobie and the Church Temporalities with respect to the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. WHITE. The reason for this Bill is because the diocese which it is proposed to incorporate embraces certain portions of territory that are not included in any of the Provinces that have yet been formed; therefore it was deemed necessary to come to this Parliament and obtain the powers sought for. I believe the same powers have been asked for from the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec in portions of both of which Provinces this diocese is situated, but it also embraces part of the land situated in the vicinity of Hudson Bay and James Bay outside of any Province.

Mr. BLAKE. As to where these lands of the Hudson Bay and James Bay are it might be difficult to say. Does the hon. gentleman mean that concurrent Local legislation has been obtained in Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. WHITE. I think so.

Mr. CARON. This Bill came before the Private Bills Committee, and the reason given for seeking legislation from this House was that besides the diocese being a portion in the Province of Quebec and a portion in the Province of Ontario, it also extended beyond the two Provinces and embraced a portion of the lands extending as far as Hudson Bay. Hon. gentlemen know that this diocese comprises districts in which missionaries have been labouring. What the hon. gentleman said about concurrent jurisdiction does not apply to this Bill, but it applies to another Bill incorporating the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa. In this latter Bill it was absolutely necessary to have the concurrent jurisdiction of which the hon. gentleman has spoken. An Act of incorporation had been obtained from the Province of Canada before Confederation and subsequently, from the fact that the diocese took in some lands belonging to

the Province of Ontario, an Act of incorporation was obtained from the Province of Ontario. The powers which are sought for by this Bill are exactly the same as were granted by Ontario, except that as the Bill covers territory beyond the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, it was considered advisable to obtain a charter from Ottawa also.

Mr. BLAKE. Though not agreeing, myself, with a good deal of the reasoning given, I think it is not at all unreasonable that wherever Local legislation has granted powers of incorporation we should endeavour as far as we can, to confirm them here in analogous circumstances. I do not now propose to say anything with reference to the other Bill which is coming on presently; but with reference to this Bill it seems from what the hon. gentleman who is promoting the Bill has said, that he was not quite sure that there was concurrent legislation. My own impression is that it is an unfortunate step to take to legislate here in this regard, otherwise than with a view to confirm or get rid of any difficulties which may exist in the implementing of the will of the Local Legislatures in this matter. I think there are yet serious questions to be settled as to where our jurisdiction is. I do not think private parties ought to suffer from the nonsettlement of these questions by our withholding our hand from implementing, or completing Local legislation, but if there has been no Local legislation we seem to be taking an unfortunate step, the soundness of which I question. The other Bill seems to fall exactly in the principles to which I allude. This one seems to be going a step in advance of that question which I, as a defender of Provincial rights, am somewhat indisposed to sanction.

Mr. MACMILLAN. I have looked at some portions of this Bill, and I suppose that in considering the preamble we are also considering the principles of the Bill. Now, the fourth and fifth sections of this Bill seem to me to contain some very extraordinary provisions, and to ask for legislation which is utterly unwarrantable and ought not to be sanctioned by this House. If it was for the purpose of passing an Act with reference to lands or properties I should have no objection to it, but we are asked to form them into a joint stock company, into a mortgage company, into a loaning company. They are to be purchasers and sellers of real estate, and so far as I can see we are asked to empower them to do everything except being a bank of issue. Now, it seems to me this is going altogether too far. Section 4 says:

"The corporation shall be capable of taking, holding, and receiving any real or personal property, notes, bonds, mortgages and agreements, or other obligations, for the payment of money by virtue of any purchase, agreement, voluntary conveyance, or of any last will or testament of any person whatsoever."

Then section 5 goes on to say:

"The corporation may from time to time sell, exchange, alienate, let, demise, lease, or otherwise dispose of property, real or personal, belonging to, or vested in, the corporation."

That might be all right so far; but it goes on to say:

"And other property real and personal of every nature and kind whatsoever."

My hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Blake) spoke of the case of Dobie *vs.* The Temporalities Board. That had reference to funds and properties belonging to the Church at that time. The Board did not seek to get possession of properties at any future time. In this case, however, the institution becomes a thorough exchange market, with power to buy and sell land, take mortgages upon land, sell mortgages, take promissory notes, and it appears to me to be created an institution simply for the purpose of buying and selling lands, negotiating mortgages and promissory notes and everything of that kind. I think under these circumstances it is a step in the wrong direction, and the sooner we put a stop to legislation of this kind the better.

Mr. CARON. I do not understand how the hon. gentleman can take the view which he has just presented to the House. The property which is invested in the corporation is for trust purposes; moreover the hon. gentleman, possibly from not having attended the Private Bills Committee, ignores the fact that these clauses were amended so as to protect, in so far as it was possible for this Parliament to protect, Provincial rights, which seemed to have caused the discussion which is now taking place. I direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the amendments introduced by the Private Bills Committee for the purpose to which I have referred. For instance, clause 3 was amended by introducing the words "and subject, also, to the provisions of the law of the respective Provinces." Clause 4, which seems to be so obnoxious to the hon. gentleman, is also amended by adding "subject, however, to the same Local laws;" and clause 5 was also amended by adding a most important provision, which reads as follows:—

"Subject, however, to the same local laws; and provided also that the corporation shall within ten years after its acquisition of any such real estate, sell or otherwise dispose of and alienate so much of such real estate as is not required for the use and occupation, or other like purposes of the corporation."

This amendment was introduced as it was identical with the provisions introduced by the Private Bills Committee last year in similar Acts of incorporation sought from this Parliament. Taking into consideration the clauses as amended, I think the rights of the Provinces are perfectly protected.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) is mistaken in supposing that this Bill confers on the body incorporated any of the powers of a loan company. It only gives the corporation power to hold lands for church purposes. The hon. member for East Middlesex would not surely deprive the Church of the power to accept gifts or acquire lands for church purposes, and as provisions are inserted under which land can only be held for ten years, except such as is required for church purposes, the objection has been met and should not be pressed.

Mr. MACMILLAN. I do not understand it in that way, because the latter part of section 5 says "and also from time to time purchase and acquire other property, real and personal, for the use and purposes of the corporation."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF OTTAWA.

Mr. TASSÉ moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 95) relating to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Many hon. members on this side of the House are not satisfied with this Bill. We are not satisfied as to the desirability of granting this legislation, but we are perfectly willing, as it is considered to be of advantage to the parties seeking it, not to object to it, and I hope and trust the same good will will be shown by them to others, who are equal to them in every respect, when the time comes. I hope the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government who allow these Bills to become law—for they are both responsible for the legislation of the House—will act as men and keep as quiet then as they do when this Bill is before the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg to say to the hon. gentleman that I am no more responsible for the legislation of the House than he is himself; indeed, not so much so, for he may have some influence on the majority. It is quite true that he may

thus appeal to the leader of the House if an impropriety exists, and I have no doubt whatever that the leader of the Government will take notice of it. I state that the principles on which I thought parties coming here and applying for this Bill were not unjustifiable. I do not concur in a good deal of the decision of the Privy Council in the case of Dobie *vs.* the Temporalities Board. It is, however, the law at the present time; it may be changed on a further review of the law. In the meantime I am not unwilling to concur in helping parties out of the difficulty created by the decision in Dobie *vs.* Temporalities Board, just this far: If I find Local legislation in two, three or four of the Provinces concurrent and of the same character as the legislation on which doubt has been cast by the decision in that case, I am willing to concur in legislation to remove the doubt affecting the Local legislation. That is what I understand is being done in this case, and, therefore, from my point of view, I do not object to it. That is what Quebec and Ontario have, so far as they could, accomplished. The question is whether it has been successfully accomplished, and doubt is thrown upon that successful accomplishment by the decision of the Privy Council. What we are called upon to do is to remove all doubt as far as we can, and effectuate the will of the Local Legislatures with reference to a matter of property and civil right. For my own part, speaking with the responsibility of a single member of this House, I can see no objection to that course.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may say that no special advantage is asked, no new legislation, no new privileges. The Act of 1845 incorporating the Roman Catholic Bishops of Toronto and Kingston, gave power to organize new dioceses which were not specially included in that Act. In 1849 several new dioceses were created in Lower Canada, amongst them being the diocese of Bytown. Afterwards an amendment was made in 1861 which changed the name of the diocese of Bytown to that of Ottawa. Legislation was again sought in 1882 in the Legislature of Ontario, because the old Act of the old Province of Canada only applied to all property in Lower Canada; and as the diocese entered into the Province of Ontario, the powers granted by the Act of 1849 have been expressly given by the Ontario Act of 1882, and the present Act, as the hon. gentleman has just stated, is only to confirm legislation which was passed in the two Provinces, nothing more.

Bill reported.

Mr. TASSE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BOSSÉ. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not satisfied with the explanations which have been made to this Bill. It seems that the corporation was originally created by an Act of the Province of Canada, and afterwards some amendment was made by the Legislature of Ontario since Confederation and these Acts would certainly affect the lands and the civil rights in the Province of Ontario. I do not see, therefore, how there can be any doubt upon the question; but as I am in a small minority in the matter I would simply ask that the Bill be allowed to pass on a division.

Bill read the third time on a division, and passed.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CURRAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 21) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Before you leave the Chair for the purpose of going into Committee on this Bill, I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter which was referred to and received some discussion in the Railway Committee when this Bill was before it. I mean the question of the fusion or amalgamation between the Grand Trunk and the Great Western. The Minister of Railways stated on that occasion, that the Minister of Justice had advised or expressed the opinion that the fusion or amalgamation between those two companies which had been effected, was in accordance with the statutory powers already existing in favour of the Grand Trunk, and that no further legislation was necessary to sanction and ratify that fusion. I have reason to believe, from some enquiries I have made, that the opinion of the learned and hon. Minister of Justice was not an opinion in writing, and was not an opinion given deliberately as his own legal opinion on the question, but was an expression of opinion based principally on the opinions which had been obtained by the Grand Trunk Company from various leading members of the profession. I have heard that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had given an opinion on the point, and also that the right hon. leader of the House had given an opinion upon it.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him I would state that I never gave any opinion on the point whatever.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never gave any opinion on the point.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am glad to hear that the weight of two such eminent lawyers, as the two hon. gentlemen who have just given the contradiction, is removed from the side of the legality of this arrangement. All I can say is, that my information came from a very direct source. I was informed, positively, by a gentleman who should have known, that Mr. Bell, the solicitor of the Grand Trunk, had quoted both the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition as lawyers who had expressed an opinion in favour of the validity of the amalgamation. The names of other learned gentlemen were quoted, among them being Mr. Christopher Robinson, and Mr. Bethune, who stand at the head of the legal profession in Ontario, as were also the opinions of leading counsel in England. The only opinion I have seen was one which, sometime since, I saw in an English newspaper, as given by two counsel in England in favour of the validity of the fusion. That opinion was subsequently, I believe, withdrawn by one of them, and, at any rate, it was based, so far as the statement of the case went, on an incomplete case, on a case which did not state all the Statutes bearing on the question. Now the opinion that the fusion of those two companies is valid and legal, under existing legislation, may be right or it may be wrong. For my own part, with all humility, and distrusting the correctness of my own judgment when put against that of the learned gentleman who have given opinions on the other side; but as the great weight of the opinion of the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition is removed from that side——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had forgotten for the moment that in 1876, I believe, I did express an opinion on the subject.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say that I was a little surprised when the hon. gentleman spoke, because the papers were laid before me containing a copy of his opinion; but for my own part I declined to give an opinion, thinking that the matter would become a Parliamentary question, and that I would like to look into it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am glad to hear the contradiction. I am inclined to think that if we saw the opinion of the hon. gentleman and the case on which it was based, we might have reason to doubt whether the opinion went as far as the Grand Trunk authorities insist. We all know that the value and importance of an opinion by counsel on any question depend entirely on the case submitted to the counsel—whether that case is correct, whether it

truly sets forth all the facts and all the circumstances. Now, so far as I have been able to give any consideration to this question—having looked through the various Acts of Parliament, numerous as they are, with respect to this question—I confess that the opinion I had formed was that this fusion was illegal and unsupported by any statutory authority. The only authority which I have been able to find is that contained in the old Grand Trunk Act, passed by the Parliament of Canada in 1852, which I do not think is effectual to give authority to the Grand Trunk for the purpose of this fusion. But the circumstances of the country have entirely changed since the passage of that Act. The object to be accomplished by it was to secure communication from the western frontier of Ontario to the eastern frontier of Quebec, or at least into the city of Quebec; and when we look at the subsequent legislation of Parliament, I think there can be little doubt that the power contained in that Bill has become effete and insufficient to sustain this arrangement. But the Grand Trunk Railway Act of 1878 seems to me to put it beyond all doubt—I say it with all respect to the arguments used on the other side—that this fusion cannot be sustained as within the powers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The first point to be considered, of course, is what is the nature of the existing arrangement between these two companies. So far as I understand it, it is simply a joint working agreement whereby they agree to pool their receipts and agree to an application of the proceeds in a certain specified manner. This would be termed a working agreement, so that I think it would come within the fifth section of the Act of 1878, which says:

"It shall be lawful for the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to lease or enter into working agreements with, or to agree for, running powers over the line of any railway company in the Province of Ontario which by its Act of incorporation or the Statutes relating thereto has power to make any such arrangement with any other company, upon such terms and conditions and for such period as may from time to time be agreed upon."

But then there is this proviso:

"Provided also that this section shall not give to any of the above mentioned railway companies other than the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada any more or greater powers in the respect in this section mentioned, than they now have, nor shall this section apply to any company whose lines runs in the same general direction and competes with the said Grand Trunk Railway, nor to any Company whose line runs between the Detroit and St. Clair and Niagara Rivers."

Now that the Great Western line does run in the same general direction and is a competing line with the Grand Trunk Railway, is beyond question. That it also runs between the Detroit and St. Clair and Niagara rivers is also beyond question. That it is, therefore, excluded by the terms of this clause from making any such agreement with the Grand Trunk, and that the Grand Trunk is prohibited from making any arrangement with the Great Western, is perfectly clear. The arrangement partakes of all the descriptions in this clause; it is a lease, a certain working arrangement, an agreement for running powers over the Great Western; and the Great Western, ever since the arrangement was entered into, has been run as a part of the Grand Trunk line. It may be said that if the Grand Trunk had power irrespective of this Statute to make that arrangement, it would then be valid; but I think this clause is a clear and emphatic expression of Parliament that no arrangement of that character should be made between the Grand Trunk Railway and any other line running in the same direction or competing with it, or running between the Niagara and Detroit rivers. Now, I do not propose at this stage of the Bill to take the responsibility of moving the rejection of so much of it as sanctions or ratifies this amalgamation. I feel that the responsibility of doing so, after the arrangement has been carried out and acted upon for the last two or three years, and after it has been sanctioned by the Bill so far as it has proceeded, would be a very serious responsibility. The part of the country which I have the honour to represent has no interest whatever in this particular question that I am aware of. If it were a Bill sanctioning a fusion with the Midland Railway which runs through my constituency, it would be my duty to oppose such an arrangement. But as the opinion was expressed in the Railway Committee by the Minister of Railways that this fusion was legal, I felt that it was my duty not to tacitly acquiesce in that opinion, but to state to the House emphatically that in my opinion a grave doubt does exist on the subject, and that the House must now take the responsibility, if it thinks fit, of sanctioning the amalgamation between these two companies, which is the most complete amalgamation which could possibly be effected. It provides for the extinction of the Great Western stock, and substitutes Grand Trunk securities for it—in fact puts an end to the Great Western Railway Company altogether. For these reasons I have called the attention of the House to this Bill, and more particularly my hon. friends on both sides who represent constituencies in the western part of Ontario, where I know the majority of the people were at the time very much opposed to this fusion and are I believe still opposed to it. If it be the opinion of the House and of the public that arrangement should be sanctioned, I do not propose to oppose it. But I have done my duty in calling attention to the legal position of this question at the present time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the House should have an explanation from the hon. Minister of Railways in regard to this matter. He certainly induced the Committee to pass the Bill without much consideration in this respect, by stating that it was strongly the opinion of the Minister of Justice, who had given full consideration to it, that the amalgamation was now complete, and could not be affected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We were not told that it was a casual opinion, but one arrived at after due deliberation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is a difficulty in connection with receiving opinions of Committees. In the last Parliament the Minister of Justice very frequently obtruded his opinion to guide us, and was always able to give an opinion, without asking time for consideration. It is somewhat different now, no doubt. Consideration, no doubt, has been given to it, but it is an objectionable practice that members of the Government should go to any Committee, and, by stating the opinion of the legal adviser of the Crown to be so-and-so, influence it to pass certain Bills. With regard to this Bill I had the greatest possible objection to the introduction of the amalgamation clause, until I was informed that the thing was accomplished, at any rate, and the Bill might be considered without reference to it. As the matter stands, if the hon. member for Victoria is correct, the Bill should be referred back to the Railway Committee, where it certainly did not receive the consideration which it would have received had we been aware of this at the time. I have the greatest objection to the amalgamation of roads, particularly when running in the same direction, and think it is wrong to sanction the blunderings of a gigantic corporation which would override all other interests in the neighbourhood. This Bill, apparently, was brought in for one purpose, but it will accomplish another purpose, if allowed to pass without that consideration to which it is entitled. As a member of the Railway Committee, I must ask that it stand for present consideration unless the mover proposes that it be referred back to the Committee of Railways for further consideration and report.

Mr. CURRAN. As regards this Bill, the exception taken by my hon. friend from Victoria is not, I believe, tenable.

He has referred to the contention that has been maintained by the Grand Trunk Railway in connection with this amalgamation, and he has mentioned the names of some of the distinguished jurists who had expressed their opinions as being favourable to the view that powers vested in the Company to effect this amalgamation. I may state for his information that, in 1882, parties connected with the Great Western Railway Company were anxious to have a final and definite opinion upon this subject. They consulted Messrs. Wesley & Davie, eminent counsel in London, and their opinion concurred with the opinions of others which I will read in a few moments. As the right hon. leader of the Government has said, an opinion was obtained from him in the matter; at the time, he was not a member of the Government but a practising lawyer, and he concurred in the opinion of Mr. Bell, the Grand Trunk Railway solicitor, which was submitted to him. As regards the statement that the hon. leader of the Opposition has given an opinion on this subject, he was then a member of the Government and his opinion was not obtained, but that of the firm to which he belonged was obtained; and that opinion I will take the liberty of reading to the House:

"TORONTO, 30th October, 1876.

"In the matter of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Great Western Railway Company of Canada, our opinion has been asked upon the following questions:—

"1. Did the amalgamation mentioned in and confirmed by the Act of the Canadian Legislature passed in 1854 (being 18 Vic. Chap. 33) exhaust the powers conferred by the several Acts then in existence giving the power to the two railways above named to unite or amalgamate,

"2. Is it competent for the two railway companies above named to amalgamate or unite under the powers contained in existing legislation in Canada.

"We have considered all the Acts passed by the Parliament of the Legislature of the late Province of Canada and by that of the Dominion of Canada bearing upon the two questions above stated, and the following may be referred to in particular:—

"1851, 14 and 15 Vic., Caps. 73, 74, 75 and 148; 1852, 16 Vic., Cap. 37, 39, 41; 1853, 16 Vic., Cap. 76; 1854, 18 Vic., Caps. 33; 1834, 4 William IV., Cap. 29; 1845, 8 Vic., Cap. 86; 1846, 9 Vic., Cap. 81, 16 Vic., Cap. 44; 1853, 16 Vic., Cap. 99; 1855, 18 and 19 Vic., Cap. 176, 32 and 33 Vic., Cap. 31, 33 Vic., Cap. 50 (Section 8), 35 Vic., Cap. 55 (Section 5.) We are given to understand that no attempt has ever been made to effect an amalgamation or union of the two railways named in the heading hereof under the provisions of the Act 16 Vic., Cap. 39; that the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company merged into the Great Western Railway under the provisions of the above Acts;—that the Great Western Railway received aid under the Acts relating to the main Trunk line above referred to; that, in fact, formed part of such main Trunk line, and was one of the Companies referred in the Act 16 Vic., Cap. 39, (the Union Act), and the Act 16 Vic., Cap. 76 (extending the Union Act) as forming part of such main Trunk line. We are of opinion that the provisions of the Union Act (16 Vic., Cap. 39) and of the Act extending the same (16 Vic., Cap 79) and the powers of amalgamation and union thereby conferred were not exhausted by the agreement referred and confirmed in by the 'Grand Trunk Railway Act, 1854,' (18 Vic., Cap. 33) and

"3. That it is competent for the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Great Western Railway Company of Canada to unite under the provisions of the Acts above referred to."

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). What is the date of that opinion?

Mr. CURRAN. 30th October, 1876.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Of course, it makes no reference to the Act of 1878, which is the stumbling block.

Mr. CURRAN. I may state that the opinion of Mr. Æmelius Irving, of the 9th October, 1876, of Mr. James Bethune, of the 11th October, 1878, of Mr. M. C. Cameron, also in that month, as well as the opinion of John Hilliard Cameron, all agree in that respect. I fail to perceive from the argument that has been made by the hon. gentleman, wherein he refers to the 5th clause of the Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway, 41 Vic., chap. 35, that there is anything in this clause which would deprive the Grand Trunk Railway of any of the powers conferred upon them by the legislation upon which these opinions are based. I do not think that in this law there is anything that repeals any of the powers conferred; on the contrary, it merely refers to certain Acts which they may do, and in no way alters the position occupied by the Grand Trunk Railway up to that time. I believe the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways, the other day, had reference not only to the legislation upon which these opinions are based, but also to this clause 5, of 31 Vic, chap. 25. This clause says:

"It shall be lawful for the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to lease or enter into working arrangements with, or to agree for running powers over the line of any railway company in the Province of Ontario, which by its Act of incorporation or the Statutes relating thereto has power to make any such arrangements with any other company, upon such terms and conditions and for such period as may from time to time be agreed upon by the respective boards of directors of the said companies and the board of directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada: Provided however, that no such lease or agreement shall take effect until it shall have been submitted to and received the approval of two-thirds of the proprietors or persons having the right to vote at the special and general meetings of the said Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, voting in person or by proxy at any special or general meeting of the said company: Provided also, that this section shall not give to any of the above mentioned railway companies other than the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, any more or greater powers in the respect in this section mentioned, than they now have, nor shall this section apply to any company whose line runs in the same general direction and competes with the said Grand Trunk Railway, nor to any company whose line runs between the Detroit and St Clair and Niagara Rivers, or to any railway lines owned or leased by such last-mentioned Company."

I contend that this clause in no way sustains the objection raised by my learned friend, and I am satisfied that, on careful reading of it, he will come to the conclusion himself that the Grand Trunk Railway Company in amalgamating and forming one company with the Great Western Railway Company of Canada, have in no way exceeded the powers vested in them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that, at this stage of the matter, looking at the way in which this Bill now stands and the source from which it is backed up, I can do much more than state my views to the House in reference to it. The Government having adopted this Bill, and the hon. the Minister Railways having stated before the Committee the other day that he had recast the Bill and eliminated therefrom all the objectionable features, I feel that, however I may differ from him in the last statement, it would be useless to attempt to get any alteration made in this House, where a strong Government such as this is, takes the stand it has taken, and takes charge of such a Bill as this, and proposes to carry it through the House. I have felt very warmly about this Bill. I have felt it my duty before the Committee to point out the various objections which existed, to my mind, to the passage of the Bill as it stood; and, although the Minister of Railways states what he did state there, I fail to perceive that he has eliminated all the objectionable features of the Bill, and I would beg to call attention to two or three amendments which I still think he may consider it desirable to make in the Bill. I felt so strongly, after leaving the Committee the other day, about a statement that was made there, that I felt it to be my duty to address a letter to the Minister of Railways upon the subject. With the permission of the House I will read it:

"OTTAWA, 14th March, 1881.

"DEAR SIR CHARLES,—Referring to the conversation to-day about the amendment I proposed to the Grand Trunk Railway Bill, I would beg to call your attention to the fact that the General Railway Act now provides that no railway company shall deal in, or acquire the bonds or stock of any other railway company, under very severe penalties.

"The privilege which the Grand Trunk arrogates to itself, of purchasing the stock and bonds of other companies, and on which it has lately so largely acted is a privilege conferred on that company by one of its own private acts; and so far as I can see, and according to the best advice I have taken, such a privilege should not be taken away from it, except by a private Act relating to it; and I think it would be quite inconsistent with the course of legislation, to put into an amendment of the General Railway Act, a provision taking away a special privilege already specially given to a private company.

"Under these circumstances, I am satisfied that the proper course is to insert in the present private Bill, a condition that the powers heretofore

granted to the Grand Trunk Company to buy the stock and bonds of other companies, shall cease and determine.

"Yours sincerely,

(Signed) "P. MITCHELL."

Now, the gentlemen who were present at the Railway Committee when this question came up know that, when I submitted an amendment there, it was suggested to me by the hon. Minister of Railways that I should withdraw the amendment, and the Government would take the subject under consideration, and give an early answer whether they would adopt my suggestion or not. I received an answer to it later in the day, and that was, that while the Government, as I understood it, recognized the principle of the amendment I had submitted, they thought it inconsistent to put it in the Bill because it might affect the floating of the securities the Bill provided for. I said, I care not how it is done so that it is done, in order to secure the public against the exercise of such powers as they now possess. But, after mature reflection, and after consulting with several friends on the subject, I became convinced that it was my duty to address that letter, which I did. I felt, after we left the Committee, very strongly upon some other points. I felt that, in a matter of this importance, where the Goverment had, as they said, entirely recast the Grand Trunk Bill, and the readjusted Bill was put upon the table of the Committee Room a few minutes before it was taken up to be considered—and as it involved such very serious interests, alike to the Company and to the public, as this Bill does, as the Bill was recast based upon very voluminous statements made by the Deputy Finance Minister in relation thereto, statements very complicated in their character—I felt that time ought to have been given to that Committee to consider the provisions of the Bill, and to consider the statements upon which it was founded. I was overruled in that. The Committee adopted the Bill. But, on considering the matter and looking over these statements after I got a copy of them—and the Minister of Railways was kind enough to give me a copy of the reports of Mr. Courtney—I came to the conclusion that Mr. Courtney's first report was substantially correct, except in one important particular; that was, that a mistake of £1,000,000 sterling had been made in relation to the figures, and had been made against the country and in favour of the Grand Trunk pretensions. His second report was of a very different character, as anyone who will take it up and read it will see, and it is upon that second report the Minister of Railways founded and prepared the amended Bill now under the consideration of this House. The Minister of Railways stated that he called upon Mr. Courtney to give him a calculation as to the charge upon the country which this change would involve, whether it would be increased or diminished by it, and by the statement made by Mr. Courtney he showed that about £11,000 sterling a year would be saved to the country by the passage of the Bill, and by permitting the Grand Trunk to carry out the consolidation and amalgamation which the Bill contained. What do I find in Mr. Courtney's report?—in Mr. Courtney's second report, upon which the present Bill is founded, which the hon. the Minister of Railways stated to the Committee that the Government had adopted and were proceeding to support in the Legislature of this country—I find this extraordinary statement, that it is not based upon facts ascertained by Mr. Courtney himself, but upon statements submitted by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, without a particle of evidence, so far as the Committee or this House knows, upon which to sustain them, and it contains in itself so material an error that £1,100,000 of an annual charge is placed in a certain portion of those liabilities where it ought not to be placed. The House has had no opportunity to verify the statements; the Committee had no opportunity to verify the statements; Mr. Courtney himself does not say he had any opportunity to verify the statements but he says:

"The former memo. dealt only with the capital of the companies affected by the Bill, annexed hereto is a statement furnished me by the Company with respect to the payments on account of the interest. From this it will be seen that in order to pay all the interest now upon the road which has to be paid before any interest can be paid on the Government claim, the yearly net earnings of the road would have to be, in rough numbers, £2,584,285; under the Bill now under consideration when the yearly net earnings reach that figure it would appear that there would be not only sufficient to pay all the charges for interest, but there would be in addition apparently some £11,000 or £12,000 each year to go towards the interest on the Government claim."

Mr. Courtney goes on and gives the statement as furnished by the Grand Trunk Company to him upon which he made this report. I have not seen the statement furnished by the Grand Trunk Company, but I have carefully gone over the securities named, and I find that they have exaggerated the current liabilities, as they stand to-day to the enormous amount of £300,000 sterling or about $1,500,000. Sir, I think it behooves this Government to watch the course of any legislation of this kind, and when legislation involves, as this Bill does, such enormous interests, I do not think it is either for the credit of Government or of Parliament that this legislation should be forced upon us in the way it was, without these statements being substantiated and some examination made by the Railway Committee by going into it for the purpose of finding out whether they were founded upon facts or not. Now, Sir, Mr. Courtney, in his statement, says it will leave but £11,000 or £12,000, and he says that is based upon the statement of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I tell this House that that statement is furnished by the Grand Trunk Company, and if any hon. gentleman who is conversant with figures will take up that Bill, and make a calculation of the interest upon all these securities contained in all these schedules, he will find that the statement as furnished here by Mr. Courtney and based upon the Grand Trunk statements, increase the current liabilities at this moment of the Grand Trunk Company by £300,000 over and above what the actual fact is as to the existing charge upon that Company. Why is this done, Sir? It is done for the purpose—it is wrong, perhaps, for me to say it is done for a purpose—but I will tell you what the effect of it is. The effect is to enable the Grand Trunk Company to come before this House and show that their liabilities amount to a certain figure at the present moment, and that by the additional liability which they are authorized to create, the charges will be some £11,000 or £12,000 sterling less than they are to-day, exaggerating existing liabilities by £300,000. I have gone into the figures carefully, and I have taken the precaution to get a man thoroughly versed in statistics to go over them for me, and I am confirmed in the statement by the calculation at which that gentleman has arrived. Is that the course this Parliament ought to adopt, to take up a hostile Bill thrown before us on Friday last, without any particular examination, after the statement that Mr. Courtney has given here, founded upon information given him by the Grand Trunk officers? He has had no evidence, the House has had no evidence, the country has had no evidence. I ask this House if it is a proper course to pursue in relation to this legislation. Sir, it is useless to talk about this matter. I have already done my duty, at all events, in relation to it. I am not going to take up the time of Parliament by continuing to talk when Government have made up their minds that this legislation shall pass. They may have evidence I do not possess; they may have some means of arriving at this calculation that the House does not know; but at all events after very careful consideration, after looking into the thing very deliberately, and giving it great attention, I have come to the conclusion, and I can make the statement without fear of contradiction, that there has been a misstatement in the calculation of the existing annual charges of the Grand Trunk to-day to the extent of $1,500,000. Sir, I am going again to call the attention of the Government to

two points that they would do well to consider: in sub-section C of section 5 it says:

"And the remainder of the said consolidated debentures and stock by this Act authorized to be created and issued, and any sums remaining out of the sums mentioned, &c."

And I would suggest that these words be added: "The approval of the Governor in Council being first obtained thereto." Then if the Grand Trunk Company have power to go on and buy up these debentures and consolidate liabilities by the proceeds of this stock, then they are bound to lay a double track, and that before they could appropriate the surplus money to any other purposes than those approved of by the Company, they should get the approval of the Governor in Council to do it. The other point is this: I think after section 18 this clause ought to be put in:

"That from and after the passing of this Act the power of purchasing the stock and bonds of other railway companies shall cease and determine."

It is well known that most of the embarrassments of the Grand Trunk have resulted from the fact that they have used the moneys which have been raised from time to time in buying up bonds and stocks and securities of the Northern Road, of the Grey and Bruce, of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, of the Vermont Central and others, and by this means endeavouring to obtain a monopoly through Canada of the whole railway system. Sir, it is only the other day that I felt a little proud of the Minister of Railways when he resented, in a very remarkable manner, the attempt of the officers of this Company to coerce Parliament and to dictate to it; but I must confess that it looks to me very much like a capitulation at the present time, and I regret very much to see it. At all events, I have washed my hands of any responsibility in the matter, and in conclusion I will read this letter that I sent to the Minister of Railways this morning:

"OTTAWA, March 17th, 1884.

"DEAR SIR CHARLES TUPPER,—The Grand Trunk Bill, as reprinted for the second time was brought before the Committee, with so little previous time for consideration, that it was difficult to judge precisely what its effect would be. And I may say the same thing of Mr. Courtney's reports. Now it seems plain that there was misconception about some portions of the Bill, and apparently, grave errors in the reports. The main points are with reference to using the proposed increase of capital for double-tracking, &c., and prohibiting the Company from dealing in railway stock and bonds.

"There is still no provision which requires that the additional capital procured by manipulating the securities, will be used in double tracking. The Act says it shall be done to such extent, as the directors may deem fit; which may be a mile or as much more as they think proper. The provision that the Company shall report to the Government what is done with the money, is no protection, because the Government has no power to interfere; and if it had power it would be too late as the money will be expended before the report is made. What is wanted is a specific declaration that the money shall be expended in the double-tracking of the road, after that in rolling stock and equipment.

"The words 'the general purposes of the Company' include anything and everything, and even the employment of the whole of it in purchasing the stock and bonds of other companies.

"The second point,—all the more material in connection with the first,—is the improper power of dealing in stock and bonds of other companies. If any other railway company in the Dominion were to do so, every officer engaged in it is declared by your Act of 1882 to be guilty of a misdemeanor, whereas the Grand Trunk is permitted to do it, as part of its business; and, as you know, has repeatedly done it. This anomaly in the teeth of the Parliament Act, should be done away with.

"I mention these two points to you because it is possible they may come up for discussion in the House; and I do think the Government would stand in a better position, if after its long hesitation about the Bill it should insist on, or at least, some of its most obvious defects being modified if not removed.

"I regret much to see the error into which Mr. Courtney has fallen. In his original report, according to my copy of it, he states the increase to be procured by the Bill at one million pounds sterling less than the fact, and this by a very obvious error of simple subtraction.

"In the second, the statement handed him by the Company which he impliedly sanctions, makes it appear that the annual charge will be smaller under the Bill than it is at present by an error in the statement of the present annual charge of over one million five hundred thousand dollars. That is to say, the statement makes out that the new annual charge will be eleven thousand pounds a year less than the old annual charge by incorrectly adding to one of the items of the old annual charge an amount of over three hundred and forty thousand pounds sterling per annum. No doubt both of these errors, serious as they are, are mere oversights; but an oversight becomes important, when it is made the basis of a Ministerial declaration to Parliament through the Railway Committee, and I think such statements coming from the Company interested in the Bill should not have been accepted without some reasonable verification.

"At the meeting of the Committee, on Friday last, in answer to my question as to 'whether the new stock to be created by the Bill came after or before the Government debt,' I understood you to say that 'it came after it.' So far as I can understand the Bill I think you are in error in this opinion, and if you recollect I expressed doubt at the time, though accepting the conclusion then stated by you.'

"I am, &c., yours truly,
(Signed) "P. MITCHELL."

Now, Sir, I feel it is useless to discuss this Bill or attempt to arrest its progress. I think the proper course to follow is that suggested by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), namely, that under the circumstances the Bill should be referred back to the Committee for the purpose of obtaining information in regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) and to examine into the statistics submitted by Mr. Courtney, and enquire as to how he arrived at that information and whether it is correct or not. Having offered these few remarks, I feel I have discharged my duty in opposing the Bill. If the Government choose to take the responsibility of passing the Bill, upon them rests the responsibility of that act, and I think the probability is they will regret it hereafter.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me the statements made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) demand some further statement from the Minister of Railways with respect to the legal attitude of the Government upon this question. I do not pretend to have been able to follow the statement made by the hon. member for Victoria, or the statement read by the hon. member for Montreal, with any such degree of accuracy of apprehension, as would enable me to form an opinion whatever on the legal question which has been raised. So far as I could gather from the remarks of the member from Montreal, he says there was a concurrence of legal opinion obtained, in the year 1876, I think, in favour of the opinion, that power at that time existed on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Great Western Railway Company to amalgamate or make such arrangements as they did make, whatever the arrangements were. Of course, it would be necessary that the power should belong to both companies, it is not sufficient that it should belong to either. I have no idea whether they had that power or not; I have never read the Statutes respecting it, I never formed any opinion on it, and I could not follow the hon. gentleman in the brief statement he made. If I rightly understood the hon. member for Victoria, he indicated that such was of no importance, because of the subsequent Statutes, the Statute of 1878, which was the stumbling block in the way. From that observation I would suppose the hon. gentleman rather concurred in the view as to the authority and power existing anterior to the Statute of 1878.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not go so far. I think it was a matter of doubt, but that after the Act of 1878 the doubt was removed, and it became illegal.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentlemen had agreed, there would have been entire concurrence, so far as we know, as to the power existing up to that time. I confess I was surprised and struck with regret, when I learned of the amalgamation or arrangements made between the two companies. I think it was not at all in the public interest that they should have been able to make such arrangements. The general public were struck with surprise to learn that there should have existed in some ancient and musty Statute some power to enable them to make those arrangements, which all supposed up to that time would require legislative sanction. I have always supported the position taken by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) upon this subject, and I have been prepared at all times since I have had a seat in Parliament, and I am to-day, to oppose any

legislative sanction to the amalgamation of those two companies. The question is, what are we doing? If the hon. member for Victoria is correct, we are in effect now confirming the amalgamation. Then I think we have a very serious question of policy before us, upon which I have stated what my opinion is and what my vote would be. If we are practically reduced to the one question, whether, if there was any authority before, that authority has been taken away by the Statute of 1878, I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways to state specifically whether the attention of the legal advisers of the Government has been called to that particular point to which the hon. member for Victoria has referred, the question whether whatever powers were possessed before that time, those powers continued notwithstanding the Statute of 1878, or whether they were given by that Statute; and whether the deliberate opinion of the legal advisers is, that those powers were discontinued or were given by that Statute; and that in consequence, notwithstanding the Statute of 1878, or by virtue of that Statute, there was legal authority to-day for what has been done? That is one point which it is important we should know distinctly and clearly, and then we would be able to judge whether we should put it in any train for further investigation. It is a much simpler point than an investigation of all the old Statutes; it is a point on which it would not be very difficult to reach a conclusion. I do not know whether the hon. member for Victoria was concerned in the case which bore some resemblance to this, the amalgamation between the Northern and North-Western Railways, in which somewhat similar questions came up, though everything in these questions depends on the precise character of the clauses. That is one point to which the hon. Minister's attention should be specially directed, because the question is of gigantic consequence; and if we are now called on to confirm the amalgamation of the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways, I am against that amalgamation. If, on the other hand, the companies have power to do what they have done, I am in favour of facilitating the working operations under the existing power. This is just what I stated in regard to the North Shore. I would have opposed the acquisition of power by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to obtain the North Shore Railway; nevertheless, the company having been given power by Parliament by which they obtained practical control, I was not disposed to prevent the arrangement being carried out, however much opposed I might be to it. The company had got possession of the road, and the rest was matter relating to carrying it into effect. So with regard to the present case. Then there is the other point—I speak with considerable hesitation, not having been at the Railway Committee—the only other very material point, raised by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), in regard to which he is entitled to some little information, that is with respect to power to acquire the stock and bonds of other railway companies. Last Session I cordially approved of the proposition that some stay should be placed upon the power of one railway company to acquire the stock and bonds of other railways, unless Parliament specifically indicated what particular railway company it was authorized to so deal with. A general power to acquire stock and bonds I believe to be a mischievous power. Undoubtedly some years ago, I suppose for a specific purpose, as I said last Session—for the purpose of extending the road to Chicago—we gave a general power of this character to the Grand Trunk. Does the Bill propose to leave that power intact? If so it is objectionable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Bill does not refer to it. It leaves that power as it was.

Mr. BLAKE. But the Minister of Railways said last Session, he would introduce a measure this Session, dealing with that subject generally. I supposed the power which had been given, and which might affect pending arrangements, was not to be taken away at a moment's notice; he said, the interval between this Session and next Session will be taken as notice. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) informs me that some companies have obtained such power this Session. This is unfortunate. I am opposed to the continuance of any power to a railway company to acquire stock and bonds generally of other railway companies. I believe, if they want such power, they should come to Parliament and tell us the bonds of the particular railway company they wish to obtain, and Parliament will decide, as it does in respect to granting leasing and amalgamating powers. I stated that I thought that was the most material point in the view of the case presented by my hon. friend from Northumberland. I do not think we are materially interested in the question of the finances of the Grand Trunk. I am not amongst those who have the remotest hope of this Dominion ever receiving any substantial pecuniary benefit, whatever other benefit we may receive, from the existence of that lien. Therefore, it is a very nice theoretical question, but I do not observe that it is a practical question of very great consequence. We are concerned then with the general principles of legislation, and upon the two points which have been taken by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron) and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) I think we should have some further information from the Government benches.

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

After Recess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was stated several times in the course of the debate before recess, especially by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that the Government had charge of this Bill and were promoting it. The Government are not in charge of the Bill in any way, any more than of any other private Bill. It is no part of the duty of a Government as such to take charge of private Bills, and in England they do not take charge of such Bills, except when the interests of the Crown are directly affected by them. Still, it is the duty of the Government to see that there is no private Bill legislation, or any legislation which is prejudicial to the public interests. With respect to this Bill, after the statement made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) and the remarks which fell from the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and also from the leader of the Opposition, I think it should be allowed to stand over for further consideration. I shall not at present ask the House to refer it back to the Committee on Railways, but I will ask that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

Mr. MITCHELL. One word of explanation. If I understood the right hon. gentleman aright, he stated that the Government would not take charge of the Bill. I based my remark on the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, in Committee, who stated that the Government had recast the Bill entirely, and that it was an entirely new Bill. If I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, I shall only be too happy to make the necessary correction. I understood him to say that the Government had taken charge of the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What I understood from the chairman, and from the Minister of Railways both, was that they had pointed out to the promoters of the Bill some objectionable clauses, that these clauses were removed, and that the Government approved of the Bill as it stood.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is right; that is precisely what occurred. I stated, as will be remem-

bered, when the Bill first came before the Committee, that I had drawn the attention of the parties promoting it to a number of objections which I thought might be taken to the Bill as it stood, and I said it would be necessary for the Bill to stand over, in order that the Government might have an opportunity of fully considering those questions to which I referred. I stated, on subsequent occasions, that so far as the question of the legality of the fusion or amalgamation between the Great Western and the Grand Trunk was concerned, the Minister of Justice, after careful examination of that question, had arrived at the conclusion that, under existing legislation, they had a legal right to amalgamate—that the amalgamation was legal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That it was complete.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Precisely; that it had already taken place, and consequently it was not necessary to deal with that question in this Bill. I also stated that the Bill had been referred to the Department of Justice and to the Finance Department, and that the Bill, as recast and reconstructed, was not considered by the Government to be objectionable. In the outset, I stated that the Government entirely approved of what was one of prominent objects proposed to be attained by the Bill, and that was the double-tracking of the line between Toronto and Montreal, and were prepared to give any reasonable facilities in their power for the accomplishment of that object. And in a subsequent discussion with my hon. friend, I stated that Mr. Courtney had examined it from a financial point of view, and had arrived at the conclusion that the effect would not be to place the Government lien in advance of what would be required to double-track the line, but that under the provisions of this Bill the claim of the Government against the Grand Trunk Railway would not stand in any worse position than it does at present, but that on the contrary it would stand in rather a better position, in consequence of the Bill claiming to be a consolidation of their existing liabilities and aiming at obtaining a readjustment of those liabilities, in a way which would furnish the amount of money required for that purpose without materially increasing existing charges. And when the hon. gentleman proposed that we should make it a condition that the double-tracking of the line should be the first thing dealt with, it was pointed out to my hon. friend that their ability to obtain the means of laying the double track between Toronto and Montreal would result from their being enabled by this Bill to effect a consolidation and a readjustment of their liabilities, and to place their liabilities at a lower rate, and that therefore it was impossible to place the proposed condition in the Bill, seeing that the accomplishment of the work between Toronto and Montreal would, to a large extent, depend on the arrangement which was proposed. I quite concur in the statement of the right hon. gentleman, after what has fallen from the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and especially the leader of the Opposition, who states that he entertains great doubt as to whether the amalgamation of the two roads has been legally accomplished, and that if it is open to oppose that amalgamation, he is prepared to oppose it in this House. After that statement, I think it is quite impossible to proceed with the Bill to-night, and the only proper course to be taken, as my right hon. friend has suggested, is to adjourn the debate and allow the Bill to stand over for future consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understand from the Minister of Railways that the Government will take charge of the Bill——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear it, for we shall have a better chance of getting justice than if they had. I wish to call attention to another feature that may be affected by the postponement of this Bill. The misrepresentation of the finances of the Grand Trunk, upon which the statement of the Minister of Railways is founded, that the charge is going to be less than $60,000,000 should be remembered so that the House may not legislate under a misconception of the facts.

Mr. MILLS. It is proper to ask the Government on what ground they ask for a postponement of this measure. Do they agree with the views put forth by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) and the leader of the Opposition, that if the Great Western and Grand Trunk Companies have not the power of amalgamating, they are not disposed to give them that power? Are we to understand that that is one of the grounds on which the Government ask for a postponement of that measure? If that be the case, it is very important that we should know precisely what are the views of the Government on this important question of public policy. I think that in the country generally, the amalgamation of two very powerful corporations is looked upon with considerable alarm, and that if they have not the power of amalgamating, a large majority of the electors of the country are opposed to giving them that power. If that is the view of the Administration also, I think it is desirable that we should know it. The First Minister did not, so far as I could gather from the observations he made, say anything as to the policy of the Government in regard to this measure.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My hon. friend who has just spoken, I think a little over-stated what I said on this matter. I expressed my doubt, from a legal point of view, of the validity of the fusion that has taken place. But there is another point which he should have remembered as to which I did not desire to commit myself. It is this: This fusion took place two or three years ago; it has been in operation since then; the funds of the two companies have been mixed up; their rolling stock and their operations have been confused, if I may apply that term; financial transactions of great magnitude have taken place, on the view that the arrangement had gone into operation, and I am not prepared to deny that such a state of things may exist as would render it improper for Parliament now to refuse to sanction that arrangement. No stockholder in either of the companies has thought fit to test this union in the courts. It has been allowed, by acquiescence, to go on and be acted upon; and it is possible that such a state of affairs may exist between the two companies as to require that the interests of the companies concerned, and the financial standing of Canadian companies in England, will have to be considered, if we are asked to refuse to give our assent to the sanctioning of the fusion which has already taken place. But, inasmuch as the action of Parliament and the railway company, as I understood it, was based to a great extent upon the opinion expressed by the Minister of Justice through the Minister of Railways, that this amalgamation was already legal and in the power of the companies, I felt it my duty to inform the House that I did not individually assent to that opinion, and that if the House intended deliberately to sanction the amalgamation, it ought to have full knowledge that it was doing so. With regard to the legal authorities quoted by the hon. member for Montreal Centre, they did not seem to me to touch the subject. They do not come down to a later time than 1876. No opinion that he quoted, to my mind, removed the very serious doubt as to the validity of this fusion under the terms of the Act of 1878.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that it is at all necessary to go into a discussion as to what the policy of the Government is or may be on any question, until that policy is a matter before the House. My hon. friend from East York stated that he understood that the Railway Com-

mittee passed the preamble of the Bill upon the statement of my hon. colleague, that in the opinion of the Department of Justice the amalgamation was already a *fait accompli*, that the companies were in fact amalgamated, and that the Bill in no way affected that amalgamation, which had taken place before. That is a very important statement. Then my hon. friend who has just spoken has expressed the opinion that the Act of 1876 and the subsequent legislation may possibly affect the whole matter, and may have in effect repealed the power given by the old Act; and that view of the case was pressed very strongly by the member for West Durham, who stated that if it were an open question he would vote against the amalgamation, and would only agree to support the Bill on the understanding and the conviction that the amalgamation had taken place and could not be voided. If that be the case, the Bill is a mere matter of arrangement of the internal affairs of the Grand Trunk Railway, with all its enlargements. After that statement, I think we ought to reconsider the Bill, and we shall take an early opportunity of consulting the Minister of Justice again before it is pressed.

Mr. STAIRS. While the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland are fresh in the minds of the House, I wish to say a word or two in reference to the financial statement presented by the Grand Trunk Railway, some points of which he seems to take exception to. I think the particular figure to which he objected was the amount of £583,000 sterling, being the interest which is to be paid to the Great Western Railway Company on Great Western preference stock. The hon. member for Northumberland stated, in his remarks before six o'clock, that this was about $370,000 too much. I would just like to show where the hon. gentleman is wrong. To look a little more closely at the statement presented to the hon. Minister of Finance, we find that the whole amount required, under the present existing arrangement, is £2,584,285, to pay dividends and interest and charges on bonds and other classes of securities, made up as follows:—

"To pay pre-preference charges as per schedule, £640,000; to the Great Western Section, preference and the ordinary stock holders, £583,285; to the Grand Trunk Railway, preference stock (as per margin), £691,000; to the Grand Trunk Railway, ordinary, as now existing, £670,000."

These are the amounts required yearly to pay the interest and charges existing, before the people of Canada can obtain any dividend whatever on their claim against the Grand Trunk Railway, of £2,584,285. Under the proposed Bill, the net revenue distributed, after earning the profits of which it is made up, would be £2,463,000, showing a surplus, after we deduct about £110,000 for the interest required to pay the increase on the debt to be created by this Bill, of about £11,000, to which extent the present contemplated arrangement is better for the Government and the people of Canada than the existing one. The one point we have to consider, and that point is disputed, is this £583,285. It has been asserted this does not tally with the amount given in the schedule No. 3, attached to this Bill, of the preference stock and the ordinary stock of the Great Western Railway Company. The preference stock in this schedule amounts to £500,000, and the ordinary stock to £5,000,000, the first bearing 5 per cent., and the second bearing a guarantee interest of 3 per cent. This amounts to a very much larger sum than the £583,000 placed in the Grand Trunk Railway statement. The discrepancy occurs from the fact that under the arrangement between the Great Western and the Grand Trunk Railway, not only did the Grand Trunk Railway guarantee 3 per cent. on the ordinary and 5 per cent. on the preference stock of the Great Western, but they also agreed to pay the Great Western 30 per cent. of the net earnings of the road. After you deduct the amount which is to be provided for the Great Western debt, schedule 1 and 25, amounts to £585,000. I do not know whether I make the matter clear, but that is the explanation given by the Grand Trunk Railway authorities for the supposed discrepancy pointed out by the hon. member for Northumberland. The only question at issue is, whether the Great Western and the Grand Trunk Railway had the power to amalgamate. If they had, the Grand Trunk Railway had the power to guarantee the 30 per cent. of the net earnings of the Great Western. Of course it might be said that this should not affect the Government claim; but in answer to that, it can be said that particularly the Government claim on the Grand Trunk Railway property is not weakened at all by the 30 per cent. guarantee to the Great Western, because when the Grand Trunk Railway guaranteed that, they did so with the full knowledge that the profits on the Great Western would be equal to earn this amount. It is evident that the 30 per cent. of the net earnings of the consolidated road were guaranteed the Great Western only with the understanding that the Great Western itself would earn this, and that none of it would come out of the profits of the Grand Trunk Railway itself; so that the claim of the people of Canada is not weakened at all by this proposed Bill. Of course it is shown clearly, under the Bill, that the capital charges which come in before the Government claim are very much increased, but such charges are now all perpetual and under the new Bill they have no practical effect in weakening the Government claim at all. The hon. member for Northumberland will see that the Grand Trunk Railway statement is, that really the interest charges under the proposed change will be about £11,000 less than under the existing arrangements, so that he will be perfectly safe in supporting the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Saskatoon and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

LOYAL ORANGE ASSOCIATION INCORPORATION BILL.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria), in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of British America, said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend, on the present occasion, to make any speech on the subject before the House, because I do not think it necessary, after the full discussion which the Bill received during the last Session of this House. The Bill, as introduced this year, is substantially the same as that introduced last year, with the exception of an alteration made in the preamble, certain words, which, if I understood rightly, were not acceptable to some of our friends who are opposed to the Bill, having been omitted from the preamble, so that they are not committed, by adopting the preamble and voting for the second reading of the Bill, to any declaration or expression of opinion as to the matters therein contained. If there is any clause in the Bill itself which, in the opinion of any gentleman in this House, is objectionable, and any reasonable or proper objection is pointed out to it, I have no doubt the Committee on Private Bills, when it comes to consider the Bill, will strike out, or alter, or amend these clauses, as it thinks fit. The subject is not one that needs, now, at this advanced period of the Session, and on a night like this, when I am aware that so many gentlemen desire to go elsewhere, to receive any lengthened discussion. I believe my friends, who think with me, and are in favour of this Bill, and intend to support it, are quite willing that there should be no further discussion of the subject, unless in reply to any objections which may be advanced against the

Bill. Of course, if any hon. member of this House thinks it to be his duty to discuss the matter at length, we who are in favour of the principle of the Bill will be prepared to support it; but, in asking the House to sanction the second reading of this Bill, we only ask, as we feel, on behalf of this society, that right to hold property which has been conceded to all other societies who have asked it in this House. We ask no recognition by Parliament, no special privileges, but merely the legal authority to hold property in the name of the association as a corporation, without the necessity of the intervention of trustees. It is a subject that need not be discussed with any acrimony, and that, in fact, I think, on the present occasion, need not be discussed at all. If hon. gentlemen in this House are prepared to accept the Bill, or to express their opinions by voting upon it, without any discussion, we who favour it are quite willing that that course should be adopted; but, on the other hand, if any hon. gentleman thinks it necessary to discuss the principles involved in the question, we are quite prepared to sustain the application that this association now makes, by introducing this Bill, to be allowed that right to hold property legally, as a corporation, which has been granted to other societies, and that is all it asks. If more is contained in this Bill than that, we are content that any surplusage beyond that necessary purpose, should be struck out by the Committee or the House, and I have no doubt the Committee would do so when it comes before them. All we ask is the mere legal right to hold property as a corporation, without any other recognition, privilege, or right, conceded or to be conceded by this Parliament. I, therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Call in the members.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The members of this society are willing this Bill should be discussed. We are entitled to time as well as any other society, and, if he wants to speak, let him.

Mr. MILLS. I think this is a very important measure, one that ought to be discussed in this House. It seems to me that, in proposing to incorporate this society, which exists not merely in Canada, but exists in other portions of the civilized world, it is important that we should consider whether it is asking from us powers which it is in our power to confer. Now, without going into the question as to the expediency of any such organization, it does seem to me that the Orange society, in coming to the Parliament of Canada and asking for incorporation, have come to a House or to a Parliament that has not the power to confer upon them the privileges for which they seek. Sir, even though this House had the power to incorporate this society, there are so many incidents connected with the history of the Association, so many incidents which it seems to me are not calculated to promote unity and good fellowship and feeling throughout this country, that, in my opinion, it would be highly inexpedient if we were to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Call in the members.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Members must bear in mind that the Orangemen will consider it an insult, unless there is a discussion.

Mr. MILLS. Even though we had power of granting an Act of incorporation, I think it would be highly inexpedient for us to do so. I am not calling in question the respectability, the earnestness, the sincerity of the great majority of those who are connected with the Orange society. I know their views differ widely from those I entertain. I believe it is not in the public interest, it is not calculated to promote good citizenship, it is not calculated to promote the unity or harmony of our population, to grant to the society, under the circumstances, an Act of incorporation here. What does this society seek? It is seeking power to hold real estate as a corporation throughout the various portions of this Dominion. Now, we know right well that this Parliament cannot grant this power of incorporation. Only a few hours ago we were considering the propriety of incorporting a body that had sought incorporation from the two Provinces, which had sought power to hold real estate and which came here for the purpose of being united into one corporation. But the Orange society is not incorporated in Quebec, it is not incorporated as a united society in Ontario, and it is not incorporated in all the other Provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it is.

Mr. MILLS. I am quite aware that the society is incorporated in particular Provinces, but it is not as distinct provincial corporations that the society is coming here and seeking to have those corporations united into one. It is simply seeking power to hold real estate and to dispose of it when it is thought no longer necessary. I think, Sir, it is quite clear that we have not the power to grant the Orange society the power which they seek. We know that in an important judgment, not long since, by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the members of that Board expressed the opinion that the power to hold real estate given by the Parliament of Canada would not enable any society to hold such estate against the policy of any one of the Provinces from which the power to acquire or to dispose of real estate was to be acquired. Now, that being the case, what is the object of the Orange Society coming here and seeking incorporation? It is not certainly for the purpose of holding real estate. It cannot acquire from this Parliament this power. Who may hold real estate, how it may be acquired or disposed of, is to be determined by the Legislature of each Province, and each Province has it within its power to determine what its policy shall be in that particular. It may decide that no secret society shall have power to hold real estate; it may decide that certain societies may have such powers; it may decide that this power shall be granted to all, or be limited in its extent; and it does seem to me that it is preposterous to come to this Parliament for power which we cannot grant and which, if we were to assume to grant it, would not be of the slightest service in any one Province to the society to which that power was granted. I think that we ought not to confer upon the society the power to hold real estate and to dispose of it when no longer required, when it is clear from the decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire that we do not possess that power, except, it may be, in the North-West Territories—certainly not within the limits of any of the Provinces. This being the case, I am not disposed to grant this power. I am not disposed to grant it, because I think, under the circumstances, it would be highly inexpedient. It is not in the public interest, and for this reason I am not disposed to vote for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not propose discussing this Bill at any length. There are objections to the Bill itself of a very serious nature, to some of which my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has referred. Now, it is well known that the Orange society is a secret organization. As members of this Parliament, we know nothing of the secrets of the Orange association; we know nothing of the aims and objects of the association except what we gather from the expressions of the organs and leading members of it, and from the public press. Now, Sir, as far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to give my vote for the incorporation of a purely secret organization. It may be a religious and a benevolent institution, to some extent, but I think it is a good deal more than a religious and benevolent institution; but, whether it is or not, I do not think the sanction of Par-

liament ought to be asked to give corporate existence to any purely secret association. That is one of my objections to this Bill. I say further, that the Bill should not receive the sanction of Parliament, because it expressly deals with civil rights. In the second section of the Bill, it provides that the property now held in the Provinces in the names of trustees for separate lodges is to be transferred by the Bill to this corporation. By section five of the Bill, the Grand Lodge may acquire and sell property for the use of the provincial, the county, and the district lodges, or for private lodges. Now, I say that this clearly shows that the Bill proposes to deal, and does deal, with property and civil rights. Now, when asked to sanction this Bill we are asked to give power to corporations, to take the property of the private, or separate, or local lodges out of their hands, and transfer it to the association without any information, so far as we are concerned, that these private lodges really want anything of the kind. Now, the Bill is objectionable in another respect. It is a matter purely of provincial concern, a matter that ought to be dealt with by the Provinces, and the great Orange association has so treated the question up to a very recent period. They sought incorporation at the hands of several Local Legislatures and obtained it. I believe in Manitoba the association was incorporated, though I understand that the Bill was reserved for the consideration of the Government here and not allowed to go into operation. I believe, in the Province of New Brunswick, the society has been incorporated, and I think in Nova Scotia also. In the Province of Ontario a Bill was passed incorporating that institution some years ago. That Bill was reserved for the consideration of the Federal Government, and in the Minute of the First Minister, in dealing with that question, I think we have the clearest possible evidence, that this matter is purely one of property and civil rights, a matter that pertains entirely to the Local Legislatures, and ought to be dealt with by them. The First Minister, in passing upon the Bill reserved for the consideration of the Government here, said :

"If these Acts should again be passed, the Lieutenant-Governor should consider himself bound to deal with them at once, and not ask Your Excellency to interfere in matters of Provincial concern, and solely and entirely within the jurisdiction and competence of the Legislature."

The First Minister very clearly pointed out that the incorporation of the Orange society was a matter of purely Provincial concern; that the Lieutenant-Governor, if the Local Legislature passed the Bill a second time, should at once sanction it, because it was a matter solely and entirely within the jurisdiction and competence of the Local Legislature. I say upon that ground we should not sanction this Bill. There is another objection I make to the Bill. As I understand the Bill, it is a direct violation of and interference with the Mortmain laws in force in this Province. Under this Bill a dying Orangeman can leave all his estate to the Grand Lodge or to a separate lodge; but a dying Presbyterian or a dying Catholic cannot do that. I object to this kind of special legislation in favour of the Orange institution. I have another objection to present to the House. Hon. members will observe by the fourth section that the provisions contained therein are of the most extraordinary and exceptional character. What does the fourth section say? It provides as follows :—

"The constitution and by-laws of the said association in existence at the time of the passing of this Act shall, from and immediately after the passing hereof, become and continue applicable to the said corporation, until the same are altered in the manner pointed out in the said constitution and by-laws; and all the powers and duties vested in the said several lodges and the officers thereof, under the said constitution and by-laws, shall be exercised and performed by the said lodges and officers, after the passing of this Act, in the same way as the said powers and duties have been exercised and performed, under the said constitution and by-laws, before the passing of this Act, until the said powers and duties are altered under the said constitution and by-laws."

The effect of this section is this, that the by-laws and the rules and regulations of this association, whatever they may be, are made part and parcel of the Act of incorporation. We know nothing about the secrets of the Orange institution; no man except a member of the body knows anything about those secrets; we know nothing about the by-laws of the institution; and yet we undertake, by this Bill, if it passes in its present shape, to make the rules and regulations and by-laws part of the Statute law of the country. But the Bill goes further. They are at liberty to change those by-laws and rules, and those by-laws and rules so changed are incorporated into and form part of the Act of Parliament. They are practically made part of the Statute law of Canada. It is a wholly unheard-of thing in the history of incorporation of associations that the rules and by-laws should be made part of the Statute law.

Mr. BOWELL. They are not secret.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). On all these points I am opposed to the incorporation of the Orange institution, apart from the policy of incorporating such an asssociation at all. A good deal may be said on a question of this kind. According to the preamble of the Bill, this institution now asking incorporation seeks it on one ground only. The preamble says:

"Whereas the Loyal Orange Association of British America has, by its petition, prayed for an Act of incorporation to enable it to hold property as a corporation, and for other purposes in connection therewith, and it is deemed expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition; Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows :"

I say that incorporation is sought on the ground that this is a religious and benevolent institution, and solely such. I do not know what the Orange institution is elsewhere; I do not speak of what it is elsewhere; but I say that in the Province to which I belong it is not solely a religious and benevolent institution. It is more of a political organization than a religious and benevolent institution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Some hon. members opposite say "no." I am in a position to establish the statement I have used by the utterances of the leading members of the Orange order, and by resolutions of the Grand Lodge, and to prove that it is not only a religious and benevolent institution, but that it is a political institution, run in the interests of a political party, and for the benefit of a political party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not propose to enter at any great length into this point; but will the hon. gentlemen who say "no," deny that the Orange Lodge has expelled men for voting for a Liberal candidate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Will hon. members deny that the Orange Lodge has expelled men for voting for a Catholic candidate? Will hon. gentlemen deny that the Grand Lodge has more than once declared and put resolutions on their minutes, some of which I hold in my hand, declaring that it was improper to vote either for a Grit or the Popish ally of a Grit. If hon. gentleman do not controvert that, I do not care to occupy time in discussing it; but in my Province I say the Orange institution is largely a political institution and is ran in the interest of one political party. I have here a statement by one of the leading men of the association, who stated that the association always voted one way, and that that way was Tory. If so, I say it must be looked upon as a political organization; but I am not going to discuss at length that question to-night. I have thrown out a challenge. The challenge has not been met. Sir, I am in a position to prove, by

documents in my hand, that my statements are correct. I oppose the Bill principally because it is unwise for Parliament to incorporate this association on the four grounds I have set forth. I do not understand that hon. gentlemen have denied that it is a political institution, because, if so, I will continue my remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then I will take up some of the time of the House by trying to establish the statements I have made.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). You are only talking against time.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I hope hon. gentlemen will not object to hearing statements read which come from the mouths of their own friends. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) stated that he wanted free discussion on this question; I am going to give him a little free discussion. What I am going to say is not original. They are the observations of men who belong to the Orange order. I have said that the association, while claiming to be for religious and benevolent purposes solely, is really a political association in Ontario. Some years ago I find that a person of note connected with the institution was sent as a delegate from this country to England, as the representative of the Orange association. He was a big man in the association, he had a dozen letters after his name, indicating his titles and position, he was a Knight of the Red Scarlet. He went to the old country and there at a public gathering of the order he made use of the following language:—

"It was true they did not discuss politics in their lodges in Canada but when they came to vote, they all voted one way."

Now what is that one way? Is it in favour of the Liberal candidates? No, Sir, not in my Province at all events. These are the words of one of their own men, a man who occupies a prominent position in the order. I find that in an election contest, held not long ago in one of the ridings of Ontario, a mass meeting of Orangemen was held for the purpose of considering the course they should pursue in the election. The poster which was placarded around the riding is in the following words:—

"MASS MEETING

"Of the ORANGEMEN of South Ontario.

"A meeting of all the members of the several lodges in the County will be held at Brooklin on Friday, 30th August, 1878, at 2 p.m., sharp it having been thought necessary that the Orangemen should take some united action in the ensuing election. Full arrangements for carrying out the best method of securing our rights as Protestants will be made. Every Orangeman is particularly requested to attend. By order,

"WM STEPHENSON,
"Co. Master.

"WM. ROBSON,
"Co. Secretary."

Now, what was the object of this organization? What was the object of this meeting? Why should there have been a mass meeting of Orangemen? If it was a political gathering a mass meeting of electors, not of Orangeman, should have been called; but it was a meeting of Orangeman called for the purpose of promoting united action, and assisting the Conservative candidate, and they did so decide by resolution. Now, I say that the organs and members of the Orange association have expressed opinions in the same direction. I will first give an extract from a speech of Bro. McCormick, D.M., which, I suppose, means District Master. This speech was made in the old country by this gentleman, who is a leading Orangeman:

"He would like them to get enrolled as voters, that at the next general election they would be able to vote for such men as Johnston, Verner, Hill Trevor, Creighton and Stuart Knox; men such as these whose principles have been weighed in the balance and have not been found wanting. He was proud to say that everywhere the 'people's William' was being defeated; that since last election, upwards of twenty-eight seats had been wrenched from the so-called Liberals, which gave to the Conservatives about forty-two votes on a division. This was a triumphant blow given to the great Liberal majority with which the present Parliament opened. More success to the Conservative cause."

Do these words indicate that the institution is a purely benevolent and religious institution? No, Sir; nothing of the kind. You will find further than a banquet was given to this Orangeman, and several toasts were given, among them being the Conservative cause throughout Great Britain and Ireland, which was drunk three times three and one over. Then, Sir, the toast of the press was given—no, not the press, but the Conservative press—all of which goes to show that the pro position I set out with, that this body is not solely and purely a religious and a benevolent institution, is correct. On another occasion, at the opening of an Orange hall near Belfast, Rev. Mr. Henderson, an English Church minister, was called upon to make a speech, and here is a report which a newspaper makes of it. It said:

"Rev. Mr. Henderson, in the course of one of his humorous, pathetic and thrilling speeches, defended the religious element of the Orange institution as well as its political, and reviewed the policy and spirit of the Radicals."

Now, Sir, I say that this all goes to show that the institution is something more than a religious and benevolent institution. I have quoted so far from the expressions of opinion by Orangemen in the Mother Country. Let me now give the House what the Grand Master of the Orangemen of western Ontario stated on one occasion at the Grand Lodge. He began with an apology for not having attended to Orange matters for some considerable time, and the reason he gave was that he was busily engaged in promoting the Conservative cause in the various counties. He stated:

"I principally regret that a continued absence from home, from the 8th of December last, to the 14th of February instant, fighting the battles of our party, has left a number of letters on Orange business unanswered."

He went on to say:

"I trust you will be glad to know that your Grand Master has been honoured with a seat in the Legislature by that good old Orange county, South Simcoe, which for half a century has stood true as steel to the Conservative principles of our order, but I have to repeat what I said in my address last year, that there have been Orangemen all over the Province, and notably in East Toronto, who have so far forgotten their duty to this loyal and Protestant society as to ally themselves with the Grit-Republican party in the recent elections, and in the latter case with a Roman Catholic, who, if not a Fenian himself, is at any rate the brother of one who invaded our soil and murdered our brethren at Ridgeway. This state of things calls loudly for the active interference of the Orange body. If we ever hope to possess the influence in the country our numbers justly entitle us to, it can only be by union among ourselves, and I trust to see the day when the Grand Lodge will appreciate this fact and make it an offence punishable by expulsion, for any member, from the Grand Master down, to resist or oppose the policy of the Orange body in Parliamentary elections."

Here was a Grand Master for western Ontario, declaring it was an outrageous thing for Orangemen to vote for a Liberal, especially if he were a Roman Catholic. Now, I stated that I was in a position to prove that the institution was not simply a religious or benevolent institution, but that in Ontario it was a political organization, run in the interests of a political party, and that they always voted one way, and that was for the Conservative party. I go further, and I say that whatever may be the principles of the order—and I say nothing about that, because I do not know the secrets of the institution, or the principles on which it was founded—but whatever may have been the principles upon which it was founded, I say it is run now, not in the interests of benevolence or religion, but in the interests of a political party, and that the leaders of the institution, those high in authority in the order, run it in that interest only. Let me quote to you, not from the present, but from a late organ of the Orange institution upon this question, to show that it is antagonistic to all who do not think as they do, to those who entertain more liberal sentiments in politics or are opposed to them in

religion, that is to say, to the Liberal party and the Catholic Church. Here is what that organ stated not many years ago:

"We have not to be convinced, in the month of August, 1873, that the Grit or Radical party, as a whole, are not only traitors to our great Empire in general, but to our own happy Dominion in particular. * * * * Let everyone remember that an Orangeman is sworn to belong to no society or body of men that are enemies to Her Majesty and our glorious Constitution, and in reality the Orange institution is more opposed to the Grit and Radical faction than to political Popery. The rebellion of 1837-38, the rewarding of the rebels in 1848, in paying them their losses when our people placed the same rebels in power; the suppressing of all institutions they regarded as loyal, or tending to loyalty in Canada; their hatred and persecution of the Orange institution, and their recent insults which they have offered to Her Majesty's representatives in Canada, show most clearly that the Grit faction, in 1873, are as vile rebels in heart as the same faction were in 1837. * * * * It is well that our brethren everywhere should know these things and govern themselves accordingly; and beware of the two smoking firebrands—the Grits and their allies, the Papists."

This is the language which is used towards the Grits and their allies, the Papists, who are put on the same ground, as being traitors and disloyal to their country; this is the language used on behalf of this purely religious and benevolent institution, which comes here seeking incorporation at our hands. Sir, if incorporation is granted on those grounds it is granted under false pretences. Let me read you something further on this point. There was an Orange gathering not many years ago at Hamilton, and there was a certain reverend gentleman who made a speech there. Reverend gentlemen, you know, generally use the strongest language; and on that occasion, he made use of the following language:

"Orangemen never commenced a riot, but when attacked always returned home, with flying colours to the notes of the 'Protestant Boys,' and 'Croppies Lie Down.' None but Croppies have a right to feel that music grating to their ears. We must be united, the lecturer said, to effect any good. We want no Grits, no traitors in our ranks, to divide us. If united we shall conquer, but if we allow our enemies to divide us, they will laugh us to scorn and render us powerless. Grit traitors are making a strong effort to come in among the Orangemen, especially in Toronto. We hope to see their power abated, their wrath assuaged, and their devices confounded."

Here, you see, both classes to which I have referred are put in the same category: they do not want to see a Liberal in their ranks; and yet this is a purely religious and benevolent association. The organ of the association at that time made use of the following language:—

"A few years ago, in Ontario, the very expression of Grit Orangeman, to every man in the least degree acquainted with the Order, would be the subject of great amusement. It was then known, what every true Orangeman now knows, that Radicals could not be Orangemen, and no Grit, with any kind of a clear conscience, would for one moment think of taking the Orange obligation. But times have changed so far, at least, as Toronto is concerned. A meeting can hardly be convened in Toronto, of Orangemen, but Satanic Grits are stationed in different parts of the hall, impudently wearing our colours, and watching with an eagle's eye every member present, and catching every word that may drop from the lips of the brethren, to convey them to the enemies of our order. They are known at every meeting, from the noise and disorder they create, in their endeavours to get brother arrayed against brother. Toronto has always been distinguished for its loyalty, and we hope our brethren—the old standards—will unite as one man in this city, for the purpose of driving the intruders out of the order. We hope soon to see a special rule adopted by the brethren, making it a serious offence for a brother to introduce the name of a Radical as an applicant for admission into the fraternity. We are glad to see that several of the city lodges are taking steps in the right direction, in order to leave the Grits, like their old friend Judas, in their own places, and outside the portals of any society which calls itself loyal. Brethren, remember the enemy is at the door; take notice and govern yourselves accordingly. * * * * * * * * * The sneaking Grits can readily be known by their clamour and, we may add, by their gross ignorance. We only wish the Tylers were directed to lead them, or rather forward them, to where they could be treated according to their merits. To call them brothers we never shall. We regard them as intruding enemies with whom no true Orangeman can ever be at peace, so long as one of them is present at our meetings to spy out our liberties and report to our enemies. We have long made it a matter of conscience not to converse with them as Orangemen, and we are happy to say to our readers that at least nine out of every ten Orangemen in Toronto are with us. In the meeting referred to, Lieut.-Col. O. R. Gowan, and R. S. Birch, Barrister-at-Law, made eloquent and telling speeches in defence of our loyal institution against both Radical Jesuits and Grit plotters."

Yet the organization, the hon. gentleman says, is not political. In the same newspaper, on the same date, there is a piece of doggerel which I am going to trouble the House by reading. It is headed, "Radical intruders in an Orange lodge," and is as follows:—

By the blood of your fathers, the martyrs of old;
By the honour and courage that never were sold;
By the throne that you love and the faith you revere:
Watch, Orangemen! watch! the vile traitors are near.

By the dread recollection of horrors long past;
By the Radical who still is true to his cast;
By the Pope's low Grit allies, who plot to betray:
Watch, Orangemen! watch! drive the traitors away.

By all that kind Heaven or earth can afford;
By religion and love, and by torture abhorr'd;
By base superstition, and priestcraft and crime:
Watch, Orangemen! watch! 'tis the crisis of time.

By wife, home and children; by friends and by kin;
By the one sacred triumph, of which Britons sing;
By Conservative principles, keep the Radicals down:
Watch, Orangemen! watch! and defend Church and Crown.

And yet this is a purely benevolent and religious institution, having no politics connected with it. Sir, I say there is no benevolence in the quotations I have given—this setting of man against man, of party against party, of creed against creed, and this raising up of the worst feelings of our common humanity, instead of doing anything to allay them. I find that the Grand Lodge has also taken up the question as to how to deal with Grits who attempt to enter Orange lodges. In the Grand Lodge it was moved and

"*Resolved*,—That our humble petition be presented to the Grand Lodge of British America, praying that the constitution of our association be so amended as to prevent members of our association voting at any municipal or parliamentary election for any person or persons belonging to or in sympathy with the Roman Catholic league, and in the event of their so voting, that they be expelled from our order."

Why, Sir, what does this mean? According to the resolution of the Grand Lodge, a Roman Catholic was not fit to be elected to a common council, was not fit to be made a pound keeper, and every member of the order was instructed to vote against him. And yet this is a religious and benevolent institution. Further, it was moved by another brother and seconded by another brother of the same Grand Lodge:—

"That inasmuch at it is reported that brethren of the Loyal Orange Institution at the recent Parliamentary election, voted for a Fenian sympathizer, in preference to a sound Protestant, be it resolved that the District Lodge of Toronto be directed to investigate the matter, and deal with the offending brethren as may be conceived conducive to the bests interests of our institution."

The sound Protestant was Mr. Coatsworth, and the Papist who was running against him was Mr. John O'Donohoe, the present Senator; and the members of the order were called upon to do—what? To expel from the Grand Lodge those men who exercised the right of free men, to vote according to their consciences. For doing that they were to be expelled from this religious and benevolent institution, run in the interest of our common humanity. This is not all. I have something further that I propose to trouble the House with. I have shown you that this is a political organization, run in the interests of one political party. I have shown you that a resolution was passed in the Grand Lodge, making a man liable to expulsion if he voted for a Roman Catholic or a Grit. I have shown you that this organization is opposed to the Liberal party and to the Roman Catholic Church. I say that an institution of that kind does not deserve recognition at the hands of an independent Parliament. I say that it is arbitrary and arrogant in resolving that men shall not be allowed to exercise the franchise in the way they see fit, without being subject to expulsion from the organization. At a meeting of the Grand Lodge of Ontario, held in 1876, the following resolutions were passed:—

"*Resolved*—That in the opinion of the Right Worshipful Grand Lodge, the time has arrived when the Orangemen of Canada, without reference to politics or political parties, must unite in one grand political phalanx in order to stop the encroachments of the Romish Hierarchy upon the

body politic of the country, and that the following platform be adopted :—

"Unswerving and untiring allegiance to the Mother Country and British connection.

"2. No grants of money from the public purse for sectarian purposes

"3. No separate schools, but free secular education for all.

"4. Taxation for all; taxation of all property held by religious bodies upon its fair assessment value.

"5. The opening of all public institutions in the land, religious or otherwise, to public inspection by Government officials.

"6 That it shall be the duty of the Country Master in every Orange county, in the event of a general election, or other election taking place, either for the Local or Dominion Parliaments, to submit the platform to the candidate or candidates, to ascertain if they will support them or not, and then to call a county meeting before the day of polling, and if neither of the candidates will support the said platform, then it shall be the duty of the County Lodge to bring out a candidate."

What is that if not political? Does that show a religious and benevolent spirit? It shows the most intolerant spirit that could be manifested by any class of the community. That is not all. The spirit of hostility is not only manifested towards the Liberal party, but also to the Roman Catholics. We have had ample occasion to learn that in Ontario during the last few years. We remember well the bitter discussion that took place in the press on both sides of politics, with respect to a book that was adopted in our common schools. I refer to Marmion. The Catholic Archbishop of Toronto objected to that book, and the Minister of Education withdrew it, because it was objectionable to a large and important body of his fellow-countrymen who have different religious opinions from his, opinions which ought to be and are respected by every right-thinking man. The *Orange Sentinel*, commenting on the action of the Minister of Education, said:

"It was an outrage on the part of the Minister of Education (Mr. Crooks) if he has made this concession to the priests for any reason * * * Because the Protestant public of this Province will not submit to Archbishop Lynch or any other Romish priest dictating what books shall or shall not be used at schools, which are almost entirely supported by taxes paid by Protestants."

Then the *Orange Sentinel* goes on to say :—

"The hand of Rome is on the throat of our public school system. The Protestant public are sick of this political pandering to Romanism which, if continued, will end in the destruction of our dearest liberties. * * * Because Archbishop Lynch does not want the book interdicted on account of its immorality, but because it exposes the lewdness of Romish ecclesiastical celibacy.

And so on. With these facts staring us in the face, it is folly to close our eyes to the fact that this institution is something more than a religious and benevolent institution. At a demonstration of Orangemen held not very long ago, in my own town, another reverend gentleman made use of the following words :—

"They should not on any consideration put a Roman Catholic into Parliament."

That is religion and benevolence.

"Read from papers showing that the Papacy declared their only hope of continuing to a vigorous old age lay in America, and that was by having legislators to make laws favourable to them. Hoped no Catholic would be allowed into our Canadian Parliament. Said that a Roman Catholic was not a loyal man and could not be such so long as he placed the authority of the Pope first. He would, therefore, advise his brethren that where they could not send a man to Parliament of the political stripe they desired, to allow a member of any other political party, if a Protestant, to represent them rather than a Roman Catholic."

Now, I think I have shown you enough to prove that this is something more than a religious and a benevolent institution, and that I am justified therefore in opposing it. It is a good deal more than that. You will find that an Orangeman is not at liberty to send his child to a convent, though there may be no other schools for miles distant, without rendering himself liable to expulsion. I hold in my hand the minutes of the Grand Lodge, and what do I find reported there:

"H. E. Ketchum was expelled for taking his child to a Roman Catholic school; Wm. Stimpson was expelled for marrying a Roman Catholic."

The feelings of the heart cannot even be encouraged by this institution which is so eminently benevolent and religious.

"Thos. Powell, for being drunk and using a knife on a Protestant."

Had he used it on a Catholic, it would not have mattered. Now I find throughout this report a dozen of these cases:

"Dalton McVicar was expelled for marrying a Roman Catholic; Richard Bradford for marrying a Roman Catholic; Alexander Kinch for marrying a Papist."

They were not particular about the name in this case. You find, from beginning to end, that almost every movement made in the Grand Lodge is a movement in the direction I have just indicated—all pointing in the one direction, not simply that it is a religious and benevolent institution, but something more than that—a political institution. This order has no right to ask incorporation on the ground of its being a religious and benevolent institution, if these extracts, which I have taken from the reports of the Grand Orange Lodge, are true, and they must be true, since the report is an official record. The society is, in fact, largely a political association, and is kept alive, to a large extent, for that purpose. Why, then, should we give this association corporate existence and Parliamentary recognition? What does it do every twelfth of July, but stir up old sores, old reminiscences, old memories that ought to be forgotten, in a free country like ours. I trust the hon. First Minister will not vote for this Bill. I know that he was a leading Orangeman at one time; I know that he was a Knight of the Royal Scarlet, and I remember reading an able speech of his, a powerful speech—a speech more able than I have ever heard him make in Parliament—delivered to his brethren in Kingston, and after the speech was over they marched down through the streets of Kingston to the tune of "The Protestant boys," and "To hell with the Pope." This is not the kind of proceeding to which we ought to give legal status. I hope my hon. friend, as he and I are growing older, as the shadows are growing longer, will be found on the same side, recording our votes against this Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The earlier part of the hon. gentleman's speech had to do with the constitutional right of this Parliament to pass this Bill. He took the ground that we had no authority whatever to pass a Bill of this kind, incorporating a body to hold property, because that was a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. But we have already, during this Session, incorporated two or three rather important bodies to hold property throughout this Dominion; we have incorporated the Wesleyan body, the new Methodist Church in Canada, and, curiously enough, we have made the articles of union—which may be said to correspond with the rules and by-laws, and regulations and constitution of the Orange society—a part of the Statute, giving it the effect of law, and giving to the body the right to change its provisions by a certain process afterwards, if they think proper. We have this afternoon created two corporations, so far as this branch of the Legislature is concerned, with authority to hold property. I know that the question has been raised by the hon. member for Quebec as to the right of this Parliament to create those corporations, to give them the power we are giving them, but notwithstanding that point was raised, this House, without any serious objection, at any rate, has created those corporate bodies. It is quite true that the granting of those powers will undoubtedly require, as I understand it, that the property be held subject to the laws of the several Provinces, but so far as we are concerned, we simply create the corporation; the object is that they may have a corporate existence. The hon. gentleman further objected, on the ground that we were going to hand the property of the private lodges to the general body. That is a matter which, it seems to me, concerns the lodges themselves, and I am not aware that any petitions have been presented to Parliament from Orange

lodges complaining that they are about to have their property placed at the mercy of the Grand Lodge. If there is such objection, it will undoubtedly come before the Private Bills Committee, where this matter will be discussed, and it can be there dealt with. We have the statement that it is a direct interference with the law of Mortmain and reference is made to one of the clauses of the Bill, in which it is said that an Orangeman, according to the interpretation of the hon. gentleman, could bequeath his property to a Grand or any lodge. This is a question also of detail, which can be dealt with by the Private Bills Committee, if this Bill should reach that Committee. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the second part of his speech, after declaring that we had no power to pass this Bill at all, went into a general attack upon the Orange association. Sir, I ventured, when we were discussing this question on a former occasion, to point out the great inconvenience which would arise if, in questions of incorporation of public bodies which come here, we were to be bound by our opinion of the methods or principles of those corporations. The hon. gentleman has read the opinions of a number of Orangemen —pretty strong opinions, I will admit—but I venture to say that if he goes into some of our Protestant churches, or into some of our Roman Catholic churches, and listens to the controversial sermons which are sometimes there delivered, he will find the attacks upon Roman Catholics on the one side, and on Protestants on the other, quite as strong as anything he has given us here this evening.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. WHITE. Do I undertand hon. gentlemen to say no?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Then I can only say that I have heard them, and the singular thing is that the strongest expressions the hon. gentleman has quoted to us to-day were those of clergymen. Are we to be told that they use stronger expressions out of the pulpit than they would use in the pulpit? But I am not prepared to admit that those expressions are reasons why this society should not be incorporated. Then we had read to us a platform, or what was said to be a platform, of the Orange body, to be submitted to every candidate, in order to determine whether the Orange body would vote for that candidate or not. I thought, when I heard that platform read, that I recollected something like it as being the platform of the Liberal party of the Province of Ontario. "No separate schools." That was one of them. Do hon. gentlemen remember who raised that cry in Ontario, and do they remember, as I pointed out once before, that it was the votes of Orangemen in the old Parliament of Canada which gave the extension of the separate school system to the Roman Catholics of Ontario, two Grand Masters of the Orangemen voting for it and the large body of the so-called Reformers voting against it, although they were supporting a Reform Government, which did not bring in the Bill, but supported a Bill which was introduced by an hon. gentleman who is now a Senator. "No sectarian grants." That was another plank.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain who it was that put the Separate School Act in force—under what Government was it put in force?

Mr. WHITE. It was put in force, if I mistake not, as far back as 1852, under the Government of Mr. Hincks, with determined opposition from the late Hon. George Brown; and, from that day downwards, the late Hon. Mr. Brown and his followers in the Province of Ontario were the leading opponents of separate schools, and the Conservatives were attacked in every constituency in the Province of Ontario on the ground that they were not true to the Protestant principles which ought to govern them in that Province, because they were in favour of separate schools. And then, in 1863, when it is well known that the Roman Catholics of the Province of Ontario desired some changes in the separate school law, some further extension of it, and Mr. Scott brought in his Bill, when Mr. Sandfield Macdonald was at the head of the Government——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Scott being a Conservative.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; Scott being, of course, a Conservative at that time; it was before he went into the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite—when he brought in that Bill, sanctioned and supported by Mr. Sandfield Macdonald and his Government, but opposed by the ordinary following of that Government from Ontario, that Bill was passed by the votes of Conservatives in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Scott was not in the House in 1852.

Mr. WHITE. "No sectarian grants." That was a cry on every Reform platform in Ontario. "Public institutions open to inspection." Have you never heard the late Hon. George Brown announce that as his policy, as what ought to be the Statute law of the land, that every public institution receiving any grant of any kind from the Legislature, ought to be open to inspection? And I have no hesitation in saying that any institution which does receive a grant from the public Treasury ought to be opened to inspection by the Government if it chooses to accept that grant. "Taxation of church property." Why, that is a strong cry now, with the Liberals in the Province of Ontario. Take the Liberal newspapers, nearly all of them, and you will find that they are in favour of that principle. I believe even the London *Advertiser*, a newspaper edited by a prominent member of this House, is in favour of that principle. And so on with all these principles embodied in that platform, which was said to be offered to candidates for their acceptance. All these were the principles, which for years governed the Liberal party in this Province. One cannot but look back at the history of that period. I can remember very well, and all those who took part in political discussions in this Province of Ontario, can remember very well when broad Protestant principles were the basis and foundation of their whole political superstructure, when Conservatives were attacked in every part of the Province of Ontario, because they were said to be priest-ridden, because they were sold to the French of Lower Canada, because they were not true to the Protestant principles which ought to govern them. When the hon. gentleman reads extracts from speeches delivered by Orangemen, I would recommend him to read the speech delivered by the late Hon. George Brown, when he was running for Toronto, in 1858, at the presentation of a gold watch by the Orangemen of Toronto or some of the Orangemen of Toronto, those who were disposed to go with the Liberal party at that time, headed by the late Mr. Robert Moody, who presented it; let him contrast the speech of the leader of the party in those days, who, even after he left public life, was recognized as the leader of the party, with the speeches he has quoted to us to-day, and he will find that the speeches of to day are mere milk and water—aye, the very skim-milk and water at that—in regard to their strength, as compared with the speeches of the leaders of the Liberal party in this Province at that time. We have nothing to do here with the fact whether the Orangemen are Conservatives or Liberals. What we do know is, and it is a matter of record, that in many constituencies, Roman Catholics from the Province of Ontario—and we have them to-day in this House—owe their seats to Orange votes, and we know that it has been the steady record of parties in the Province of Ontario, that in their electoral acts, when candidates were put in the field, the liberality has been on the part of the Orangemen and the illiberalty on the part of the clear Grit Protestants of those constituencies. That has been the

history of the two parties in relation to their liberality towards our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens; but, as I have said, we are not here to discuss the question of whether Orangeism is wise or unwise, whether it is good, bad or indifferent, or whether it would be better if there were no Orangemen in the country. Extreme Protestants would say it would be better if we were all Protestants and there were no Roman Catholics. Extreme Roman Catholics would say it would be better if we were all Roman Catholics and there were no Protestants. But do we stop to consider that, when either the one party or the other party comes here to ask for incorporation? No; what we have to deal with is this, in this particular case, that there are to-day in Canada at least 250,000 people who are Orangemen—whether wisely or not, is not for us to consider here—they come to us just like any other body comes to us to ask a simple Act of incorporation, to ask that which is not denied to any other body that comes to this Parliament; and it does seem to me that, if we undertake to say that they shall not be incorporated, because, forsooth, their politics do not suit the politics of hon. gentlemen opposite who happen to be Protestants, and who, upon that ground, at any rate, cannot object to them, if we are to take that ground, we are laying down a principle of legislation which, in its practical effects, would prove exceedingly injurious if carried out in other cases which come before us. This is simply a Bill for the incorporation of people who, as citizens, conduct themselves certainly as well as other citizens: who, as neighbours, in neighbourhoods where Protestants and Catholics live together, meet their neighbours of the Roman Catholic faith, and live together as happily as men can do. I happen to represent a constituency where, in one part of it, there is a large Roman Catholic population, and where, in the very same township, there is a large Orange population. You meet the two classes at their bees, at their social gatherings, everywhere, no difficulty between them, each willing to help the other in time of need, each willing to visit the other in time of sickness or distress, when social intercourse is of its greatest value. By granting this Act of Incorporation, instead of increasing Orangeism, instead of embittering the feelings between Orangemen and Catholics, I venture to say the effect will be largely to decrease that feeling, by taking away that reasonable ground of grievance, which men have a right to feel when they come as citizens of a free country to a free Parliament, to ask for the privileges which are given without question to all others who choose to come here and ask for them, and who find their reasonable request refused.

Mr. BLAKE. Upon this question parties are divided. It is well known that the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite are divided, and it is known that the Liberal party does not think, or speak, or act, as a unit on this question. I am not speaking, I do not propose to speak this evening, in any shape or sense in the capacity which I, for the time being, hold as leader of the Liberal party, but to speak only in my individual capacity as a member of Parliament. I am not speaking for any one but myself. Although I gave a silent vote on the last occasion when this question was before us, and although but for what has occurred since then, I should have repeated that silent vote, I feel bound, on this occasion, to express my views upon the Bill before the House. The action of myself, and the action of those members of the Liberal party who voted against this Bill, have been misrepresented, seriously misrepresented, during the recess, and, indeed, an alleged party action has been stated, which did not in fact exist. A political course has been taken by the promoters of this Bill, which I propose to develop before I sit down, and which, I think, furnishes, of itself, ample justification for my departing from the intention I had to have repeated at this time, if there was no reason against it, the silent vote which I gave before. But I do not conceal from myself that, irrespective of those circumstances, there are important questions at stake upon this occasion; and my own opinion is that a temperate discussion of those questions is no evil, but rather a good. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have supported the Bill, and hon. gentlemen opposite who have opposed the Bill, are, many of them, apparently desirous that there should not occur that discussion, but it is as well that we should understand our exact positions. It is well that the reasons why we act on one side or the other should be made known. It is well that the objections and difficulties which some of us may have should be stated, in order that they may be answered and, if possible, removed. Hence, it becomes necessary for myself, and perhaps for others who may have voted for the reasons which I am about to describe as influencing the vote I gave, and which I am about to repeat—that we should state those reasons, in view of the character of the attacks that have been made upon those who voted against the Bill last Session. The first misrepresentation to which I wish to refer is one which was made, I think, by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) at an Orange gathering at Brockville, in which he said:

"The onus of defeat rests primarily upon the Reformers who, while professing to be Protestant Reformers, decided in caucus to oppose the measure."

Now, the hon. member for South Leeds could not know that to be true, because he was not at the caucus, and it happens to be entirely untrue. There was no caucus of the Liberal party at which this question was touched upon; there was no meeting or gathering, formal or informal, at which it was touched upon, and there was no decision or arrangement between the members of the party as to the way they should vote. There was no concerted action of any kind or description. On the contrary, to the few gentlemen who happened to approach me on the subject, I said that I thought it was a matter in which each man must decide for himself, that I did not conceive it would be a party question on the other side of the House, and that I did not conceive it was necessarily a party question on our side; and I deprecated all party action upon it. That was the advice I gave and which, so far as I know, was acted on; and, until the vote was taken, I had not myself any idea—with the exception of, perhaps, six or eight gentlemen at the most, who may have spoken to me—of the sentiments of the gentlemen with whom I usually act. Yet, Sir, we find hon. gentlemen, high in the confidence of the Orange order and members of this Parliament, declaring that there was a caucus of the Protestant Liberals, who decided to oppose the measure. I complain of that, Sir. I think I have reason to complain of such statements being made with a view to influencing persons of the same religious faith that I am, against us.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I may state, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that he is entirely mistaken. The hon. member for South Leeds, who sits beside me, never spoke at any Orange gathering in the town of Brockville.

Mr. BLAKE. I have taken my quotation from the *Sentinel* which, I believe, is the organ of the Orange society, and which speaks of Mr. Taylor, M. P., for South Leeds, as having made this speech at, I think, Brockville. It may not have been at Brockville, but it was in that neighbourhood. The question is, was the speech made?

Mr. TAYLOR. I made no such speech, either at Brockville or anywhere else, and I am not responsible for newspaper reports.

Mr. BLAKE. I have read from the organ of the hon. gentleman; and the other quotations I am about to make I shall take from the same quarter, and I hope they will be more trustworthy than this appears to be.

Mr. FERGUSON. Put them on a par with the *Globe*.

Mr. BLAKE. I am about to state my own views frankly on this question. I dare say they will not please extreme men on either side, but I hope that to some moderate men those views may be acceptable. In the first place, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) alleges that this Bill is similar to other Bills, upon the constitutional ground, which we have dealt with. I think there is a very marked distinction, on the constitutional ground, between this Bill and the other Bills, and I adverted to it this very afternoon. I pointed out that I did not myself concur in all the reasoning, or in the result of all the reasoning, in the case in the Privy Council to which allusion was made this afternoon; but it seemed to follow from that decision that a difficulty and doubt existed as to the relative powers of the Local and the Dominion Parliaments in certain cases in which there had been, at any rate, a corporation created by the Legislature of the old Province of Canada, which sought modification. I did not believe that the true solution was that alleged, but there was a difficulty. Now, Sir, how far have we gone? How far have I, at any rate, assented to our going? Thus far, that—since that decision had taken place—wherever there was a Local Legislature attempting to carry out the wishes of the corporators in each of two or more Provinces on a question affecting property and civil rights, I said I thought it was not unreasonable that, considering that doubt and difficulty, we should use what power we might have—which is undecided, in my judgment—to implement the wishes of the Local Legislatures, and to confirm, in effect, their legislation. That is the rule that I have laid down for myself in this class of cases. I did not intend to give my assent to any Bill which acts upon other principles. Perceiving that the earlier of the two Bills, which came on this afternoon, did not fall entirely within that principle, I pointed out that I objected to it. The second Bill seemed to me to come quite within that principle; and, therefore, from my point of view, though I sympathized, as the hon. member from Quebec will have observed, with his general view as to our powers, I thought it not an unreasonable thing that we should not interfere with local legislation, but act for the purpose of implementing or complementing local legislation.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is no legislation of a local nature for the Methodist Bill. We have passed it.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that in the case of the Methodist Bill, it was stated in the petition, or at any rate, stated in the House, that legislation was going on and was being granted in two Local Legislatures. It was for the purpose of making sure, by the Bill, the Union which, as far as property and civil rights were concerned, was to be made complete by the Local Legislatures.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; they are going to apply for it.

Mr. BLAKE. They have applied, and the Bills are going through. Now, with reference to the particular measure before the House, there can be no doubt whatever that the general question of the incorporation of the society for the purpose for which its promoters ask its incorporation—which, as they say, is merely in order that they may have a corporate entity enabling them to hold real property — is one of civil rights and property. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that this is within the control, and the exclusive control, of the Local Legislatures. The report of the Minister of Justice (Sir John A. Macdonald) upon the Orange Bill of 1873, passed by the Ontario Legislature, which was reserved, reads thus:

"If the Acts should again be passed, the Lieutenant-Governor should consider himself bound to deal with them at once, and not ask Your Excellency to interefere in matters of Provincial concern and solely and entirely within the jurisdiction and competence of the Legislature of the Province."

That was a perfectly correct statement. It is true it applied to Provincial incorporation; but it was a perfectly correct statement that this proposed incorporation was not merely within, but solely and exclusively within, the competence of the Province. There have been Acts passed, as we know, in several of the Legislatures, granting the Order incorporation. The order has been incorporated in Manitoba, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick—in three at least of the Provinces. And we know also that it is not because these incorporations are deficient for the purpose for which they were made, that the applicants come here. They do not come here because they want more power in Nova Scotia, Manitoba, or New Brunswick; not at all. The present incorporation is adequate for all the purposes they want, only they cannot get incorporation in enough Provinces—that is the question. This case is quite different from the class of cases in which I am willing that Dominion legislation should intervene, to clear up any doubts arising from the decision to which I have alluded; it is not to implement such legislation, but it is because legislation cannot be obtained in some Provinces that the parties come here. It is not to confirm, not to complete, the legislation of any Province in regard to which difficulty had arisen under our complex system; but it is to coerce Provinces into accepting legislation which the Provinces would not otherwise pass. I wish to make good the propositions I advance as I proceed, and I shall do this by quoting extracts. I find that the Grand Secretary of the order (Mr. Keyes) said this:

"Bills have been passed by five of the Provincial Legislatures incorporating our association; but through no fault of ours, in three of these Provinces, Ontario, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island, the Bills have never become law. Under these circumstances, and in order to settle the question, we have appealed to the Parliament of Canada for the passage of a general Act of incorporation for our society in the Dominion."

There you see it is not to supplement, to make good and pertect local legislation, but because local legislation cannot be obtained, that they come here to obtain that which they cannot get in the proper quarter.

Mr. BOWELL. Have you the date of that report?

Mr. BLAKE. No; but I remember the period; it was shortly before the last application to Parliament. Since that time, the Manitoba Act has been passed. Fears were entertained at that time that the former Manitoba Bill would be disallowed; I believe it was vetoed by the then Government. Then I have a report from the Secretary of a county lodge, as late as February, 1884. He says:

"We must not permit any political feeling in this matter, as it is very important to our institution to have a Dominion Act of incorporation.

"Without such Act, our noble brethren in the Province of Quebec will be without one, as you all know it is no use for them to ask for incorporation in their Provincial Legislature, where Protestants are in the minority."

There you see, Mr. Speaker, once again, that it is because incorporation cannot be obtained in a particular Province or in particular Provinces, that they come here, and not because there is some difficulty or defect in the power of Provincial legislation, which they want us here to heal. This view is not a view which is held by those who oppose this measure alone; it was held by leading Orangemen. Leading members of the order, up to a comparatively recent period, held the view that the measure should not be brought here; that it was a matter of Provincial concern and should be discussed elsewhere. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) who introduced the Bill last Session, and who has occupied a very high position in the order, and who still holds a high position, speaking in Winnipeg, after the defeat of the Bill of last Session, said:

"He, along with Brother Marshall and other members of the order, had asked that the Incorporation Bill be not sent to the House of Commons, as he thought it should be brought out in the Ontario Legislature; and if defeated there, they should wait till their friends gained power; but in spite of all argument on his part, he had been forced to take the Bill into the House."

Again, the hon. gentleman said, in a speech at Brockville, after the Session of Parliament:

"At the Session of Parliament he found himself needing more assistance than ever before in his life.

"Many of his friends were adverse to the Bill being given a second reading: they were divided as to its effect; and in this way he found himself assailed on all sides."

* * * * * * * * *

"Prominent Conservatives advised him to withdraw the Bill."

Once again, at Hamilton, he said:

"He was willing to admit that the Orangemen themselves were not as united in asking for the Bill as they might have been. They did not act as unanimously as they should have done; and there was no use in denying the fact that a certain portion of their own organization did not want the Bill to come to a second reading."

Mr. Marshall, a gentleman holding high office in the order, speaking at Winnipeg, said:

"He had been opposed to sending the Incorporation Bill to the Dominion House. The battle had been commenced in Ontario, and should be fought out there."

These are statements all made since the defeat of the Bill last Session, and they seem to indicate that, on the part of leading members of the order itself, there was a strong feeling adverse to the propriety of introducing this Bill here, and favourable to the view which I have ventured to take in this House, that substantially and essentially this is an attempt to make use of the power of this Parliament under the pretence that Dominion incorporation is really wanted and is really needed, when the reality of the case is, that Provincial incorporation is all that is really wanted and is really needed. And it is because the Provinces cannot be induced to grant that incorporation, or, at all events, because such is the case in some of them, that it is proposed to use alleged Dominion power to force the measure on those localities that object to it. By the Bill itself and as much of the constitution of the order as we are acquainted with, it is a divided organization, with Provincial, county, district and private lodges; and the local branches are to have the right to hold property. I do not intend to discuss the matters of detail to which the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) alluded, as I learned from the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and which might be remedied in the Private Bills Committee. Although those observations were very fit and proper, because they point to the essentially local character of the measure, as dealing with property and civil rights; yet they are not fatal to the Bill at this stage. The question with respect to the Mortmain Act shows what sort of a Bill it is; but even this is not fatal to the second reading, because, as the hon. member for Cardwell properly observed, that provision might be struck out in the Private Bills Committee. But I say that the essence of this Bill is alleged by the promoters to be the right to hold real property. I say that the right to hold real property is, if anything be such, a Provincial right—a dealing with property and civil rights. I say that we should not strain our jurisdiction to grasp that right in any case. I say, that we are to use our jurisdiction where we have it, for we may have it in some cases, as incidental to some classes of Dominion incorporations. For instance, I have supported, in this House, as a necessary incident of railway companies incorporated by us, the power of expropriating lands. It is a necessary incident of our power to incorporate certain classes of railways, that we should have that power of expropriation, and we use that power because it belongs to us. But, I say, that we should watch jealously, and when it is proposed to go beyond the necessary incidents of corporate rights, and when the whole essence of the corporation is, as it is claimed, the right to hold real property, it should be a very strong case which should lead us to interfere with it. And when we are told that the real reason why the promoters come here is not because the Provincial incorporation would not be adequate, but because they cannot get enough Provinces to agree to incorporate them, that should end the question of the propriety of our interference. I maintain that they should go to the Legislature of Quebec for incorporation in Quebec, and to the Legislature of Ontario for incorporation in Ontario, and as Mr. Marshall and the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) have said, fight their battle there; and if popular feeling is ultimately with them, they will get their incorporation, and if it should remain against them, they must content themselves without it. But it is not only upon this ground that I personally am opposed to this Act of incorporation. I entertain views on the point to which I am about to address myself, which, I dare say, are shared only by a small minority in this House, but none the less do I entertain them. I am opposed to State recognition of secret societies. I do not care how good their purposes, or what their objects may be; I believe it is a mistake to lay down the principle that any secret society should be recognized by the State. I think secret oath-bound societies are, so far as that point may be brought fairly into question in this case—though I agree that we are to decide it upon our own notions of what is right—I say that such societies are contrary to the spirit of English law as to recognized societies. I know they are contrary to the Quebec criminal law. Now, the Quebec criminal law is not to be modified by a private Bill in this House. We have power to modify, or repeal, or amend it; and an hon. gentleman has before us a Bill for its amendment, upon which I hope to have the opportunity, if it comes to a second reading, of pointing out what I understand are the true principles of action in cases of that description; but I say that the Province of Quebec cannot complain if we propose to amend or modify any portion of the criminal law, simply because that portion of the law is exclusively Quebec law at this moment; for we alone have the power—they have not the power to deal with it. But the way to deal with the criminal law is to amend or repeal it by a general Act; and having amended or repealed it to such an extent, if you think fit, as will make this a legal society, as would make it legal to have such a society in the country, then to proceed to pass your private Bill authorizing that corporate entity to be created which is no longer contrary to the law of the land. It seems to me to be unprecedented and certainly very inconvenient that we should repeal a general criminal law *pro tanto* by the creation of a private corporation; because nobody can doubt that this private Bill, by which we set up the Orange society, by which we allow it to continue to extend the number of its lodges, and so on; by which we give it incorporation and State recognition, by which we giveit power to hold property—nobody can doubt, I say, that it comes within the criminal law of Quebec. Now that is no way to escape from the operation of the criminal law. A measure might be brought down, as one was brought down in the other Chamber last Session, dealing with the criminal law on the general principles on which it is thought that it should be dealt with. I quite agree in the view, which I have expressed in this House on previous occasions, that unless on the greatest pressure of obvious necessity, we should pass common laws for all parts of the Dominion, in respect to common interests with which we are charged. I those conceive it to be an anomaly—perhaps justified in special circumstances, and only to be justified by special and obvious circumstances—that there should be one criminal law for one part of the Dominion, and another criminal law for another part; and, therefore, I think it is fitting that a law should be brought down on the subject of secret societies, making such portions of the Quebec law as it may be deemed fit to retain on the Statute Book, general, and modifying, in the sense which I shall take another opportunity of pointing out, such parts as are not deemed fit to be retained. But it is putting the cart before the horse to

legalize, by a private Bill, and vote out of the operation of the subsisting criminal law, one institution. Your law should be amended first on general principles; and then if you find that the institution is one which you can legally incorporate, you may proceed to give it incorporation. Now, as I said, I am not in favour of State recognition of any secret societies. I have never joined one; though many of my best friends are members of secret societies which are, as this professes to be, benevolent—secret societies which do not meddle at all with political topics—secret societies whose real action, so far as one of the public can know, is not inconsistent with, and does not go beyond, the avowed purposes of their association. But I believe the tendency of secresy itself to be injurious. I believe that it brings with it the possibility of evil; I believe that it involves a certain amount of sacrifice of individuality and independence and gives very great facilities for the misleading of members by designing leaders—very great and mischievous facilities for that purpose. That is my general proposition with reference to secret, oath-bound societies, a point on which, I dare say, as I said before, I am in a small minority; for I suppose the vast bulk of at least the Protestant members of this House belong to one or other of these societies, and I do not wish to be understood as saying that these mischievous tendencies are carried out in many of those societies; the operations of which, so far as I know, are beneficial. But these things are to be dealt with on general principles; and I maintain that secrecy is in itself a bad thing; and if societies are beneficial, they are beneficial in spite of, and not because of, this element of secrecy. Now, there are, of course, three attitudes that the State can take towards these societies, that is, suppression, recognition and neutrality. And I maintain that, unless a society be one for an obviously bad purpose, in this age and under our circumstances, the only course to take is not to suppress, not to recognize, but to occupy a neutral position with reference to it; not to interfere one way or the other, not to give State recognition, not to attempt—what is perhaps in most cases a fruitless attempt—suppression. Those who talk of the benefits of secret societies have, I think, read the history of early and of later periods, and of very late periods especially, on the continent of Europe, in the United Kingdom and in the United States, after a fashion in which I have not read it. I believe that a great deal of the trouble, social and political, that has occurred in those countries is due to secret societies; and I think that we who hail from one or other of the quarters of the United Kingdom, we who are doubly interested in the peace, prosperity and contentment of each one of the three United Kingdoms, must have marked from early days what a baneful influence secret societies have had upon that part of the United Kingdom which, unfortunately, has given so much cause for trouble and humiliation and difficulty, to the Parliament of England and to the English people throughout the world. When you remember the Ribbon society, the Phœnix society, the Fenian society, all the other societies of this class to which I have referred, you may see very easily what immense possibilities of evil there are in the attribute of secrecy. Now, Sir, this is a view which is shared by many who have thought on this subject. I met, the other day, in a book which Mr. A. M. Sullivan has not long since written, an observation which struck me as being so pregnant that I will trouble the House with it. He says:

"I had not studied in vain the history of secret oath-bound associations. I regarded them with horror. I knew all that could be said as to their advantages in revolutionizing a country, but even in the firmest and best of hands they had a direct tendency to demoralization, and were often, on the whole, more perilous to society than open tyranny."

That is the statement of a very eminent man who was actively engaged in an agitation for what he believes, and what many of us believe, would be the amelioration of the Irish people. He saw what an important agency these societies would be; but he saw also from a sad personal experience, and from his own observation, what evil and demoralizing tendencies they have. The difficulty as to State recognition is this—it is essential; you cannot get rid of it; it is in the circumstance that the society is secret—you cannot determine how far, being secret, it may depart from its professed and avowed objects; how far, being secret, it may go, in what direction it may travel; how far, being ostensibly religious and benevolent, it may become a political society and not benevolent or religious; how far, being loyal, it may go in the opposite direction, as we know professedly loyal societies have gone in days gone by—how far this may be the case, you cannot determine; and, therefore, I say that State recognition ought not to be given to secret, oath-bound societies. You cannot tell what sort of tyranny may not be exercised by them. It is in the nature of these societies to become tyrannical and despotic. Openness and public discussion are the great guarantees of order, freedom, fairness and moderation. It is in private gatherings of men all of one turn, all of one thought, all of one opinion, that bitterness and misrepresentation and malignity revel and hold high carnival. It is just there that you are sure to have the very worst of that description of difficulty which exists too commonly even in all our public life, and which is tempered only in so far as our discussions are open, in the presence of the world, and of men of different opinions. It may be that in oppressed countries, despotically governed, secret societies are a melancholy necessity. It is possible. I do not admit it; but it may be so. They may be the only recourse of those countries which are aspiring to freedom. But that is not the condition of the people of this country. There is nothing here that we want, there is no amelioration of our condition that we desire, which we are not free to propose in public gathering, upon which we are not free to engage in public discussion. If we believe that those of a particular creed amongst us entertain sentiments not merely erroneous in point of dogmatic religion (which has nothing to do with the question) but sentiments hostile to the Constitution or dangerous to social order, we have a right to say so, a right to resist them, a right to challenge their opinions, and to challenge them to express their opinions. But we have no right, because we have no necessity, to engage for these purposes in secret societies, which, as I have indicated, have often been the fruitful mothers of malignity, misrepresentation and bigotry. The Bill, however, goes much further than simply giving the right to hold property. As I have said, it gives State recognition; it gives a corporate existence. For this purpose, it invokes the Interpretation Act; and the last clause gives this society power to carry on its work. It is true, the preamble of the Bill has been altered. Last Session it said that the society wanted power to carry on its work; this year it does not say so; but the clauses, so far as I can understand them, are the same; and, although the preamble does not give the power, the clauses do. The Interpretation Act gives powers which, perfectly legitimate, in fact, absolutely essential to an ordinary business corporation, are powers which yet may be open to some misconception and misuse in the case of a secret society, such as this, for the propagation of opinion. There is a power on the part of the majority over the minority. While that is necessary in the case of an ordinary corporation, in the case of a society like this, for the propagation of opinion, a clause of that description is likely to enable the majority to exercise tyranny over the minority. There is also given freedom from individual responsibility, which is quite proper in the case of ordinary business corporations; but, once again, peculiar force is given to this provision in the case of this organization, which we incorporate according to the rules and constitution in the schedule, and to which we give power to alter its constitution as it pleases

hereafter. Of course, I know that there is the criticism that this may be amended in Committee, but it is necessary to refer to it. We are asked to incorporate an institution, with power to alter its constitution as it pleases and to give whatever powers it pleases to its officers afterwards; but we do not know what those alterations may be, as the veil of secrecy conceals its acts, and yet there is to be no individual responsibility for them. Now, my hon. friend from Huron alluded to a point which met with some cries of denial at first; but I did not observe, when he came to be answered, that his proposition was seriously challenged. He alluded to the proposition that the purposes of this society were almost wholly political. I am not going to discuss how the Orange society works in the other Provinces of the Dominion; I do not know how it works in the other Provinces; I do not know how far it is true to the professed objects of the institution, or how far it goes beyond them; I do not know whether it attempts objects peculiarly political or not; but I think I speak of what I do know, when I say that my hon. friend's observation as to Ontario is perfectly correct; and I think the circumstance that, after being met with those cries of denial, when an answer was attempted to be made to his argument this statement was not denied, is sufficient proof of that.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). He said that Orangemen were expelled for voting for the Reform party. I deny that.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how that may be; but I shall furnish the hon. gentleman some information on that point before I am done. I maintain that the order is political in Ontario, and I say that the objections to State recognition of secret societies are doubly strong—in point of fact, they receive their chief vitality, when they are applied to secret political organizations. There, if anywhere, it is in open discussion only that there is safety, in open attack and defense, in public charges and public answers. Why, many of us believe, and, I am sure, most of us would gladly agree—if it were practicable; I do not think it is—many of us believe that the greatest boon would be conferred upon the public if you could abolish private canvassing, if you could arrange that the only mode of canvassing would be to meet the electors of both sides openly at open public meetings and there avow your principles and define your positions. Why? Because we know that a private canvass gives opportunities for statements which suit the political complexion of the person addressed; because we know it gives opportunities for private statements of the political faith of the candidates and for private assaults upon the political faith and standing of an opponent, and that it is in every way objectionable. I believe myself that publicity is the very breath of freedom in politics; and I have not hesitated to declare that, though I voted for the ballot as essential to freedom, I was never able to reconcile myself to the idea that we should always be obliged to poll our votes secretly; because I believe it would be a very great advance if the day should come, when we could believe that to all our people an open vote would be a free vote. It is only because there are cases where an open vote is not a free vote, that I yielded to the ballot as a necessity, and in order that the vote might be free. Apart from that, I believe the effect of the ballot itself to be injurious rather than advantageous. To bear out what I have said, with reference to secret political organizations. I will give you an instance in my own career. The first time I entered public life, in 1867, I was contesting two counties, one for the Local and one for this House. They were from 200 to 250 miles apart, and I had to run from one to the other in the course of my canvass. At a certain point, shortly before I left the South Riding of Bruce, to go down to West Durham, I found that a secret canvass was being made against me, promoted by this religious and benevolent association. One form of this canvass was a cry to the effect that my father was the man who had shot Col. Moody, in 1837; the other was a personal cry that I myself was a Roman Catholic.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). That must have been a Grit Orangeman.

Mr. BLAKE. Having been informed, beyond a particle of doubt, that these statements were being circulated in the south riding, on behalf of the Orange organization, at the last meeting there, knowing there were men in the room who were circulating these stories, I, without repeating them, called upon those who had made them, called upon anybody to come forward and state anything derogatory either to my father or myself, and I would answer then and there. But none of them would come forward. I called on them three times at a public meeting; but although the circulators of these calumnies were present, they would not come forward. In the West Riding of Durham, the same private canvass was going on, the same course was taken, the same precise calumnies were being circulated, and when I came to that Riding I was asked how about this and how about that; but I declined to deny things which no man would venture publicly to state. That is the evil of a private canvass, and especially of a private canvass conducted through the medium of a secret society. Do I object to this society because it is a political organization? Not at all. I approve of political organizations. I believe in political organizations which are public, which are avowedly political organizations, and are not afraid to declare themselves as such; but I do not believe in secret political organizations, or in political organizations, secret or otherwise, which act under the guise of religion and philanthropy. I do not object to this society because the majority of its members are opposed to me in political opinion. That is no reason for objecting to it. They have as good a right to their opinions as I have to mine, and their right to hold theirs is as dear to me as is mine to hold mine. As I hold mine by the same tenure as they hold theirs, and as I would not part, for any consideration, with the free right to hold mine, I hold their right equally dear. But if that political organization is opposed to me, I want to meet its members as such, and not as members of a religious and charitable society. Our religious opinions should be held entirely separate from our political leanings. No greater calamity can befall a community than when the cleavage of political parties is coincident with the cleavage of religious bodies. That is a great calamity and misfortune. I am anxious that, whatever our creeds or religious opinions may be, we should feel that they have nothing whatever to do with our political opinions, and that we should agree or differ on political questions entirely irrespective of the faith we may happen to hold on religious questions. The more you set up, as a combination, a great Protestant society, which is also a great political association, the more you make coincident, or strive to make coincident, the lines of division for the religious and the political convictions of the people, and act directly in the teeth of what I believe to be for the benefit of the State. Our political differences are bitter enough, without introducing into them religious differences, and if the *odium theologicum* which is known to be so bitter, is to be accentuated by political differences, it will become intolerable. Let us endeavour then not to make coincident the lines between political and religious opinion. Yet this society, which, under the guise of religion and benevolence, is in Ontario largely and chiefly political in its power and efficacy, is doing this very thing, which I believe to be for the public evil and not for the public good. I do not propose to refer, in support of my view, as to the political condition of this society in Ontario, to anything very ancient. I do not propose to refer even to things so ancient as those to which the hon. member for the West Riding of Huron (Mr. Cameron) referred. It is enough for me to refer to quite recent transactions. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White),

made a speech in the town of Woodstock on the twelfth of July last, and in that speech he made some very amusing allusions to the secret history of the conduct of this Bill. In the course of these statements, he took a line which I want to point out, and proved what I have declared with reference to this society being really and substantially a political organization. He said:

"The Bill and its requirements were put before the people of the Dominion, but, before the second reading came on, unfortunately mistakes were made. He was not going to find a great deal of fault with the Roman Catholics, or with the Reformers; but, so far as our own people were concerned, as Conservatives and Orangemen, they were not as anxious as they should have been. He would say to them, so far as the Reformers of Canada were concerned, they should not forget the fact that nine-tenths of the members of the Orange society in the Province of Ontario belonged to the Conservative party."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Suppose they do.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, suppose they do. I am sorry for it, but I do suppose it. I am merely showing that this is a political organization.

Mr. FARROW. That does not prove it.

Mr. BLAKE. If that does not prove it to the hon. member for Huron, I despair of proving it to him. I do not address the remainder of these remarks to the hon. gentleman:

"He thought, in justice, according to Reform principles, they should have passed over any little wrongs which they might have suffered in the past, and have voted for the Orange Incorporation Bill. He wished it had been so, and, if they had done it, he was satisfied that at the next election the Orangemen would have divided, and have gone in more for men and measures, and not so strongly for party."

"And not so strongly for party." That is the hon. gentleman's description of the character of the Orange organization in Toronto, that they have in the past gone very strong for party, and that in the future they might have mended their ways and gone more for men and measures. And that is not a party organization!

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Those are good words.

Mr. BLAKE. They are very good words. I wish they would be made good:

"Mr. Bunting went to Ottawa; he worked day and night for the Bill he told the Frenchmen if they did not pass the measure they would be doing an act of great injustice. He spoke to Sir Hector Langevin, to Sir John A. Macdonald, and other members of the Cabinet, on the subject. He referred them to the general support which the Conservative party had always received at the hands of the Orangemen."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh! it is not a political party, but it gives a general support to the Conservative party.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Those are very good words; I am not ashamed of them.

Mr. BLAKE:

"He (Mr. White) thanked Mr. Bunting for the noble assistance he gave them during that time of trial, assistance which they hoped would yet result in triumph. In conversation, along with twenty other gentlemen, with Sir Hector Langevin, Mr. Bunting said: 'Sir Hector, we must have incorporation.' What was the reply? Sir Hector said: 'So far as incorporation is concerned, I personally wish you to have it, but I am opposed to all secret societies, because my Church is opposed to them. I like to see the Conservative party prosperous, but I like the prosperity of my Church better than that of the Conservative party. My bishops and priests tell us, the members of the Church, not to vote for and support any such societies.' Mr. Bunting, in reply, said: 'That is a great mistake, for there are no men on earth more anxious to do justice to all parties, and to give your Church any incorporation it may require for its benefit, than the Orangemen.' In his (Mr. White's) opinion, Sir Hector Langevin would find out that he had committed a great mistake; for, if ever he obtained the leadership of any Government in this country, it would be impossible for him to hold it without the assistance and co-operation of the Orange society."

"Theirs," says the hon. gentleman, warming into enthusiasm towards the peroration:

"Theirs was a great organization; let it be good, prudent and cautious; and he said as a Conservative, remember the next general election, if we do not succeed in getting justice before that time, judge each man by his deeds. They should take a leaf out of Archbishop Lynch's book. The Orange society were in a position to rule the whole country if they were only true to themselves."

Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman also delivered an oration at Hamilton. Three cheers were given for "Sir John" at a particular period of the meeting, and the hon. gentleman followed up the cheers by saying:

"He [that is Sir John] was as true and as consistent a friend to the Orange Bill as any member in the House. There was a proposition made that the Bill should be withdrawn, or at least a Bill granted to all the different Provinces, with the exception of the Province of Quebec. Sir John said to him, 'Mr. White, don't accept that, for if you do it will only bring disgrace on your society. Better have the Bill carried for the whole Dominion, but don't disgrace yourselves by deserting the worthy members of your order in the Province of Quebec.' Those were good words, and he was satisfied that nothing in the world would have given Sir John Macdonald greater pleasure than handing the Incorporation Bill to the Governor for his sanction, because Sir John was satisfied in his own mind that nine-tenths of the Orange members belonged to the Conservative party."

Why, I see the hon. member is amused. I thought I would amuse him.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). That speech of mine, which he is reading, is the best part of the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. BLAKE. My proofs are always the best part of my speeches, and this is my proof:

"Supposing Sir Hector Langevin were the leader of a great party, and in its ranks there was a society which was as true to him as the Orange society had been to Sir John Macdonald, he would go to Sir John and say: 'It is necessary, in the interests of our party, that this society, which is loyal to the Queen, to the Constitution and to the country, should have an Act of incorporation.' Sir John would have answered: 'Yes, with all my heart you shall have it.' The Prime Minister was leading a party that was fair and just, while Sir Hector Langevin was leading a party that was bound hand and foot to the Church of Rome, which possessed a grasping disposition, taking everything and giving nothing."

Well, then, the hon. gentleman had occasion to speak of the Minister of Customs, and, after giving him a very great laudation for the mode in which he executed his office, he said:

"Orangemen had looked forward and expected him to speak on the second reading of the Bill, and in not doing so he (Mr. White) thought he had made a great mistake. They were proud of him when he stood up in the Commons Chamber and got Riel expelled from it; when he took the step of bringing the first Commoner, Mr. Speaker Anglin, to the Bar of the House to answer for his violation of the law which he helped to pass—the Independence of Parliament Act. He (Mr. White) did not know why the Minister of Customs did not address the House on the second reading of the Bill, but he was confident that Mr. Powell would yet retrieve the lost ground, and stand before them as he had in the past, a worthy and an honoured member of the society. If he had made a mistake, they must not be too uncharitable with him, they must bear patiently with him, and he was confident that, if the time came again, and the privilege was allowed to Mr. Bowell, he would stand up and speak for the Orange Incorporation Bill, even if he lost his seat in the Cabinet."

Well, Sir, so far for the hon. gentleman, the member of Hastings. But there are some other recent proofs of the political character of this religious and benevolent organization, so far as it is managed in Ontario. Brother Marshall, to whom I already alluded, who occupies a high position in the order, and who was with the hon. gentleman at Winnipeg, said:

"The question was asked how they always voted, Tory and the answer was because that party had befriended them."

You see the statement is "they always voted Tory," but they are not a political organization! At the Grand Lodge meeting at St. Catharines, the Grand Master, Mr. Merrick, who is also a member of the Local Legislature, said:

"I hope it will teach us a lesson for our future conduct not to trust to mere political party as such, but to support and work with our best energies for those who will support and work for us; and then, no doubt, we will be able to say, with the Grand Master of New South Wales:

"'In connection with the recent Parliamentary elections, we find that in every locality, throughout the various electorates, when a lodge was in operation the chosen candidate of the lodge received the greater number of votes.'"

But it is not a political organization! Then, Mr. Johnston, at the same meeting, said:

"The brethren should endeavour to make the association less of a political organization, and more of a religious and benevolent association."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). How would that suit you?

Mr. BLAKE. That would suit me very well; but I do not perceive that the hon. gentleman is "a doing of it," Sir. Then there was a grand meeting of the Triennial Council in England, at which Canadian delegates were present, including Mr. Marshall and Mr. Bennett. Speeches were made by Mr. Bennett and others; and they indicated the condition of the order in another colony, and so far are not uninteresting. Mr. Neale, who represented New Zealand, South Australia and Queensland, spoke, and said:

"The last general election was the grandest triumph for Orangeism ever witnessed in New South Wales. We gained no less than twenty-eight seats in the Colonial Parliament; and a very large number of the other members were returned through the Orange vote, and only eight Romanists succeeded in gaining admission."

That was the statement which these Canadian delegates heard, and which shows the condition of things, and the way the order is worked in New South Wales. At that meeting Mr. Bennett was present representing Ontario, and he made this statement:

"I may also tell you that we have in our country an Orange paper, and we have found it to have a beneficial and magical effect; because divided as the Protestants are in the country into two political parties, each of these parties bidding for the Romanist vote, so that the organs of these political parties dare not, for fear of offending the Roman Catholics, say anything in favour of Orangeism—having a paper of our own, we not only get all the Orange news from all parts of the world, but have an organ, not only to put forth our views to the country, but to repel all attacks that may be made on us by the Roman Catholic and Jesuit press of the country."

So that you find, Sir, that the Order is organized, and that here in Ontario, at the present day, by the confession of its leading men, though it comes here claiming incorporation as a religious and benevolent association, the guise in which it appeals to its friends, and the voice with which it speaks to those whom it asks to support it, are political. They say they are a political organization. They vote almost unitedly one way; they are a party political organization. Nor, Sir, is it to be wondered at, for we all know that in both the great branches from which the order springs, the Irish Grand Lodge, and the English Grand Lodge, the order was for a great many years, and I believe is still, political. I do not intend myself to attempt any statement of the origin, and still less of the progress and work of the Irish lodges; but I intend to read a brief extract from a letter written by Sir Francis Hincks, a few years ago, in which he says:

"I have read in many newspapers, as well as in the sermon of the Rev. Mr. Doudiet, a similar expression of opinion; that the cause of offence to Irish Roman Catholics is the celebration of the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne. I believe that those who entertain this opinion are under a complete delusion, from which it is most desirable that they should be freed. Irish Roman Catholics would never have resented the celebration of an ordinary victory, but the Battle of the Boyne was the first of a series of victories which led to the complete subjugation of Catholic Ireland to Protestant Great Britain, and the effect of that subjugation was that a Protestant minority, settled chiefly in one of the four Provinces of Ireland, was enabled to rule a Roman Catholic majority in the three other Provinces, with a rod of iron, during the eighteenth century.

"The motto of the Protestant minority for years before the Orange lodges came into existence, was 'Protestant Ascendency,' and this was maintained by penal laws, every amelioration of which laws was resisted by Orangemen with all the vigour for which they have ever been distinguished. When it is borne in mind that, for nearly a century after the Battle of the Boyne, no Roman Catholic could either be elected or vote for a member of Parliament, that no Roman Catholic could be a lawyer or a solicitor, that no Roman Catholic could keep arms that his children could not be educated, and that his clergy were proscribed, that no Roman Catholic could own a horse worth over £5; when it is further borne in mind that every amelioration of these penal laws was gradually extorted from the Protestant minority, which was alone represented in the Irish Parliament, by the influence of English statesmen, who, differing upon other questions, were nearly all favourable to the gradual repeal of the penal statutes; when, I say, all this is considered, it is not difficult to understand the hatred that is felt by Irish Catholics to an institution whose distinguishing principle is 'Protestant ascendency,' and whose members habitually proclaim their adherence to this principle by their flags and party tunes—'Protestant Boys' and 'Croppies lie down.'"

Sir Francis Hincks goes on to point out the continued political operations of the Irish Orangemen, with reference to Catholic emancipation, and with reference to Church disestablishment, as showing their active operation as a political body, up to a comparatively recent period. He proceeds to point out that the Orange organization has existed in the Province of Upper Canada, that there they were opposed to certain reforms, the promoters of which they were pleased to call disloyal; and he shows that they there also were a political organization. So, Sir, with reference to the English lodges; you will find that, at a very early day, in the enquiry that was made as to the Orange institution in Great Britain and Ireland, not very long after the order had been instituted in England, the Deputy Grand Secretary was asked some questions, and speaking of its true character he answered as follows:

469. It is stated here, "as part of a grand Conservative body, extending over the whole Kingdom, and having its head in the Metropolis, the value of our provincial establishments is immense;" will you state what is meant by the advantage of having that general association all over the country, the head of the body being in the Metropolis; did you mean by the Conservative body, the Loyal Orange Institution?—No, the institution that is known by the name of the Conservative body or club.

470. This is issued under the sanction of the Grand Master of the Empire, His Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland?—Yes, so it is; but I should not hesitate to say it had reference to Conservative Associations more than Orange, but I consider the one as interwoven with the other.

471. Do you mean that commonly called the Carlton Club?—Yes.

472. Will you state what is meant by this: "Lastly, it enables men possessing wealth and patronage in their command to distinguish the true support of constitutional principles, to reward merit and honesty whenever it suffers oppression and distress;" by "it," do you mean the Loyal Orange Institution?—I should rather say, taken by surprise as I am, that it must mean the Conservative Institution; I have always considered the two to be so interwoven, with a difference of name, that it is of little consequence.

473. You consider the Loyal Orange Association of the same nature and identified with that called the Carlton Club?—Yes, I should consider so, with this distinction, that the Orange Institution is a religious institution, and the Carlton Club does not profess to be so. With respect to a person being a member of the Carlton Club, if, as a gentleman of some rank and situation in life, he is eligible, they never inquire I believe into his religion, which is no exclusion; whilst I have no reserve in saying religion is the first principle we look to in the Orange Institution; we exclude Papists, for instance, and we exclude Jews.

* * * * * * * * *

476. Are you to be understood to say, that you believe the Carlton Club and the Orange Institution are generally interwoven in their views, but you consider the Carlton Club more political and the Orange Institution more religious?—Yes.

Then, I think, Sir, that pretty effectually proves that in the opinion of the Deputy Grand Secretary, the Orange institution and the Carlton Club were institutions of different names, indeed, but having pretty much the same object. That is also proved, practically, by the papers which were produced at that time. Amongst others, was the report of the Grand Secretary, in 1835, in which he says:

4. Perhaps the way of all others, in which Orangeism can be turned to the best account, or can be rendered available to beneficial objects, is by a practical observance of its fundamental principles, when the executive feels a necessity for making an appeal to the sense of the nation. If, however, by an abandonment, or by a compromise of those tenets, for the maintenance of which they profess to assemble, its members act so inconsistently as to countenance those candidates who avow their hostility to the Protestant church and a free constitution, their continuance with us must prove ruinous to our cause. So obvious will this be to the least cultivated mind, as to need no argument in support of the fact.

5. Since the mania of reform it may not be foreign to the purpose to observe, that no small portion of the brethren have sunk into the soft captivity of its delusion. Hence it may not be superfluous to add, from representations to the D.G.S. both orally and in writing, that, in disregard of the "obligation" which is so much their proud but empty boast, a number of Orangemen have bestowed their suffrages on persons well known to be opposed to the establishments of the land, and unfavourable to the existence of their own body. So at variance is such conduct, not merely with the spirit but with the letters of the laws by which their movements ought to be guided—so contrary was it to the votes, no less from feeling than from honour, which they are bound to

have given—as to call for and demand their dismissal from a society, whose interest they had betrayed and whose safety they had endangered. As men, their indisputable right to exercise the freedom of election would never be questioned; but as members of an institution who associate for the purposes of loyalty and for the repudiation of such a liberalism of sentiment, they ought to be restrained in so anomalous a course, which is calculated to cast a suspicion on the integrity of, to the entailment of a degradation with a mixture of contempt on, all belonging to it.

6. In illustration of the above, the D. G. S. has to offer an extract of a letter that he received from the D. G. M. of Rochdale soon after the election, than which nothing can more strongly show the justness of the remarks he had previously put forth, in condemnation of so vile a departure from the pure essence of sound Orangeism, as therein is reported to him thus officially by that functionary, viz :

7. "No doubt you have heard of the triumph," says the writer, "we have gained over the Whig candidate, by the election of John Entwistle, Esq., of Foxholes, as the representative of this borough. Yet after obtaining the victory, I am not altogether satisfied, as three of our members voted for the Whig party, contrary to the principles of our loyal institution. The names of the persons who have gone against us are Richard Simpson, of warrant 68; James Whittl s, 266; and John Crossley, 302. The brethren of my district call aloud for the expulsion of these offenders. For Crossley I feel strongly, as he was compelled, by his master, to vote contrary to his wishes. I hope, therefore, you will take his case into your kind consideration, as I believe him to be really a true Orangeman. I shall feel obliged by your advice in what manner I am to act under these circumstances. At the ensuing meeting of the Grand Lodge, I hope you will lay this case before its dignitaries. In the mean time I shall await your answer with impatience."

8. Much credit is due to the D. G. M of Rochdale for his prompt report of these delinquents, as well as to the brethren of the district f r their just reprehension of characters so unworthy of their fellowship. Other accou ts of a similar though of a less specific colour, have been transmitted to the D.G.S., whose best attention to them shall be especially given on his approaching tour of general inspection. With the names of the districts most disaffected he is well acquainted, and those Masters who shall appear to have connived at, nay, not to have used strong efforts to prevent these offences, may expect soon to be superseded in their command. Such a desertion from principle on the part of the brotherhood, and such a dereliction of duty on the part of their officers, at a conjuncture of peril too like the present. when the altar and the sceptre are alike in danger, can no longer be suffered to pass with impunity. As an example, then, to deter, rather than to punish, let the two chief transgressors stand expelled, and the one so unduly influenced be suspended

11. The D.G.S. has now to notice a communication more in unison with the feelings of Orangeism than the last, reflecting no less honour on the D.G.M. of Barnsley than upon the individuals, to a man, over whose proceedings that functionary has been invested with a superintendence. Prior to the late elections, the officer, parading his forces, in a brief harangue analogized the rudiments in which they had been more than traditionally instructed since their enrolment in our social bands. By the implied, as well as by the written laws, he reminded them their actions ought to be governed on these occasions, which was a theorem not to be refuted. Hence, while their cordial support was due to candidates cherishing sentiments congenial with conservative doctrines, they were bound to withhold it from aspirants entertaining ideas unfavourable to legitimate designs. Indeed, it was absolutely imperative on them as Orangemen to uphold persons who were resolved on repairing, instead of destroying our venerable monuments of antiquity by unrighteous attempts to level them with the dust. The consequence of this ingenious step was, that the whole of the district, with three hearty cheers, declared their readiness to vote in accordance with the precepts, in a virtual sense, thus enjoined on them. Such of the members as had no franchise to exercise would most cheerfully, they said, yield their assistance in any way best calculated to promote the good cause.

Such was the course of conduct pursued in 1835 by the Loyal Orange Association of Great Britain. With respect to this measure now before the House : after its defeat last Session, at first there was a disposition on the part of the promoters to blame the Roman Catholic Conservative members who opposed the Bill and to deal rather lightly with Protestant Reformers. I might refer to a speech which the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) delivered in Ottawa, which the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) read in this House, and which is reported in the *Hansard* of 1883. I refer also to a speech delivered by the hon. member for East Hastings at Winnipeg, when he said :

"At the first reading, the Roman Catholic section of the House had expressed considerable sympathy, but had been compelled to oppose it, owing, no doubt, to instructions received from the bishops and priests. No country could afford to submit to the dictates of bishops, priests or ministers of any denomination. The Reformers said very little in the matter. The three Reform representatives from Manitoba acted nobly, but the rest were undecided as to the action they would take. He was advised to consult Mr. Blake, but refused, as that gentleman was an Ultramontane Protestant.

"Many of the friends of the Order did not act as they should have done. They forgot that they owed their seats to Orangemen, and were afraid that they would be killed if they supported it, and he told them that they would die anyway.

"The Conservative party had not been as true to the cause as they might, but his advice would be to test them again; and if the Bill was defeated three times he would advocate the ballot-box."

There you see, Mr. Speaker, the disposition to which I refer, to blame those Roman Catholic members who voted against the Bill, and to deal rather lightly, as the hon. gentleman did at Ottawa, with Protestant Reformers. Then Major White said at Winnipeg:

"The association has not the influence it ought to have, because the members were not true to each other. The brethren should see to it that in all municipal and legislative bodies they had men who would truly represent them. In the past they had taken the broad view that a man's religion should not be a bar to his political preferment; but the conduct of the Roman Catholic members of the House demonstrated that they could not represent Protestants, much less Orangemen."

There again, you see the same disposition—a disposition to blame the Roman Catholic Conservative members for not voting for the Bill, to declare it was a measure which they should have supported, and to threaten them with general ostracism in parliamentary and municipal matters.

Mr. WHITE. We will grant them absolution before next election.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has the frankness and manliness to avow it. The official organ of the Orange body says :

"The bigotry displayed on Monday by every French and Irish Roman Catholic member of the House of Commons has, however, opened our eyes, and in future we shall know how to act. As we said, although the Reformers acted foolishly and illiberally, still we think, under the present state of Canadian politics, an excuse may be found for their action, but none whatever can be offered for the course pursued by the Conservative Roman Catholics, and upon their shoulders, in the greatest measure, must rest the onus of our defeat."

There again, you see the first line taken by the promoters of the Bill—they were prepared to charge the Roman Catholics, whether Conservatives or Reformers, and particularly Conservatives, with the onus of the defeat of the Bill. The *Sentinel* says :

"For years past the Orangemen of the Dominion have, under various political pretexts, and to meet the exigencies of political parties, been induced to support Roman Catholics at the polls; but the measure of bigoted intolerance with which our liberality was met in the vote upon our Bill, precludes any possibility of this mistake again occurring."

The *Sentinel* goes on to say, with respect to the course of the leader of the Conservative party :

"The leader of the Conservative party has been charged with insincerity in his efforts to have the Bill passed, and while we believe that personally he has acted with the greatest sincerity towards us, and has used all his influence to obtain for us the redress we sought, still we cannot close our eyes to the fact that it is the first measure introduced since 1878, with his approval and sympathy, which has received such a weak support."

Now, Sir, that was the first start. That was the way the promoters of this Bill began to conduct the political campaign towards procuring a second reading this Session of the Orange Bill. After the attack, they were honest enough to say that they had not much to expect from the Reformers. They did say that they had a right to expect from the Conservative Roman Catholics their support of the Bill, and they showed the true principles of their leading men, in the observations I have just now read, as to the ostracism they propose to pronounce on Roman Catholics generally, in consequence of the course of the Roman Catholic Conservatives with reference to the Bill. I have said that in Ontario the Orange society is mainly a political organization, and I say that it subordinates all other considerations—its leaders cause it to subordinate all other considerations to the political and party consideration. That is proved by the course which was pursued shortly afterwards. Their tactics were changed, and they seemed to think it would not do to continue blaming the Roman Catholic Tories for opposing the Bill, that this might disturb their political alliances; and they must throw the odium on the Protestant Liberals, and on me particularly, as an Ultramontane Protestant. It would not do to

go on saying that the Roman Catholic Conservatives had done wrong, and that they must not return Roman Catholics to Parliament, and the hon. gentleman did not wait until the next election to grant absolution. He granted absolution at once, and he turned the condemnation upon us, whom, for a little space of time, he was just enough to say he had no right to expect much from. And why was this done?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Read what I have said.

Mr. BLAKE. I have read what the hon. gentleman said—is he not satisfied. I cannot read all his speeches, but I will gratify him. There was a meeting, to which I have already referred, held in Ottawa, immediately after the defeat of the Bill, at which an address was presented to him, and the address contained the following paragraph:—

"From the proceedings in Parliament on the Orange Incorporation Bill, we have learned a bitter, but salutary lesson, and one that will bear fruit in due season. While we disclaim an intolerant spirit, we declare that henceforth the Roman Catholics must be prepared to reap as they have sown, and that if we are such disturbers of the peace as they declare us to be, we will for the future abstain from voting for them, and so deprive them of the power to mortify us by refusing to grant to us the same rights that we have always cheerfully accorded to them."

The hon. gentleman's answer was as follows:—

"Many Conservative members had asked and begged of him not to ruin them, but he told them that he would stand by the order first. Another mistake was that of assisting to elect a Frenchman in Russell and an Irish Roman Catholic (Mr. Baskerville) in Ottawa city, and he said he was now ashamed of his actions; he hoped the Orangemen would forgive him for asking them to vote for Baskerville. There are very few Hawkinses. One Roman Catholic member of the House whose name he did not wish to mention, said to him privately: 'How can we vote for this Bill when the priest says he has power from the Pope to damn those of his constituencies who dare vote for a candidate for parliamentary honours who would support such a measure.' If the Conservatives would not stand true to us, then let us be Reformers. He likened them, at the present day, as being between the devil and the deep sea—the Roman Catholics and the Reformers."

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). One word; I believe the hon. gentleman is reading from the Ottawa *Free Press*.

Mr. BLAKE. I am reading from *Hansard*. I do not know where the report was taken from, but it was read in the House and the hon. gentleman did not repudiate it.

"He kindly praised the Reformers who supported the Bill. He believed Mr. Blake had made a mistake in voting against the second reading. It was, at that time, within his grasp to have the united Orange vote of Ontario."

Now, Sir, as I have said, the Tory politicians who lead and direct, and control the bulk of the Orangemen of Ontario, believed it would not do to continue the battle with their own allies; and, as politics are the main ingredient, in their view of the order, as it is for the propagation of their own party politics that they work the order, they decided on taking another course; and the fight which existed against the Roman Catholic Conservatives was put to one side, and the guns were turned against us. Sir, it reminds me of the story of the Irish duel. The First Minister with the hon. Minister of Customs on one side, and the hon. Minister of Public Works with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue on the other, met in a coffee-room with hostile intent. They met to fight the battle to the bitter end; and the poor innocent fellow who is taking his breakfast upstairs, away by himself, is astonished by a bullet coming through the floor and striking him in the leg. He asks the waiter what is going on, and he replies, sure it is only Mr. Moriarty and Captain O'Toole fighting a duel, but thanks be to God they both fired in the air. The gentleman upstairs with the bullet in his leg did not thank Providence at all. This duel between the First Minister and the Minister of Customs on the one hand, and the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Inland Revenue on the other; this great demonstration of hostility, of voting squarely against one another; all this fire and fury and blood and thunder; all this threatening of slaughter ended by both combatants firing in the air, and hitting the poor fellow up stairs who had nothing to do with the row. Now, Sir, I do not propose to be hit without protest. As I have said, they have changed their ground. They have determined that they will not fight with one another but will attack us; and what is the present argument? The present argument is, that the contest over this Bill is a contest between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, and that all true Protestants must unite in supporting the Bill against the Roman Catholics. That is the argument; that is the proposition. You cannot get out of it. And if we do not agree to that proposition, we are to be told—in our religious associations amongst those with whom we confer, and co-operate in religious work—that we are not true Protestants, because we have not gone against the Roman Catholics by voting for carrying this measure. I have made that statement; and with reference to that statement as with reference to the others, I shall produce the proof. But before doing so, let me give you two short extracts from recent utterances evidencing the same point. In November, 1882, a lodge meeting was held at Clover Hall, and an address was delivered by a great man in the order, the late local member for South Simcoe (Mr. Parkhill). He spoke as follows:

"If he observed the signs of the times correctly, there is as much need of Orangeism, both in Ireland and Canada, at the present moment, as there ever was. True, we may not have to fight, as our forefathers fought, but we must all, whether Grits or Tories, bury our political feelings and go united to the polls in defence of our Protestant principles."

What is his proposition? I am to be told, being a Reformer, that I must bury my political feelings and join with my friend, Mr. Parkhill, whom I have the pleasure of knowing, and whom I should not suspect, from his appearance, of holding such bloodthirsty principles—that we are to unite against the Roman Catholics. At Rosemont, the hon. member for South Simcoe spoke at a lodge meeting. We are told that:—

"Colonel Tyrwhitt, M.P., was warmly received, and made a good, practical, Protestant speech, in the course of which he referred to the utter want of political principle in the Roman Catholic electorate. The only principle they held was allegiance to their Church, and to its interests. On such matters Roman Catholic representatives were a unit in the House of Commons. They even had an Irish Catholic party in the House of Commons last Session, who met daily to consider their interests. While all this was going on, he was sorry to admit that Orange and Protestant representatives were divided. He counselled organization and unity on the part of all Protestants irrespective of politics in order to stem the aggressive march of the Papacy in this our beloved Dominion."

Now, this is not old. I am not reviving the buried fires of old days. This is reported on the 4th of January, 1883, and the speech was delivered on the 29th of December, 1882. Then, in the *Sentinel* of 12th July, 1883, these remarks are made:

"Mr. Blake is the most prominent man in the House who voted against the Bill. He is, at least by profession, the Protestant of Protestants, from whom such a vote was not expected. * * * * He is, above all, by virtue of his leadership of the Opposition, the member of the Federal Parliament whose vote against incorporation influenced the largest number of his colleagues to vote as they did in violation of the just rights of large numbers of their constituents. * * But, Mr. Blake, by his vote, threw his great influence in the House against the Bill, and, undoubtedly, thereby secured its defeat. He stultified his advocacy of Ontario's rights, and he made plain the hollow insincerity of his Protestant principles. His position in the House, his professions of Protestantism, his advocacy of Ontario's rights, made him a prominent target for the censure of Orangemen, because of a vote, which, if he were true to his principles and professions he would certainly have never given."

Once again you see the assertion that this is a question between Protestant and Catholic, and that a man who professes Protestant principles is insincere if he votes against this Bill. There was also a lodge resolution reported in the *Sentinel*:

"We are not surprised at Roman Catholic members who put religion before party; but we strongly condemn those Protestant members who preferred party before religion."

There again this is made a religious question. We are told that we voted for our political party and against our religious principles. Then Churchill lodge passed a resolution which

was particularly directed against the humble individual who now addresses you:

"We particularly condemn the action of the Hon. Edward Blake, who, by voting for the Bill at one reading and against it at the next, showed that he was more anxious to embarrass his political opponents than to do justice to a large body of his fellow Protestants; and that we consider such a trifling with the question an insult to our order, and that in being guilty of it, the said Hon. Edward Blake has proved himself unworthy of the name he bears as an ultra Protestant, and also of the high position he occupies as leader of one of the so-called great political parties of this country."

Once again, you observe that my innocent conduct, for which I did not think I was to be blamed, in giving to this Bill what I have given to every Bill brought into this House since I have been in Parliament, and what I propose to give to almost every conceivable Bill, the courtesy of a first reading, and the opportunity of fair discussion on the second reading, is called trifling. Hon. gentlemen opposite, members of the order, called upon us not to be so unjust as to vote against the first reading. They pointed out that the first reading was not on the merits of the Bill, but that it gave an opportunity for discussion. I thought they were right, and I accepted their view; but Churchill lodge blames me, and various members of the order say that I was wrong. Then, Sir, the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) is reported to have said:

"No doubt there is danger in the air, and the Orangemen of Ontario should become the Ultramontane Protestant party in Ontario in contradistinction to the Roman Catholic Ultramontanes of Quebec."

Then the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), himself, at Woodstock, said:

"The day was not far distant, if we did not show more pluck and courage in opposing the growing influence of the Papacy in this Province, when we should be obliged to fight, not as Conservatives or Reformers, but as Protestants, to free ourselves from the trammels which Rome's agents sought to place on us and our institutions."

Mr. Marshall, at Winnipeg, said:

"The Bill of incorporation was not defeated by the Roman Catholics, but by the Protestants, who were pandering to the Roman Catholic vote. He hoped Brother White would never ask a Catholic member to support the Bill, as he could expect no support from them; and if he did, he gave them credit for more honesty than politicians generally possessed."

And I perceive that, only the other day, on the 11th March, a special meeting of the Middlesex County lodge was held, at which it was resolved:

"That the county lodge of the County of Middlesex of the Loyal Orange Association is of opinion that while those who last year voted for our incorporation did but their duty in having shown their willingness to accord us those rights which we, as Orangemen, are ever ready to extend to all sections of Her Majesty's loyal subjects, we have no words to sufficiently express our strong condemnation of the course of those Protestant representatives, especially from Protestant Ontario, who from political spleen voted to deny us (their Protestant fellow-citizens) those rights which they are always willing sycophantly to grant to Roman Catholics; Resolved, further, that we, the representatives of the Orangemen of the County of Middlesex, will not be satisfied until our full rights in the matter of incorporation are properly accorded to us, our motto being 'No surrender and no compromise,' and that a copy of the resolutions be sent to the public press."

Now, Sir, I think I have shown to you that, as I have said, the line of attack was altered—that the line of attack upon their party friends, and their religious opponents, who, they at first said, ought to support the measure, and who should be ostracised for not supporting it, they are obliged to abandon in order to strike at their political opponents by representing this as a case in which all Protestants ought to combine, and in which no man of true Protestant principles could have given, or could repeat a vote against the second reading of this Bill. Well, that may be true; but if it be true, I ask this House, without distinction of creed or party, if it be not a serious state of things. I ask if it be not a serious state of things that a religious war is to be raised in this country; because that is what it is. If it be the case that, as a matter of fact, this is an issue raised between us, in which all Protestants are to be on one side, and all Roman Catholics on the other, and in which I, a firm Protestant, am to be told that I am untrue to my profession of religion, to my Protestant principles, if I do not vote with the Orangemen and against the Catholics for that Bill, is not that a serious state of things? If this be true, I say that every true lover of this country must deplore such a circumstance, and must forebode the greatest evil to his country from its existence.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You are drawing it pretty strong; you are drawing on your imagination.

Mr. BLAKE. I have given the text, and I will guarantee that the comments are justified by the text. Now, Sir, I deny entirely that there is any such necessity. I deny that there ought to exist such an issue; and I tell the hon. gentleman opposite that no matter what his threats may be, no matter whether he may say that my speech does me harm or good, he will neither seduce, nor threaten, nor drive me on any such issue into any such line or any such professions. In furtherance of this same plan, this attempt to produce a religious prejudice against those who support this Bill, the hon. gentleman and others are declaring that I am controlled by the Archbishop of Toronto.

Mr. WHITE (Hasting). So you are.

Mr. BLAKE. I tell the hon. gentleman that he states that which is not the fact. Notwithstanding that I am relieved from the necessity of proving my case as to his statement, by his own statement in this House, I proceed to give the evidence of that as I have given the evidence of other things. He said:

Mr. Mowat was controlled by Archbishop Lynch and they must come to the conclusion that he, too, controlled Mr. Blake. No doubt orders went from the Palace at Toronto and the great Reform statesmen had to obey."

I determined, as soon as I saw this statement of the hon. gentleman, that I would meet him here, face to face, and have this out with him, and have it out with him. I will. This is not all. The Rev. Brother Wright, at a meeting in Leeds, said:

"They (the Orangemen) were not defeated in Parliament solely by the Roman Catholics, but through the instrumentality of Ontario politicians who considered the smiles of Rome of greater value than the approbation of their fellow Protestants. The Bill was defeated because Archbishop Lynch said, no. Christopher Fraser repeated, no; and Edward Blake bowed his head and whispered, no."

He voted "no" the last time; but I trust that the hon. gentleman will admit that his negative this night is not given in a whisper.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I drove you to it.

Mr. BLAKE. You drove me to it! Manage your own drove. At Winnipeg, again, the hon. gentleman said:—

"Unfortunately Archbishop Lynch had Mowat bound hand and foot, and it was even hinted he was getting a hard hold on Mr. Blake, and let us hope our own leader will keep his skirts clear."

An hon. GENTLEMAN. He has no confidence in the breed.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend says he has no confidence in the breed. Now, I have had the honour of the acquaintance, for a considerable time, of His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, and I hope, being both of us Irishmen, I may even call myself his friend; but I have never, either directly or indirectly, through others or myself, by speech or writing, or in any way, had the slightest communication with Archbishop Lynch on any one political topic, of any description whatever—not this one only, but any political topic of any description. For aught I know, unless he may have given public utterance to the contrary, that prelate may entertain the same view with reference to the Orange Bill as I observe the hon. member for Hastings has said Archbishop Taché has, namely, that he was in favour of its being passed. But I say that in this, as in all other particulars, I have acted entirely upon my own judgment and wholly free from every—I will not say dictation or control—but attempt at dictation or control, hint or suggestion, knowledge or information, as to what the opinions

of that prelate or of any other prelate or dignitary or persons of the Roman Catholic faith might be on the subject. I have acted on convictions which I have entertained ever since I came into public life, on convictions which I was known to have entertained in the Local Legislature, and to have expressed, not on the floor of the Legislature, but to leading members, when the question was likely to come up in the Local House, with reference to another secret organization—convictions hostile to the incorporation of secret corporations, hostile to the incorporation of the Orange society. It is perfectly true that I am, as the hon. gentleman says, a Protestant, and it is also true —I suppose that is the meaning of his phrase ultramontane—that I am of that school of thought which is most opposed to what I believe to be the dogmatic errors of the Church of Rome. That is perfectly true. I protest against those errors; but I am also an earnest advocate of religious freedom and equality and the full rights of conscience. As the Ontario leaders of the Orange society declare that that Province is ruled politically, by the Roman Catholic clergy, and that it must be freed from the domination of the Roman Catholic clergy by subverting Mr. Mowat, I notice they have sometimes said a word with reference to the conduct of the Province of Quebec, and as to its rule; and I desire here to advert to this question, speaking with the same plainness of speech which I have used this evening, though I may perhaps offend some of those who may have listened with approval to some things I have hitherto said. I say I do not find this pretention to be the exclusive standard bearers of Protestant principles and to lay down a rule and measure with which, unless all Protestants comply, they are to be held untrue to their principles, to be the proper attribute of this association, judged by its leaders in Ontario. I have spoken of Quebec. Now, in that Province there have been, for a long time, some persons—some persons only, I am glad to say—who have striven to create that *regime* in favour of their own party, who have insisted on extreme pretensions as to the rights of the clergy to use their influence in elections; who have sought to drag the clergy into the political arena; who have sought to pervert certain general language, which was used by the authorities of the Church, from its true sense and to turn it to the condemnation of one political party; who have sought to maintain the view that the clergy should refuse the rites of the Church to persons on account of their votes, who have sought to repeal the law as to undue influence, as far it affected the clergy; and there can be no doubt that these efforts on the part of some persons in Quebec met, in the past, with a measure of success. Pressure was used in several counties against the candidates of one political party, as Liberal Catholics; and the struggle was severe, and resulted in a great weakening of that party, from which it has not even yet recovered. The members of that party appealed, under these circumstances, to three tribunals; they appealed to public opinion, to the courts of the land, and to the highest authorities in their own church. They fought a long and arduous fight, which reached its climax, perhaps, in the period from 1875 to 1881. Public opinion, one of the tribunals to which they appealed, was roused to a considerable degree in the Province of Quebec; and many Protestants there even changed their political views and left the party with which they had usually acted, because they felt that this pressure was a pressure inconsistent with the proper sphere of religion and the proper sphere of the Church. The members of the party appealed also to the law; and the law was vindicated in several cases. They appealed also to the highest authorities in the Church, and those authorities also interfered. We know well, for it is public to us, what was done. We know that, in 1876, an instruction was sent out from the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office in these words:

"The Bishops of Canada must be made to understand that the Holy See fully acknowledges the extreme gravity of the facts reported by them; and the injury caused by these facts to the authority of the clergy and the holy ministry is particularly to be deplored.

"Wherefore in order to make up for these great injuries, it is especially necessary to root out the evil. Now the cause of such great inconveniences lies in the fact that these Bishops are divided among themselves, both as regards the political question and as regards other questions which are now agitated in Canada. Therefore with a view to putting an end to these much to be regretted dissensions, it will be necessary that the Bishops, together with his Lordship the Apostolic Delegate who has been sent to Canada, concert with each other to determine a uniform policy to be followed by all and each of them with regard to political parties.

"Another cause of these same inconveniencies lies in their too great interference in political affairs, without enough of heed for pastoral prudence. The proper remedy for this excess of zeal, is to remind these Bishops of that which has already been recommended to them by this supreme congregation, on Wednesday the 29th of July, 1874, to the effect that, on the occasion of political elections, they should conform in their advice to electors to what had been enacted in the Provincial Council of 1868.

"It must be added that the Church, while condemning Liberalism, does not intend to strike each and every political party which might chance to be called Liberal, since the decisions of the Church only apply to errors which are opposed to Catholic doctrine, and not to any specified political party whatever, and that consequently, whoever, without any other foundation, declares that one of the political parties of Canada, namely the party called the Reform party, a party heretofore strongly supported by some Bishops, is condemned by the Church, whoever makes such a statement acts wrongfully.

"Finally, as to what concerns the main subject of the doubts propounded; in order to determine what measures should be taken as regards Catholics, who, by reason of a pretended undue interference of the clergy in politieal elections, appeal to the civil courts; it is impossible to lay down a general rule for the Bishops on this subject, and therefore it will be the duty of whoever is in charge to provide in each case, with respect to the consciences of persons making such appeals. Therefore let the Bishops take the necessary measures to guard the honour of the clergy, taking special care to prevent as much as possible clergymen from being obliged to appear before lay judges.

"Lastly, Bishops must be exhorted to observe the greatest reserve with regard to political affairs, by reason, especially, of the danger there would be of provoking a violent war against the Church on the part of Protestants, who are already restless and irritated against the clergy under pretence of undue interference in political elections.

"Besides, the clergy must be brought to always avoid naming persons from the pulpit, still much more so if it is to discredit them on the occasion of elections, and to never make the influence of the ecclesiastical ministry subservient to private purposes, except when candidates might become antagonistic to the true interests of the Church."

Now, Sir, that was followed up by the pastoral letter and circular which were issued after the arrival of the Delegate Apostolic, and after an understanding had been reached with him in 1877. The Pastoral Letter of 1877, contains the following passages:—

"The gravity of the events which have taken place since the last General Election, and the numerous and various difficulties to which they have given occasion, make it our duty to remind you briefly, our most dear brethren, of the principles and the rules of policy which were expounded to you before now, in our councils, our circulars, and our pastorals, and particularly in that of the 22nd of September, 1875.

"The ninth decree of the Fourth Council, held in 1868, expounds your duty as electors in the following terms:—

"Let the pastors instruct with great care, the faithful on their duties in election times; let them strongly impress on their minds that the same law which confers on citizens the right of suffrage imposes on them at the same time the very serious obligation to give their votes whenever it is necessary, and always to vote according to their consciences, under the eye of God, and for the best interests of religion and of their country; that consequently, the electors are always bound in conscience, before God, to give their suffrages to whatever candidate they believe to be truly honest and able to fulfil well and faithfully the important duties which devolve upon him, to be ever attentive to the welfare of the Church and State, and to work faithfully to promote and guard the welfare of the Church and State."

Then, after pointing out what had been done in 1873 and 1875, and giving a warning against the doctrines *Catholico-Libérales*, the pastoral goes on to say:

"Unfortunately, and against our intention, some persons were inclined to see in this document an abandonment of principle to come down to persons and political parties. Our wish has been to expound to you the true doctrine on the constitution and the rights of the Church, on the rights and the duties of the clergy in society, on the obligations of the Catholic press, and on the sanctity of an oath; such has been our only aim, and such is still our intention. In this we have followed the example of the Holy See, who, in condemning Liberal Catholics, has refrained from naming persons and political parties. In fact, there does

not exist any Pontificial act condemning any political party whatever; all the condemnations which have, up to the present time, emanated from this venerable source are only applicable to Liberal Catholics and to their principles; and the brief addressed to one of us in September, 1876, must be interpreted in that sense. Following the example of the Sovereign Pontiff, and in accordance with the wise prescription of our Fourth Council, we leave to each one of you to judge, under the eye of God, which are the men to whom these condemnations apply, whatever may be the political party to which they belong."

Now, Sir, at the same time, as I have said, a circular letter was issued to the clergy, from which I will read an extract or two:

"In analyzing the ninth decree of the Fourth Council, and the eighteenth of the Fifth, we find that the clergy must confine themselves to instructing the people as to their duties in election time; which duties are the following: 1st. To give their votes when sufficient reasons call for it. 2nd. To vote according to their consciences, and under the eye of God, and to give their support to the candidates whom they may prudently judge to be truly honest and able to discharge the duties of a representative—which are, to watch over and to procure faithfully the welfare of religion and of the state. 3rd. Not to sell their votes. 4th. To avoid intemperance, slander and perjury."

Another passage reads thus:

"When you shall have so explained to your people the principles which ought to guide them in their choice, leave to the conscience of each of them the option of applying them to persons and to parties. And whenever a penitent shall tell you that he has voted in all conscience, and under the eye of God, never call in question his good faith, and put into practice the well-known axiom: 'The same belief must be given to what the penitent says on his own behalf as to what he says against himself.'"

Then again, Sir, the letter says:

"The decree of the Fourth Council forbids you to teach from the pulpit or otherwise, that it is a sin to vote for such and such a candidate, or for such and such a political party. With much more reason is it forbidden to you to announce that you will refuse the sacraments for that cause.

"Never give your individual political opinion from the pulpit.

"Never attend any political meeting, and never make a public speech on such matters without the permission of your ordinary.

"If you have a right to vote, you may avail yourself of it, but let it be with prudence and without ostentation. It is proper that you should choose the most favourable opportunity for voting, and not wait till the last moment, when the excitement is always greater, and that you should not remain near the place where the election is taking place.

"To those who may come to consult you privately, answer with prudence, with calm, without entering into discussions which would be compromising to your character; for you know well that language the most innocent and the most true is exposed to be, at such times, misunderstood, misinterpreted and misreported. And even if you see that people are greatly excited, it will be prudent on your part to state simply that what you have said from the pulpit must be sufficient to guide them."

Well, Sir, these documents to which I have referred contain' I may say, some injunctions in which I think the pastors of the Roman Catholic Church set an admirable example to the pastors of the other churches; I mean particularly those observations against selling the suffrage, against bribery, against corruption, against intemperance, against calumny, and against perjury. Then we go further. I do not confine myself wholly to the statements made by these ecclesiastical dignitaries. About the same time, a discussion was raised in this Parliament, and I wish to show that the views which are reprehended by these documents are views which were not held by all the Roman Catholics even of the Conservative party, On the 11th February, I think, in the year 1877, Senator Masson, then a member of this House, used these expressions:

"Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says in his letter that the party with which I act was controlled by a power which declared that free thought was a cardinal sin. Well, Sir, I say that this is no more nor less than a slander on the Conservative party; and as a Conservative and an Ultramontane, as I am called by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, from the Province of Quebec, as the leader of the Ultramontanes, I say that the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, and I speak advisedly, are ready to give to the clergy of the Province, on religious questions, that submission and that confidence which, according to our creed, we are obliged to give them; and regarding questions relating to the material progress of the country, and the political affairs of the country, we are ready and shall always be ready to give to the opinions of these gentlemen that respect to which they are entitled, owing to their high intelligence, their great virtue and their disinterestedness; but we are not ready to give any more."

Well, the matter was not finally settled. Notwithstanding what had been said, the discussion went on. Still the question was raised, and raised in pretty influential quarters, on the part of the Conservative party in Quebec, with reference to the law as to undue influence; and I felt it my duty—thinking the question might become a serious one, and desiring to place myself on record, and as I might by my voice in some degree influence my fellow countrymen—to speak upon the subject myself; and I did so at the village of Teeswater, in the year 1877. From that speech I may be permitted to quote:

"Another demand of a very different character has been made from very high quarters, namely, that we should alter the law as to undue influence. Now, the basis of our representative institutions is that our elections shall be free. Each of us is called on to surrender his share of control over the common affairs to the majority, upon the ground that this surrender is necessary, for so only can we reach a decision; but also on the hypothesis, without which the demand would be quite unjustifiable, that, all having a common interest, and each man speaking freely for himself, the view of the majority is more likely to be sound—is more likely accurately to represent what would be beneficial to the community than the view of the minority. This is the ground-work. Now, that ground-work wholly fails if the vote be not the expression of the voter's own opinion, but the expression of somebody else's opinion different from his. If, instead of its being his opinion, it be the opinion of his employer, his landlord, his creditor, or his minister, why, it is not his vote at all, it is somebody else's, and we have not submitted ourselves to the free voice of our fellow-countrymen, but possibly to the voice of a very small minority, who have determined what the voice of the larger number is to be. Thus the whole basis of our representative institutions would be destroyed if we permitted the opinions of our employers, creditors, landlords, or ministers to be forcibly substituted for our own. For this reason, besides the penalties which are enacted against the exercise of undue influence, we have declared that the vote of any man so unduly influenced shall be null and void, and that elections carried by such undue influences shall be annulled. I cannot, if a landlord, say to my tenant, 'Now, tenant, I shall turn you out at the end of your term if you do not vote for my candidate.' Though I may have a legal right to turn him out at the end of the term, yet I cannot give the intimation that I will, on this ground, exercise this right. If I do, the vote is annulled as not free. I cannot, if a creditor, say to my debtor, 'I will exact that debt at once if you do not vote as I wish,' though I may have a legal right to exact my debt. I cannot, if an employer, say to my employee, 'You shall leave my employment at the end of the current term unless you vote with me,' though the law may not oblige me to retain him in my service. It has been found necessary in all these cases to prevent the relations to which I have referred from being made the means of unduly influencing the vote, in order that this great cardinal principle of our Constitution—the freedom of each man to vote according to his own opinion—may be preserved intact. True, the landlord, and the creditor, and the employer have each the right to speak and persuade by arguments; and the confidence placed in them may be such that the voter's opinion may be changed; but between the argument, the persuasion, the confidence which may conduce to a change in the mind and opinion of the voter, and that coercion which compels him to vote contrary to his mind on the threat of some loss or penalty, there is a broad and palpable distinction, and that is the distinction which the law lays down. Now, if there be a form of religion under which the minister is supposed to have the power, by granting or refusing certain rites, or by making certain declarations to affect the state of the voter after death, is it not perfectly obvious that the threat of such results to the voter unless he votes in accordance with the opinion of the minister, might be infinitely more potent than any of the other threats which I have named—the exaction of a debt, the ejection of a tenant, or the discharge of an employee? And would not such a threat be obnoxious to just the same objection?"

"I am far indeed from implying that politics should not be handled on Christian principles. Whatever difficulties and differences there may be as to Christian dogma, there is, fortunately, very little difference concerning Christian morals. We are, fortunately, all united in this country in the theoretical recognition—however far we may fail in the practical observance—of the great doctrines of Christian morality which are handed down to us in the Gospels; and I believe it is on the basis of those doctrines that the politics of the country should be carried on. Dim indeed would be our hopes, and dark our expectations for the future, if they did not embrace the coming of that glorious day when those principles shall be truly, fully and practically recognised—if we did not look forward to the fulfilment of promises that 'the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord;' and that 'nation shall not make war against nation, neither shall they learn war any more;' if we did not watch for the time when the human law of self-interest and hate shall be superseded by the Divine law of self-sacrifice and love. But while we hope and strive for the accomplishment of these things, we must not forget the lessons of the Great Teacher and Exemplar. When interrogated upon secular things—when asked as to rendering tribute to Cæsar, He said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's.' He laid down the principle, and He left the people—the querists—to make the application. So again when He was called upon to settle a dispute between two brothers about an inheritance, He said: 'Man,

who made Me a judge or divider over you?' Such was the view He took as to the duty of a minister, as to the work of the pulpit; and while I do not hesitate to say that to all ministers I would freely accord the right as citizens of voting, of expressing their opinions, of arguing and persuading, and influencing if they please, my own opinion is that the pastor of a flock divided on politics will be much more likely to retain the fullest confidence of all the members of that flock, and so to discharge effectually his great task, if he abstains from active interference in those political affairs on which there is and will be great division of opinion among them. But, sir, it has been argued in some quarters that the free exercise of one form of religion amongst us is impaired by this law. That would indeed, if true, be a serious thing. But, if it were true, we would still be bound, in my opinion, to preserve the fundamental principle of the freedom of the elector. No man, any article of whose creed should make him a slave would be fit to control either his own destiny or that of free men. A slave himself, he would be but a proper instrument to make slaves of others. Such an article of religion would, in a word, be inconsistent with free institutions, because it would not permit that liberty of opinion in the individual, which is their very base and corner stone. But we are not confronted with that difficulty. The public and deliberate utterances of high dignitaries in more than one Province of Canada have shown that the assertion is unfounded, and have recognised the right of every elector to vote according to his conscience; and the recent statement—communicated to the public through Lord Denbigh—of the head of that Church, shows that the United Kingdom, where the law as to undue influence is precisely the same as ours, is perhaps the only country in Europe where the professors of that religion are free to practise it. If this be the case in the United Kingdom, it is so here, and it is not true that there is any form of religion, the free and full exercise of which is impaired by the preservation of the great principle to which I have referred. I trust, then, that the ill-advised pretensions which have been set up will be abandoned; but should they be pressed, I take the opportunity of declaring that for myself, whatever be the consequences, I shall stand by the principle which I have laid down and shall struggle to preserve—so far as my feeble powers permit—to each one of my fellow-countrymen, whatever his creed, the same full and ample measure of civil freedom which he now enjoys under those laws which enable him and me, though we may be of diverse faiths, to meet here on the same platform, and here to differ or agree according to our own political convictions, and not according to our religious faith or the dictation of any other men, lay or clerical."

Now, Sir, finally, in September, 1881, there was a further communication dealing with these two subjects to which I have referred, and from it I will trouble the House with a very brief extract. It is a communication from the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation, Cardinal Simeoni:

"It has come to the knowledge of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda that in your Province certain members of the clergy and of the secular body continue to interfere too much in political elections, by using either the pulpit or newspapers and other publications.

"It is equally known to the aforesaid Sacred Congregation that a certain suffragan of your Lordships now endeavours to appeal to Parliament to cause the Electoral Law concerning the so-called undue influence amended.

"Now as regards the first point I hasten to remind your Lordship that as far back as the year 1876 the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office issued the following instructions:—

And then follows the instruction I have already quoted. The communication proceeds as follows:—

"In conformity with this instruction, your Lordship must without delay make known to all your suffragans, to the clergy and to all those whom it may concern, that it is the intention of the Holy Father that all the aforesaid prescriptions of the Holy Office be strictly observed.

"As regards the second point, your Lordship must notify all the suffragans that each of the Prelates individually must refrain from agitating or causing to be agitated the question of the amendment of the law concerning the said undue influence. If there should come a time when the Bishops assembled should judge unanimously that the proper time had come to make the aforesaid demand they must first apply to this Sacred Congregation to receive from it their proper instructions."

And that, so far as I know, was the final settlement of that controversy, so far as concerned the views of the highest authorities of the Church, repeated after an interval of years. During that controversy, on 20th January, in the year 1876, the Archbishop of Toronto addressed a public letter to my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), which, dealing as it does with this subject, may appropriately be read at this time. It is as follows:—

"TORONTO, 20th January, 1876.

"HON. A. MACKENZIE,
"Premier of the Dominion of Canada.

"HON. AND DEAR SIR,—I think this an opportune time to inform you and your Government that priests in our Archdiocese are strictly forbidden to make the altar or pulpit of their churches the tribune of political harangues for or against any party or candidate for election; or to threaten any spiritual disability for voting with either party.

"Priests may, of course, instruct their people on the conscientious obligation of voting for the candidate whom they judge will best promote the interests of the country; of taking no bribes; and of conducting themselves at the elections in a loyal and peaceful manner; but they are not to say to the people, from the altar, that they are to vote for this candidate and reject the other.

"It would be very imprudent in a priest, whose congregation is composed of Liberals and Conservatives, to become a warm partizan of either political party.

"It would neutralize his influence for good in too many instances, and a priest requires all he possesses to forward the interests of his whole congregation.

"It is true that a priest, in his ordination, does not renounce his rights of citizenship, nor does he receive authority to impose on his congregation his own particular views of politics.

"The Catholic Church asks no special favour from any party. Her existence is independent of both. She asks only that her people be put under no unjust restraint or ban. It is true that the old legislation of England made the Catholic religion a bar to political and almost social existence; and though wiser councils now prevail in Courts and Parliaments, yet some of the Protestant populace, and an occasional statesman in his individual capacity, so long educated in the traditions of the past, retain a deep-rooted prejudice and suspicion not easily conquered, that the Catholic religion should be a bar to preferment, and that the Catholic Church is inimical to free institutions and unfavourable to State rights. This is still a reproduction of the old Pagan cry: 'The Christians to the beasts,' or the old Jewish accusation: 'We have found this man perverting our nation and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar.'

"The Catholic Church asks only liberty to do good, and to be untrammelled by unjust laws in the exercise of her divine rights. I might here remark, that when in a free country, religious and sacred rights are brought into the arena of politics, then the Catholics have to follow them to the polls and contend there for their right, as in the case of education. We believe that parents have a perfect right to educate their children as they please. 'Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it.' Hence, when the Catholics of Lower Canada conceded the right of separate education to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, the Catholic minority of Upper Canada claimed the same right, but had to contend for this right at the elections; and thus religious questions are dragged out of their sphere. The Catholic does not permit his religion to hinder the progress of the country, or the peaceful exercise of a different religion to his neighbours. When his religious principles are safe, the Catholic, under the impression that party Government is a lesser evil, gives his support to that which he thinks will perform its duties for the greater good of the country and the happiness of the people.

"I am, Honourable Sir,
"Your very obedient servant,
"JOHN JOSEPH LYNCH,
"Archbishop of Toronto."

As I have said, there was a long and bitter controversy in the Province of Quebec with some who strove to abuse the power of the church in the way to which I have referred. That long and bitter controversy was a controversy in which my friends, the Liberals of Lower Canada, were the oppressed party, the party which was being overborne in it, which was suffering from it, in the constituencies; and though they have received justice at last in the particular to which I have referred, it is useless to disguise the fact that so long a conflict, waged in that manner, and with these weapons, has had a permanent weakening effect. But I want to know where, in all that time, were the Orange Tory leaders of Ontario. I want to know whether they were helping in the cause which has thus been vindicated in the end. I want to know whether they were expressing and actively manifesting their sympathy with those who were struggling for the rights which have at length been accorded them. It is not so; it is known not to be so. It is true that many of the Protestants of Quebec came to the assistance of the Liberals of Quebec in that struggle, but the Orange Tory leaders of Ontario were unflinching in their support of and in their consort with the very members who were waging that controversy against the Quebec Liberals. Why? Because they were united in political bonds with those members; because they rejoiced in their success at the polls, although that success was achieved against those with whom they professed to be in sympathy. They were kept in place and power by means of that partnership; and therefore they were untrue to the principles which they professed, and in order to promote which they are now saying they wish to

be incorporated. I have declared my views on this subject, and I have nothing to recall in regard to them. I have shown where I am to be found in case any conflict may arise in which any church, whether Roman Catholic or Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, or what you will, shall strive to encroach on what I believe to be the just domain of the State. I believe that if you commit to any church absolute power and control over faith and morals, and if, at the same time, you commit to that church absolute and unlimited power to determine what is comprised within faith and morals, you concede necessarily to that church absolute power altogether; and I believe, therefore, that it is quite necessary to consider that there may be a point at which we may be called on to consider what the tenets of the church in that particular point of view are. I have shown that the struggle was fought out within that church; that those rights on which the Liberals of Lower Canada insisted have been vindicated and the electors have a right to vote as free men. But should such a struggle recur, which God forbid; could I, judging from the past, hope for any assistance, could the Liberal party look with hope for any assistance from the Orange Tory leaders of Ontario? No; because we have not received it in the past, and whatever their views of these leaders they subordinated them altogether to party politics, which led them to rejoice in the triumphs of those who were perpetuating principles directly opposed to their own. There are some other reasons which lead me to think that this society in Ontario is not a beneficial one. Its leaders claim a monopoly, not merely of true Protestantism, but also of loyalty. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), at Winnipeg, said :—

"One of his reasons was, that with three others, he had opposed the Costigan resolution, which was a direct insult to the Mother Country, and to every loyal citizen in the country, except party leaders on both sides and members who were pandering to the Catholic vote, and not one member of the Orange society said, 'well done.'"

Grand Master Bennett said:

"You are no doubt aware that a most singular combination was formed at the last Session to defeat the Bill. We had the astounding spectacle of Protestant Liberalism and Ultramontanism in alliance to defeat it: Liberalism, because of the loyalty of Orangemen, and Ultramontanism, because of the advanced Protestantism of the Orange order."

There you have it, Sir, laid down as a rule, that Orangemen are so loyal, and their loyalty is so offensive to others, that the Orangemen must be put down by force. I maintain that that is an offensive statement, and that a secret society which devotes itself to the propagation of such opinions as these, as to the loyalty of others, is one which does not deserve favour or State recognition. There is another reason. These Ontario Orange leaders claim that their object is to advance Protestantism; and they claim to advance it, by assertions with reference to the Roman Catholic Church, which I believe to be baseless. And here again I do not propose to deal with assertions as to dogma. I do not propose to deal with assertions with respect to religion, as to whether certain views are right or wrong, for we have nothing to do with them. But we have to do with their views as to the tenets of that church, as they affect the political condition and social order of the country. Those things are of material interest to us, and it is well that we should know what is advanced in the name of Protestantism, or with a view of promoting it, by the leaders of the Orange society in Ontario. In the *Sentinel* of 21st December, 1882, there is the following, which is headed "Allegiance to Rome only":

"We have always contended that the Romish Church teaches its followers to be disloyal to every State wherein it exists, to recognize the authority of no temporal Government, and to own allegiance only to the Papacy."

On April 26th, 1883, the same paper said:

"It is hardly necessary to say that every true member of the church must yield to the Pope, the infallible head of the church, unquestioning obedience in morals, dogmatic faith or belief, and also conduct and civil affairs.

"No member of the church can dispute the right of the head of it to decide infallibly and dogmatically all questions affecting temporal power in Governments, any more than he can that of the faith and belief put forth in her teachings. * * * * * * *

"The people in America are governed by constitutions which leave to themselves the power of determining the character and structure of Government.

"These constitutions are, therefore, inimical to the Church of Rome, in her opinion, and are only tolerated because they cannot be destroyed. As she is at war with every form of Government not prescribed by herself, it would be her duty to destroy these constitutions, if she could; nay, she would be guilty, under her teachings, if she had the power, and did not destroy them. * * * * * * *

"Is it not a humiliation that in a country like this, a loyal association has been refused the same privileges that are daily granted to those who proclaim the prerogative of a foreign Prince Bishop to be superior to those of Her Majesty and Her Government, privileges daily granted to those whose civil allegiance is firstly to the Pope and secondly wherever he might direct it, though that should lead to the destruction of the dignities and prerogatives of the Imperial Crown, now largely directed by the responsible Ministers of the Government, who hold office at the will of the people."

Again, in the *Sentinel* of the 8th of November, 1883, the following language is used:—

"It is necessary to keep constantly before the mind of the Orange and Protestant public of the Dominion that Rome is still true to her motto, *semper eadem*.

"She is the same to-day that she was a hundred years ago, planning, scheming, and contriving to subvert the best liberties and freest institutions of every State in christendom."

These are the statements repeated over and over again as to the political attitude of the Church of Rome, and all true Protestants are called upon to occupy an inimical position towards members of that church on the ground, first of all, that the adherents of that church do not owe civil allegiance to the Queen of this Dominion and the Constitution of this country; second, that they owe civil allegiance to a foreign power; and third, that that power is inimical to free institutions, and that its efforts are directed to subvert them as far as possible. That is the attitude with respect to the Church of Rome and its adherents in Canada to-day. Again, so late as the 19th February, 1884, at a meeting of the Grand Lodge of Ontario West, the Grand Master—while this Parliament was in Session, while this Bill was on the Order Paper—referred to the unfortunate affair in Newfoundland, said:

"Brethren, it is the old story. It has been told in Ireland a thousand times. It has been told in Fort Garry, Montreal and Newfoundland, and shows to us as plainly as the sun at noonday that when Romanism has the ascendancy Protestants have no rights and are only tolerated, and that the teachings of Rome are the same to-day as they were in '98—that to break faith with heretics is no sin, and that killing is no murder."

Then, Sir, in the same speech, he quotes approvingly from a weekly journal these words:

"It (*i.e.*, the Orange body in Ireland) is acting strictly in self-defense, for everybody who has read Irish history, or who listens to Fenian harangues, must know that from the moment when power passed into the hands of Irish Catholics no man of British blood or Protestant religion would ever dwell in safety on the soil of Ireland."

Commenting on that statement he says:—

"This statement, coming from a gentleman who on more than one occasion has spoken in no friendly terms concerning our order, shows that the thinking Protestants of this country are becoming alive to the necessity of having a Protestant secret society to counteract the influence of the gigantic secret society of Romanism."

Now those are statements with which we have to deal to-day. If those views be correct, if those be correct statements of the tenets of that church, then it does not merely hold erroneous views in matters of dogma. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) and myself, do not agree in our religious views, and unfortunately we do not agree in politics, but our difference in religion does not make the difference in our political allegiance. Our differences in religion are questions between us and our consciences, between us and our God, to be disposed of individually by each of us. But then other views, which I have just now read, are of an entirely different character; they go far beyond

divergencies of religious opinion. We have here a statement of views hostile to the Throne, hostile to free institutions hostile to our Constitution, hostile to social order and safety—views which are destructive to everything which we, in Canada—and I do not put the Catholic below the Protestant—which we, as a united people in Canada hold most dear. I say that if you tell me truly that in civil matters the adherents of the Roman Catholic faith do not owe allegiance to the Crown and the Constitution, but owe it to a foreign power, then they are not true subjects to the Queen, and they are aliens in the middle of the land. If this be so, I say that you cannot trust them. I agree with those gentlemen who sometimes, as was mentioned this evening, say harsh things until "they grant absolution before the elections"—I agree with them that if these are the tenets of that church, I can well understand their hostility, from a political point of view, to the Roman Catholic religion. If they believe that that church is hostile to, and desires the subversion of our free institutions, of our Constitution, I can understand their hostility going far beyond dogmatic difference of religion; I can understand that the whole institution is one with reference to which no alliance is to be kept. If it is their opinion, and if it be the case, that a Roman Catholic believes that no faith need be kept with a heretic, that the killing of a heretic is no murder, then social order and safety are at risk and we cannot possibly remain at ease if such doctrines as these are true. All those who honestly believe these opinions to be true of the Roman Catholic faith or of the adherents of that faith, could not possibly, if they are lovers of our Constitution and our institutions, honestly co-operate with it in politics. It is impossible, Sir, that an honest belief in these things, as the actual tenets of that church, could consist with political co-operation on the part of those who so believe, with Roman Catholics.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Do you believe what the Liberals in Lower Canada believe?

Mr. BLAKE. Order. On the other hand, all lovers of free institutions should combine against the evil which would be wrought, the pressing evil and danger to our institutions which would exist, it such indeed were the tenets held by such a large proportion of the citizens of this country. The question, then, is a serious one. We have it here; we have had it within the last few months; we have it stated as a doctrine of to-day, and the hon. gentleman nods assent to it, as the feeling an Orangeman holds with reference to his Roman Catholic fellow citizens. But are these statements true? Sir, I believe them to be untrue. I believe that the Church of Rome holds many religious doctrines and dogmas most gravely erroneous; to these I am entirely opposed.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You believe too much; that is the trouble.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, perhaps I believe too much. I will not say that the hon. gentleman believes all he says; I hope he does. I have endeavoured, in my own poor way, and to the best of my humble ability, to promote the spread of those Protestant principles of dogmatic religion, those views of the Gospel and of the Bible, in which I agree. I am doing what I can in that direction, and have been for years; it is not much, but I have done what I could. I believe that a most potent fact in that direction is a greater union among the Protestant denominations; and I have always been desirous of seeing such a union acomplished for the better advancement of the Gospel, according to our views of it. I rejoice to see the evidence of a tendency towards that union, in the existence of those organizations in which ministers and people of various denominations mingle, forget their differences, and learn what is best in each other, and in what points they agree. I rejoice to see Evangelical Allianees, Young Men's Christian Associations, and Ministerial Associations, such as the one that exists in my own city. I have worked with Orangemen in the Synod of my Church and elsewhere; they have sympathized with me and I have sympathized with them; I cared not for our differences in politics; they have never made the shake of our hands less warm, or our co-operation in the work of our church less earnest; and it pains me that hon. gentlemen opposite should seek an occasion of this kind to raise a wall of division, even among those engaged together in church work, by uttering and circulating these calumnies against me, and by declaring that my Protestant principles are abandoned because I cannot, in my conscience, support a Bill for the incorporation of a society which propagates opinions like those. I know that I shall be misrepresented and misunderstood, and that men will be misled, in my Province and elsewhere, as to what I have said to-night. I cannot help it; I felt it borne in upon me as a duty to say it: I had to say it. I say that men will be misled by designing politicians, who are using the cloak of religion and the cloak of charity to promote party politics. If we could forget our differences and agree to mingle in all charitable works, irrespective of our faith—as, God be thanked, although we differ in religion, we may agree in works of charity—it would be a blessed achievement. But to-day what are you doing? You are promoting these calumnies in reference to another church; you are coming forward and declaring untruly, as I believe, that the tenets of that church, from which you differ are in these respects detestable, and that every true Protestant must take the same position. It is a course of which I hope you will repent before you are many years older. Now, I am anxious for a Protestant ascendancy of one kind—for the spread of those opinions which I believe to be true but I am anxious that there should be no Protestant ascendancy of the material kind to which the leaders of the Orange Tory party refer, when they speak of that Protestant ascendancy, which existed in the past in Ireland, and to which they look backward with such longing eyes. I am not anxious for that kind of Protestant ascendency; and in my desire to promote my dogmatic faith, I do not countenance such weapons as the hon. gentleman and other Orange leaders use. My belief is that my Catholic fellow subjects do acknowledge allegiance to, and feel a loyalty to the Crown and the free institutions of this country. My belief is that they do not think that to break faith with a heretic is no sin, and to kill him no murder. I have not forgotten the declaration made against such calumnies as these by the Irish prelates, as long ago as the 25th of January, 1826, in a document which contains many statements of faith and doctrine, as to which Protestants and Roman Catholics are as wide as the poles asunder. But it contains two statements which touch our social and political system, and our relations to each other as citizens of one common country, as follows:—

"The Irish Catholics swear, that the Catholics of Ireland do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: and this without any mental reservation or dispensation."

The prelates go on to say:

"After this full, explicit and sworn declaration, we are utterly at a loss to conceive on what possible ground we could be justly charged with bearing towards our most Gracious Sovereign only a divided allegiance."

And with reference to the other insulting charge, they say this:

"The Catholics of Ireland not only do not believe, but they declare on oath, that they detest as unchristian and impious the belief that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatever under the pretense of their being heretics; and also, the principle that no faith is to be kept with heretics."

There you find distinct statements which contradict allegations which ought not to have been made, and which there ought not therefore to have been necessity for contradict-

ing; and yet, Sir, we find not ten years ago, not five years ago, not one year ago, but within the past few days, the most offensive of these allegations repeated, which I have shown would be subversive of the free institutions of our country, if true. Now, I am not prepared to mark as murderous, as treacherous and disloyal, nearly one-half of my fellow citizens. I do not believe the cause of Protestantism, of true religion, the advancement of the Gospel, the peace and prosperity, the welfare and the good Government of this Dominion, will be promoted by State recognition of this secret society, organized and led as it is, in Ontario, and devoted to the propagation of views such as those which I have exposed. I do not myself attach, in the discordant dissolution of parties with respect to this Bill, any particular significance to the question. I have viewed it from another aspect altogether; I have been anxious that we should understand what the real merits of the controversy are; and in my statement of what my objections are, I have endeavoured to sustain them, not by stale and musty authorities, but by recent and authentic utterances. But, perhaps, I am wrong; I dare say that I shall be more bitterly misrepresented than ever before by the Orange Tory leaders; and as to the Tory Roman Catholic leaders, they, too, the temporary struggle between them and their Orange allies being ended, and the alliance revived, will regard me all the more distastefully, because I have necessarily shown either how sham their battle is or how false and unnatural is their conjunction. But I have this satisfaction, that I have told plainly the truth as I believe it; and it will be an ample reward to me, if I have succeeded in explaining to moderate men on both sides the views I hold, and in pointing out what the true path of duty is in a community of divers races and creeds like ours; where we must combine firmness in the assertion of our own rights with fullness in the recognition of the rights of others; we must cultivate moderation and forbearance; we must avoid misrepresentation, calumny and abuse; we must hold to the ample acknowledgment of each man's individual rights of conscience in religious matters, and of the common citizenship of all in civil matters, if we would make of Canada a great and free country, inhabited by a happy and united people.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I wish to say a few words on this question before the vote is taken. I do not intend following the long and elaborate speech of the learned and hon. gentleman from West Durham, nor that of the hon. member for West Huron; but I intend simply to give my vote as I did last year, in favour of this Bill. I regret that there has been imported into this question a lamentable bitterness and a departure from the regular rules of debate, by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, after inveighing against this measure and other subjects in so elaborate a form. Last Session he had not a word to say, and I will not say that since then the mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh!

Mr. WOODWORTH. I do not wish to be interrupted, nor will I be interrupted. We listened with great attention to the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, while enunciating his doctrines and making statements which we knew were not correct; and it is unfair and unmanly for some of the gentlemen into whose eyes I am now looking, to do that which we forbore from doing. They have not had a ludicrous mouse but an elaborate speech, which one would think the hon. gentleman had passed the recess in making up. If you, Mr. Speaker, had drawn the rules of debate according to the practice laid down in *May*, the hon. gentleman could not have delivered one-half his speech, because page after page was turned over and over while he read his speech from the notes and documents he had before him, and no doubt he imagines that it will go down to posterity as a great production of his mind. If the hon. gentleman were of the opinion last Session which he now holds, he did himself then an injustice and this House an injury in forbearing to give expression to his opinion. While the first hour or two of the hon. gentleman's speech was delivered in a statesmanlike form, from a statesmanlike standpoint, the last few hours were not so elevated in tone. The first hour or two he inveighed against secret societies from a statesmanlike standpoint, not only the Orange but the Masonic and all other secret bodies; he then proceeded to tell us they were the fruitful mother of bitterness, misrepresentation and malignity. Well, if his speech on this point should be read by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, who happens to be Grand Master of the Masonic body in England, I question whether it would give the hon. gentleman, the leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, an enviable place in His Royal Highness' estimation. I, as a Mason, deny the imputation cast upon the Masonic body: and I tell the hon. gentleman he covered himself cunningly, as he generally does in his remarks, when he stated he did not know whereof he was speaking. He did not, he said, belong to any secret society. How then dare he in the presence of this Parliament, declare that the society which has for its foundation every Christian precept which the hon. gentleman elaborated and arrogated to himself, is not as high, from every moral point of view, as the precepts which the hon. gentleman holds sacred and dear? While telling us he was engaged in a Christian work, the hon. gentleman violated all the precepts that St. Paul taught. Did he not remember that one of the doctrines that St. Paul taught was that charity was not puffed up, that charity was kind and suffered long, and that while he talked religion for half an hour he violated every precept that St. Paul ever wrote or taught? I would have been proud of the hon. gentleman, had he sustained his speech in the manner he opened it. I could not find fault with his opinions then if he himself entertained them, but when he came to inveigh against all secret societies, and use the uncharitable language he did with regard to a society which enjoys the highest repute all over the land, where the British language is spoken, aye, and where it is not spoken; for masonic societies have their influence in those countries too, and their leaders are quite as honourable as the hon. gentleman. Had he confined himself in his remarks, in a constitutional way, to the fact that the Bill should be relegated back to the Province that wanted it, that New Brunswick, Manitoba and Nova Scotia had it, but that Ontario had it not, no fault could be found; but he departed from the argument and attempted to make statements here which are undoubtedly false. The hon. member stated that he was against this Protestant cry, this Protestant ascendancy, and he took under his wing the Catholics of the Dominion of Canada. He has made another bid for their vote, as he did on the famous Costigan Resolution, and he did it in that manner which did him justice as a lawyer pleading at the bar, who took every possible view of the case, no matter how inconsistent one proposition was with another. He made a direct bid for the Catholic vote of this country. He made it as a gentleman who in all times had been against Protestant ascendancy, as one who did not believe the Catholics deserved the names attributed to them by certain Orangemen here and certain Orangemen there; and what did he do? He attempted to connect—and the argument was subtle but manifestly clear, that he intended to connect—the Orange body as a partisan institution with the right hon. the leader of the Government in this country. He intended to make him the father of all the sins of omission and commission of any Orangeman who, at any meeting, when a little excited, possibly, and excited unduly, perhaps, but still honestly excited, had let fall a loose expression here or there; he gathered them all up, pointed to this speech here and to that speech there, and threw this on

the whole Orange body, and then at one fell swoop he says: "Behold your gods; John A. Macdonald, these are your friends; they are hating the Catholics and calling them everything that is evil in the world." The loyal Orange institution of Ontario, the Orangemen of Canada, have not, as a body, ever violated the decencies of private life, of public life, or of Christian life. We find the Minister of Inland Revenue standing side by side on the same platform with an Orangeman, voting with him, working with him, and appealing to the people to elect him. We find Orangemen standing on the same platform with a Roman Catholic, and appealing to the electors to elect him. Does this appear as if there was a wide separation here, and they were calling one another names? He knows, as a logician, that he cannot take these particular cases and make them general, and bring in the whole Orange body in that way. Did he not think he was bringing spirits up from the past which were hard to be allayed? Did he not remember the past? I think he did. Immediately he said, "I am not speaking of the past, I am not speaking of utterances of the past, I am speaking of them to-day." Well, if I can point not to a particular case of a Reformer, if I can point not to a particular instance where a Reform convention, not to a particular instance where a county convention had met together and called the Catholics of this country every opprobrious epithet which could be hurled at their heads, but if I could point to him where the whole Reform party, under the lash of the *Globe* newspaper, who whipped them into line as effectively as ever the knout of the Russian whipped the Russian serf into line, if I point to that *Globe* newspaper which, with malice aforethought, not in the heat of debate, not as a gentleman might do before an audience, heated by debate, let fall a loose expression for which he might be sorry, but in the sanctum of the editor, in his room, deliberately laying down the platform which he, the hon. member from West Durham, as a member of the party, subscribed to and carried on his banners, and worked under that policy and on the platform, if I can point to that, what will be thought of the temerity of the hon. member himself and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), who came into this House to-night, and, instead of discussing this question in a calm and proper way, attempted to catch the Irish vote of the Dominion by taking up these isolated cases where Orangemen at some time had said something under great excitement against their Catholic brethren. He should remember what the *Globe* newspaper said at that time, and I will read him an extract. He asked my hon. friend from East Hastings whether he was amused, while he read his extract, and he was cheered to the echo. He said, "Are you amused now?" And I never heard people so pleased as they were to hear these printed words read by the hon. gentleman to the House. I ask how amused they will feel when they hear language like this which I am about to read, used towards the Catholics of this country by these gentlemen, and I charge home to the hon. member for West Durham as much of a participation in this as if the articles had been written by himself, because he acted under them, and utilized them, and never repudiated them. Never by voice or pen did he utter one word against the statements here made, but to-day he finds it convenient to get his friend from West Huron up, while he himself was out attending to a meeting somewhere, to read extracts to inflame the public mind, so that he might have time to get back to the House and read a five hours' speech, which he had been preparing for six months. I did not intend to say one word on this question, until I heard the member for West Huron get up and speak, but the trick was so apparent——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The trick was so apparent——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am not saying the trick, as applied to him. I say the trick. I make it a personal question. I personify the words and call it "the trick," and put them in quotation marks. I do not believe any member of this House is less frequently out of order than myself. I always take care of my language, and I intend to comport myself according to the rules of the House, and I am doing so now.

"Doubtless every intelligent man is aware——"

This is from the *Globe*.

"That, as far as an Irish priest is concerned, he is loyal to no one but the Pope, and to no place but Rome."

What did he, the hon. member from West Durham, tell us here, with almost the last breath that he uttered? He told us that, if you could point to where a Catholic owed allegiance to a foreign potentate, he was no true subject of the Crown. He told you that, but he subscribed to these articles of faith, I am now reading from the *Globe*, and he has never repudiated them:

"Loyal! The thing is a joke. An Irish priest is not, and cannot be loyal to our Queen, our Empire, or our people. He had no part or lot with us."

Mr. DAVIES. What is the date?

Mr. WOODWORTH. Never mind the date. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island is fond of dates. I do not care a fig for the dates he generally gives the House.

Mr. DAVIES. Are you ashamed of the date?

Mr. WOODWORTH. Would you keep that little man quiet, please, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That young gentleman with the infantile baby face, who looks as though he ought to be in a cradle instead of in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will confine himself to the debate, without making any personal allusions.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I ask the Speaker if he will keep the gentleman from Prince Edward Island in his seat. If he will attend to that, he need not attend very much to my remarks.

"He is an alien, though born within the bounds, and his oath of fealty is the kiss of Judas. He lives to serve Rome and to crush Protestantism. The ignorance and degradation of the priests form the gloomier aspect of the picture. Springing from the lowest class of poverty, they are notoriously illiterate and immoral. So deeply rooted has this notion of their debasement become in the popular mind that, when a boy is unruly, and his parents have failed in persuading him to learn some honest trade, they frequently consider the church their last and only resource. This idea is embodied in a current proverb, which may be rendered in English to the couplet:

"'Vicious and ignorant, glattonous beast,
Nothing remains but to make him a priest.'

"One would think that one of the six (nuns) who accompanied him (Mr. Mackenzie) through the building (the convent of the Grey Nuns, Quebec), must have been ogling him, old as he is, and warming up his fancy to the boiling point. We venture to say that there is not in the Quebec nunnery anyone who has sufficient charms to enchant him, and if there is, she would be kept out of sight for fear that a bright glance from a pair of grey male blinkers might induce her to seek in the world that happiness which very few can find in a cloister. Why does Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie write thus just now? The reason is evident; the little gentleman fell asleep the other day in Parliament, and woke up to vote for the Ecclesiastical Incorporation Bill; he is now defending that vote by praising the institutions which it might have helped to perpetuate.

"In Ireland, during the last half a dozen years, Popery has been meeting the moral and spiritual efforts of the missionaries of Gospel truth by physical force, in the shape of riots, turmoil, instigated in the secret chambers of the mass house. Every other week is Father Cahill parading some act of disturbance connected with the proceedings of the 'soupers,' as a proof that the Milesian reformatory movement tends to the disorganization of the Commonwealth. At the same time, the record of the Hibernian police tribunal furnish abundant evidence that, in nine cases out of ten, these disturbances have been originated by certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, stimulated and hounded on by the priesthood, whose craft was in danger."

And again:

"Liberty and Popery are incompatible, and freedom is a disgusting attribute, predicable only of Presbyterianism and the Conventicle.

"The Catholic is rightly aware that mendacity assumes the stages of a cardinal virtue, when employed to advance the interests of 'mother church' and that what is black as soot to-day, may be white as snow to-morrow, if moistened with a syringe full of holy water.

"Romanism is the most contemptible and emasculated sham which this empirical age witnesses. When a stranger enters the shop of a Catholic, the primary question must be—have yez a line from the blessed Father Fitzhenry, or thrice blessed Father Bruyere? If not, sorrow a farthing's worth of goods will ye get here, at all, at all?

"The man may be in the last degree immoral, and do and say every thing that is vile, without being taken to task by these impious priests; but let him endeavour to live like a christian, and seek to enlighten his neighbors and down will come these bloodhounds of Rome upon him.

"A few months may see the issue of a Bull which, our Government aiding and abetting, may flood the Province with a population likely to be as great a curse to it as were the locusts to the land of Egypt. Settle the Roman Catholic Irish in masses, and we shall have a second Connaught, a second district of Quebec, a second Naples. No schools, no roads, no progress"——

Mr. CASGRAIN. What date?

Mr. WOODWORTH. Catholics are the same in all ages. They do not change their dogmas of faith. At the time this was written, the man who deliberately wrote these words was the leader of their party, and was acknowledged by the whole party. Have they come to-night to repudiate it when they find an Orange Bill here, and a Catholic vote to obtain, if possible, at the elections? I will read you something more:

"Let us take care, gentlemen, never to have our morality destroyed for the sake of physical good. (Cheers.) I object on this ground to having a low class of Irish Roman Catholics imported from the United States into this country. I object to it for several reasons. I object to it, because wherever these people predominate, there the peace, the happiness, and comfort of the community is destroyed. (Cheers.) I object to it because they sow feuds, and dissensions, and strifes, wherever they are. I object to it, because they have no mind of their own. (Loud cheers.) Their body, their soul, their intellect, are in the hands of a bigoted priesthood. (Loud cheers.) The mind has a wonderful influence on the body, and what is the effect of the Popish system on themselves? They cannot look you straight in the face. The system has injured the body, it has injured the mind, it has injured the tempers, it has injured the passions. You can scarcely find a noble, benevolent, open-countenanced man who is a sincere Roman Catholic. (Cheers.) There are two classes of Romanists: the one is an educated class, men of intelligence; they are the few, and they make tools of the many to carry out the purposes of the priests. (Cheers.) There are three classes of Protestants, gentlemen. There is the Protestant who, like Gallio, cares for none of those things. He holds his hands, and lets religion and the world take their course. There is another class of Protestants, and in them I find a very important reason why I objected to the two Roman Catholics coming from the United States. These Protestants are individuals, who, to bolster themselves up, and to better their trade, will pander to those Roman Catholics. (Cheers.) They are such Protestants as will introduce a Bill into Parliament to incorporate Romish institutions—(Cheers)—who declare by their conduct that the Roman Catholic nunneries are an advantage; who declare by their conduct that it is right and wise, and good, to encourage Popish colleges for the dissemination of Popish principles throughout the country. (A voice: Shame on them.) The Scotch came here with their honesty, their industry, their religion, their handicraft, their bibles, their love of primer, the school master, the catechism, the Sabbath, the sanctuary, the ministry to bless us. With rare exceptions, they do well for themselves and for the country. The Englishman comes, but less under religious influence, but, on the whole, to do us good. The Irish Protestant comes here with his joyousness, versatility, frugality, and social habits, on the whole, to do us good. But the Irish Papists come in swarms, on the whole, to do us evil. (Hear, hear.) Their bishops and priests are politicians, and these enlist under their banner. Their numbers increase the arrogance of their priests, and form an element of political strife. They increase taxation for the poor. They render necessary a strong police force. They are the keepers of our low tippling houses, they are our chief rioters. They build our Papal churches, and were it not for them our poor-houses, jails, penitentiaries and Magdalen asylums would be far less necessary, and frequently empty. (Hear, hear.) To be sure they have their uses. They are our servants, they build our canals and railways, they carry up our cities upon their shoulders. But, in a moral point of view, they are, in every respect, an injury to us. They are excitable and riotous, when set on by the priests; insolent, and to say the truth, they are regarded as a nuisance, and are frequently so treated. When creating riots, they are often shot down like wild beasts."

And so on, and so on, and so on. Mr. Speaker, I could keep this House quite as long as the hon. member for West Durham did in reading extracts from the same source, the *Globe*. It is true I have none of my old speeches here to read by the hour, as he read his. After travelling over every possible subject that he thought would excite religious prejudice, and having tried to set class against class, and creed against creed, and brother against brother—after doing all this, it was a little too much—but I am blessed if he didn't go to repeating himself! He read an old speech that he made at some place called Teeswater:

"Wild words wander here and there;
God's great gift of speech abused,
Makes thy memory confused,
But let him rave!"

He was certainly abusing the gift of speech with a vengeance. One hour, I venture to say, would have sufficed to give all the pith and point that he wanted to give it; but he gave us hour after hour, and himself into the bargain. And I thought of the fable of Narcissus, who looked into the Castalian spring, and seeing his image reflected in the water, was so enchanted with the sight that he died with admiration of himself. The hon. gentleman saw the image of himself, and no doubt was highly pleased. Then he read us a missionary homily on virtue, on forbearance, on charity, and I thought my cup was full. I thought the hon. member had come out in a new *rôle*. He had shown us how very virtuous he could be. After repeating the most malignant words he could find about the Masons and the secret societies of this country, I did think that he would have spared us the infliction of a moral at the close; but, Sir, he did not. He gave us one hour of morals, and told us how he had been practising them all his life, though he forgot them here to-night. He gave us one instance of why he hated the Orangemen. I thought that he did not do himself justice also in this respect. He said that the Orangemen, or some other secret society, had charged his father with shooting down a Col. Moody, who was a Roman Catholic. He considered it to be a crime to be called a Roman Catholic; and certainly it was a crime to charge a man with shooting another, if it were done with malice and not in self-defence. He has shown that he has a personal feeling against Orangemen. The hon. gentleman started out in a lofty tone, which I hoped he would continue, but he stopped suddenly and proceeded to show what Orangeman had said about Catholics, and sought to array the member for Montreal Centre against the hon. member for East Hastings; the Minister of Inland Revenue against the hon. member for Victoria, and Protestant against Catholic, by this inflammatory speech. I am sure he has not done the cause of peace and quietude in this Dominion very much good. I am sure he will find that this speech, in the delivery of which he has turned over ream after ream of foolscap, and which he has determined shall be spread throughout the land, at the public expense, has not accomplished the object he intended; that is, to bring to his aid the Catholic vote of this Dominion. I am sure that in delivering this speech he did not intend that we should any longer live in harmony and peace, but rather as cats and dogs, as he said we are doing at present. I have prepared no speech; I did not intend to speak this evening; but I could not, as a member of a secret order, an order, every principle of which I cherish and hold dear, listen to its members being inveighed against by the hon. member, and at the same time listen to his admission that he knew nothing about the subject, without offering a reply; but as we all know, he invented this speech out of political necessity, and its delivery was uncalled for.

Mr. BLAKE. I repudiate entirely that the language I used to night had any reference whatever to the Masonic order.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I am confident this honourable House, though it is after midnight, will bear with me while I offer a few remarks. Let me say, I have no desire to speak on the subject, and it was understood with the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill that if no speech was

made in opposition to the measure, no friend of the Bill should make any remark. But I did not think, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, from the length of time I have been associated with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) as a member of the House, that he would ever have devoted so much time to myself as he has done to-night. I am pleased; because when members of that party read the speech of the hon. gentleman, they will read also the remarks made by the member for East Hastings, and I am bound to say that they will not consider them the worst portion of the hon. gentleman's speech. To-night the hon. gentleman was a preacher, a statesman, a warrior—he occupied all those positions. He sought strenuously to set class against class. I defy that hon. gentleman to say that since I have been a member of this House, I have ever uttered ungentlemanly words against any hon. member, no matter what his political or religious opinions. But I should like to look back and advert to some of the hon. gentleman's own acts, when he occupied a prominent position in the Government of the country. It is a well-known fact that during the rebellion in the North West, an unfortunate man lost his life. He took the blood of that unfortunate man and sprinkled it on the door of every church and school-house throughout the land, and when he got into power he offered a reward of $5,000 for the capture of the murderer. It was through the death of Thomas Scott that the hon. gentleman got into power in Ontario. He will not deny it. He offered, as I have said, $5,000 for the capture of the murderer; and after he got him, what did the hon. gentleman do? He let Riel and Lepine go free; but when the Minister of Inland Revenue and myself, in our humble way, endeavoured to place poor unfortunate O'Donohue, the hon. gentleman's own fellow countryman, in the same position as Riel had been placed, what did the hon. gentleman do? He denied him the same right and privilege and branded him and punished him, the hon. gentleman then being Minister of Justice. He cannot deny it. The hon. gentleman's speech, I say, was unmanly, uncalled for and unnecessary, under the circumstances, because the men who are seeking incorporation are honest, true, loyal, noble, conscientious and good men, quite as good men as he is and quite as good Christians. There is not one of them who would attack the hon. gentleman as he has attacked them, or say of him what he has said of them. But they have gone forward heretofore without his support, co-operation and assistance. The Orange society will prosper after he is dead. I have my serious doubts that the hon. gentleman will have to change his mind and become more christian-like if he hopes to reach the happy land where there is no envy, hatred and malice. That is enough in reply to the hon. gentleman. He knows my opinion of him. We, as Orangemen, could appeal to the ballot box, but we will, as far as possible, forget and forgive. I will never, however, forgive the hon. member for West Durham. I will fight the question out with him on this line, and although he is the Hon. Edward Blake and I an humble uneducated John White, he will find he will meet me at other places where he will see that I will rally as many and as true friends as he can do. Orangemen have received an insult to-night; the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to trample on them and crush them; he has used a word of three letters, but I will not use it. I trust and believe the Orangemen will live to keep the hon. gentleman in his present position, though he is willing to do anything, to bow and stoop to any position, if he can get on this side of the House. Yes, he would appeal to Irish Roman Catholics, to Protestants, to the sentiment of liberality; but when he gets the chance, he will brand the brow of every unfortunate Conservative Orangeman and drive him out of the country, while he will elevate Frenchmen to positions of influence. He was willing to save the man who committed the murder of Thomas Scott, but he was not willing to save an unfortunate fellow-countryman. Yet the hon. gentleman comes here and preaches—preaches the Gospel, protesting by the heaven above, the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth, that he is a Christian. Well, Sir, he goes to the councils of his church, and he there holds himself up as a great churchman, and says that there are no Protestants in the Church of England but the men who follow him. He made his great speech previous to the last election on the resolutions of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and we had copies of that speech in East Hastings by the cart load; but, though there is not a man in the House of Commons to-day who has more Roman Catholic votes in his division than I have, his cart loads of speeches on the Costigan resolutions did not keep me out of the House of Commons, and his speech to-night will not keep many hon. members out of the House. There is such a thing as over-stepping the mark, and he has done it to-night, because he has got the Masonic society, and the Oddfellows and other good secret societies against him, and the line he took will not be forgotten. We must forgive, we are bound to try and be charitable, but we will not forget; and I for one will never lose any opportunity of hurling his remarks back in his face whenever I can. I ask the House and the country that if they imagine there is in the whole world a crowned head or a public building which they are afraid a member of the Orange society will injure or ruin. Is there a single being alive to-day who believes that an Orangeman would do him harm, would throw down his fence or ruin his house? No, Sir, not one; and no man knows that better than the hon member for West Durham, who will not soon be forgotten by this side of the House. I made a remark in Hamilton about the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and I am proud that I did make it. I said that the hon. gentleman was anxious that this Bill should carry, because if carried it would give the community what it required for its peace, happiness and prosperity. The reason the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has governed this country for thirty years is, that he was never found trying to put class against class, but has always endeavoured to create among them a feeling of kindly tolerance. You do not find him saying or writing anything against the unfortunate country I came from. But the hon. gentleman has gone into a private room, and for hours and days has collected, and heaped up, and rolled over, this great brief of his. He had section after section piled up on his desk, and when his speech was over, he gave it to the boy from *Hansard* room, and I say it is a good thing that they have a good sized boy there, for otherwise it would have needed a wheel barrow to have carried it. And why did he do all this? He did it because the Orangemen want the right to hold a piece of land, to build on it, to buy it, to pay taxes on it, and to meet together in order to do good for the unfortunate orphans and widows of those who belong to the order. That is the only sin they have committed. No; they have committed another sin, and that is that nine-tenths of them vote against the hon. member for West Durham and keep him in Opposition. I wonder if they will forgive him, but whether they do or not I certainly will not forget him. I hope and trust that I will never be in a position to have to go and ask a favour from him. Sir, I hope I may never exchange a word with him, since he used language against a society nine-tenths of whose members are better men and stand higher than he does—men who would do an injury to no one, men of whom the hon. gentleman would not take such an advantage outside the walls of this House. He made a great speech, and used all his great ability and all his great eloquence, which we all admit, and for what purpose? To put class against class, and he even went so far as to read his Teeswater speech, but he did not read the poetry. He spoke of heaven and God, and

the Lord and all his greatness, but I say that he belongs to a class who puts one class against another, a class which the country has no room for, and I say that more has been done to-night in that way than has been done by any statesman in this country since those celebrated articles were written in the *Globe* some years ago. It may be that I am a little excited because I think the hon. gentleman has not treated me with the courtesy which I think I deserve at his hands, because I have never, since I have entered public life, uttered an unkind word of him. He could find no fault with what I said of him either at Woodstock, or Hamilton, or other places, but that is not the way he treated me. However, I have only to say that I shall go on in my own humble way; that I love the society, and not only this society but another to which the hon. gentleman referred, for I am not ashamed to say that I belong to the Masonic fraternity, and that I respect it and I respect the members of it. I respect the members of the Orange society, and I know them to be good and honest and true men, and I say that there is no church which is doing more good to the unfortunate widow and orphan that these societies are doing. He stands up and makes unkind, unstatesmanlike and unnecessary remarks, and for what? To defeat a little Bill which asks for 30 by 60 feet of land, and asks for the privilege of holding and paying for it. I ask Orangemen to-night why they should be deprived of that right? Is there any reason for it? Are they not law-abiding, are they not ready to go and fight their country's battles, and if so, why should they not obtain this right? The hon. gentleman would like to crush us out. But, I tell him, unhesitatingly, that he cannot crush out the Orange tree which is planted in this country, nor can his associates, nor his journals; and in place of crushing it out he will add moisture to its roots, and it will grow, and its branches will extend and strengthen. I say the day will come, and I hope I may be in the House to see it, when this Bill will carry, whether the hon. gentleman likes it or dislikes it. Does the hon. gentleman think we are going to disband? Does he think we will go round crying like the Pharisees and Sadducees, some of whom I believe are in this House? No, Sir; we will stand true to our society and discharge our duties in a way and manner which will be a credit to us. Let me close by saying that I think the hon. gentleman went too far. I believe he took too much time in refusing a simple request which we asked from this House. It is not at all likely that we will carry the Bill, but I hope that he will yet be disappointed. But if we do not get it, we will do as we have done before: we will do without it, and we will do without it like men. I do not wish to reply to the hon. gentleman, because he is not worth it. He has thrown out more dirty, stinking slush——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I will take back the slush. I regret having used it, because you are so courteous that I do not wish to annoy you. But the hon. gentleman used so many legal phrases and such nice language, what he had to say he said so nicely, that I thought he was going to make an excellent speech; but he spoke against time. Well, it is a bad thing to speak against time. We care not for any hon. gentlemen who use language against us. We will stand true to any hon. gentlemen who vote for our society. As I said twelve months ago, we will not forget them. If they must follow their leader, the man who hopes to be king of this country, but never will be, we will not forget it; but we will thank them for what they have done. If we cannot get the Bill, we will do without it; and let me tell that hon. gentleman again, that his language and his course towards us to-night will not soon be forgotten by the Orange institution.

Mr. CURRAN. I rise to say a very few words on the subject that has occupied the attention of this House for several hours past. When this discussion commenced, it was St. Patrick's Day; and, out of respect for the day, I heartily concurred in the view that had been impressed upon me, more particularly by my French Canadian friends in this House, that if possible we should allow this Bill to be brought forward and voted upon without any discussion. I was perfectly willing, having already on one occasion in this honourable House, given expression to my views upon this subject, to allow the matter to take that course. However, the fates have decided otherwise; and we have had this evening certainly some very extraordinary speeches; and with regard to one particular speech, that delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think I do not go too far in saying that I have never heard anything in my life to equal it in the magnificence of its matter and of its manner. In so far as this question relates to the politics of this country, I take this opportunity of saying as a representative Irish Catholic, that if we did not know it before, the hon. gentlemen who have spoken here this night have informed us of the fact, that from time to time both political parties have enjoyed the pleasant occupation of abusing Irish Catholics and Catholics generally; and in so far as that particular branch of the subject is concerned, I think the balance of testimony is about equal on both sides. Fortunately, however, I think I can say for the Irish Catholics of this Dominion that they feel perfectly able to take care of themselves amongst all the political parties of this great Dominion. Now, Sir, I don't intend to repeat anything that I have already said in this House. I think it would be, however, a disappointment to those who, without respect to political party, have sent me here as their representative by an overwhelming majority, if I did not say a few words on this occasion. I will say first, that I was more than disappointed when I heard the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) attempt to reply to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not think it will be necessary to go into the latter gentleman's vindication of himself or of his views regarding secret societies, with which I agree; for, as a matter of course, neither I nor any other Catholic can approve of any secret societies. But I did think that the hon. member for King's, who is a lawyer, would have sought to meet some of the arguments, at all events, that were brought forward in regard to the constitutional question which presents itself to this honourable House in the present discussion. Why, Sir, we have before us a proposition that is as plain as A, B, C. We have upon the Statute Book of the Province of Quebec, chap. 10, of the Consolidated Statutes, a law which declares in positive terms that every association of a secret nature, with the exception of the Masonic body of Canada, is illegal; and I must say that I was rather astonished to hear my hon. friend, the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) take the position he took in his speech to-night as regards this Statute. Why, Sir, so convinced is that hon. gentleman of the truth of what I am saying, that in order to legalize the Quebec Masons, he has introduced a Bill here to change that particular Statute, in order that these gentlemen may enjoy the privileges which they seek. It must be equally necessary for the gentlemen who are now seeking incorporation for this association to secure the repeal of that Statute first of all. Now, Sir, I do not think it would be advisable for me to travel over the ground I have already gone over in this House. I think there are several reasons of still higher moment which I might urge here against the passage of this Bill; but the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, as a legal argument, remains entirely unanswered by anything that has been said by the hon. member for King's. We have had the lucubrations of the Orange *Sentinel* and the equally violent abuse of the Toronto *Globe*,

I do not think myself, that in the past nor perhaps in the present, either of these great party organs has any particular love for the class to which I belong. I may say, before resuming my seat, since reference has been made to speeches made during recess, that I am not going to rake up any bad feeling in connection therewith. I am perfectly prepared to meet on the floor of this House, or elsewhere, any gentleman who wishes to attack me face to face, but it would be out of place here, in view of what has transpired, in view almost of the arrangement that nothing should be said on this Bill, that I should say a word on this matter which would create ill-will, that I should revive any of those speeches, more particularly as nothing has been said on the floor of the House. Those post-prandial statements are probably to be accounted for in various ways; at all events, I have never uttered a word against any gentleman, either in this House or out of it, that I would decline to repeat here, and I now say, in conclusion, that whilst I hope that the discussion that has taken place here to-night will show all political parties that it is a bad thing to indulge in violent abuse, that such abuse will,at times, come home to roost, and afford innocent enjoyment to those who have been the victims of the abuse —to listen to what hon. gentlemen point out as what one or the other said about them—I say that the reasons which I gave last year, I now reiterate against this Bill. We have no constitutional right to pass this measure; and on that ground, as well as on others which I might urge, but do not intend to urge to-night, I intend to cast my vote, as I did last year, against this Bill.

Mr. FARROW. The hon. member for West Durham, who made such a long speech, seemed to transgress the rules of propriety. You will recollect he chose to quote a great deal to-night, and among others he quoted from Mr. Parkhill, who is an Orangeman. Before quoting him, he represented him as saying something bloodthirsty; after a time he read the quotation, but there was no blood in it, and I ask the hon. gentleman, what about the blood? He reminded me of a man who went to the post office to get a letter, and on being asked his name by the clerk, said: "Louder." The Clerk raising his voice asked again, same reply again "Louder." The man's name was "Louder," but the postmaster thought he was deaf because he answered every time "Louder." So the hon. gentleman seemed to be very deaf to-night. I understand right well that he heard what I put to him, but he was dishonestly deaf. The hon. member for Bothwell, who has recently come into this House, and who has a legal mind, hastened to take hold of this subject, and I took his words down. We had not the power he said to pass this Bill, and the reason he gave was that this order existed in Ireland and in some other countries. But we have been passing Bills for years incorporating Roman Catholics, and Methodists, and Church of England associations, and do not these institutions exist in other countries? Is not the Church of England found in England? Is not the Methodist body found in England, and in all parts of the world? Therefore, I do not think it was very logical. Another point to which I wish hon. members to pay particular attention is this: the hon. member for Bothwell went out of his way to insult the Orangemen. Now, I will give you his words. He told us the Orange society is a promoter of bad citizenship. When a man is bound to be a drunkard, he does not promote good citizenship; therefore, I conclude he means the Orangemen are drunkards. When a man is a thief, he is not a good citizen; therefore, I conclude they must be thieves. When a man is a liar, he is not a promoter of good citizenship; therefore, logically, Orangemen are liars. If a man commits murder, he is not a promoter of good citizenship; therefore, logically, they must be murderers

Does he deny what he has said? Does he deny what he said?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. FARROW. Then in what sense are they not promoters of good citizenship. I can tell the hon. gentleman, from twenty-five years' experience of being an Orangeman, of doing business with Orangemen, of knowing their constitution, their by-laws, everything about them, that they will stand on as good a level as he or any man in this House. Who compose the Orange society in this country, or in any land? Are not the clergymen of the Church of England in it? Are not the Methodist clergymen in it? Are not the lawyers of this country in it? Are not the merchants of this country found in it? Are not the best, the choicest people of this country found enrolled in the Orange order?

An hon. MEMBER. Ow!

Mr. FARROW. Ow! Now, that is your gentlemanly men. These are the men that can find fault; these are the men who can throw obloquy and every bad expression. Why, if there was only one political party in this country, and that was the Grit party, I could not belong to it. I ask the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) if he can name any lodge in Canada, any number of Orangemen in Canada, that are disreputable people. They will stand, I am sure, on a par in morals, in sobriety, in everything else that is good and honourable with other people. Now, the hon. member for West Durham laboured for three hours, and really it was labour in vain. Because what did it amount to? Here are 250,000 good men and true in this country, Orangemen, and they just ask that they shall own a few feet of land to build a lodge room. We incorporate—and I am glad we do incorporate; I am glad that Orangemen are in this House willing to incorporate—Oblate Fathers, Sisters of Charity, Roman Catholic Bills as they come up, day in and day out, in this Parliament, year in and year out, and give them the power to own thousands and tens of thousands of property in this country, to take mortgages and give mortgages, to take notes and pay notes, to do business on a large scale; and yet, when it comes down to a corporation that asks to hold $25 worth of land, or probably not more than $100 worth of land, and erect a little lodge-room, they deny them that privilege. Now, I must say this, that there are 250,000 Orangemen in this country, and you must understand that they must be of some age before they can join that society, they must be eighteen. Now, what do you suppose the population representing that 250,000 amounts to in Canada? Take the families, take the wives, take the daughters—I tell you they sum up to 600,000 or 700,000 of the population of this country; and it is no wonder that they say we shall unite, and I mean to say that, if they did unite as one man, it is not the hon. member for West Durham, nor is it any other hon. member in this House, that can keep them from getting their right, their just right. I have been a member of the order for 25 years, and am in good standing at the present hour. I ought to know something about the constitution, or else I should be—I was going to say something pretty dull, if I did not know all about the order. Now, I want to refute a little logic of the hon. member for West Durham, I hope he will pay attention to it. I thought he was a college-bred man. I know he attended college, for he has his degrees, but I do not think he understood mathematics very well. I think he has forgotten his reasoning that he learned in the books of Euclid. He said to me: "If I cannot convince the hon. member for East Huron by this reasoning, I give it up." Now, what was it? He was trying to prove to you, though he knew nothing about the constitution, though he knew nothing about the by-laws, though he con-

fessed he knew nothing about the workings of the Orange lodge, he tried to prove to you that the Orange society was a political one; and I said, after he got through, "That is no proof." Now, what was it? Why, he said that three-fourths of them voted Conservative. Well, then, it follows that one-fourth voted Grit. Now, the very fact that one-fourth of the members of the Orange lodges vote Grit shows conclusively to my mind, and it ought to his mind, that there is nothing in the constitution or by-laws that is of a political nature. I say, if one man out of the 250,000 voted Grit—one man—that would be proof positive that there was nothing in the constitution or by-laws against a man voting as he likes; but when a fourth votes Grit, why that is a plainer proof. Why, next year, there might be a half vote Grit, and the next year, they might all vote Grit. The constitution does not bind them. I could vote Grit just as easily as I do vote, and there is not an Orangeman, so far as the constitution, so far as the by-laws are concerned, that is withheld from voting just as he likes. The hon. member for West Huron had a great deal to say. He is my next neighbour, and he made a political speech, I suppose to elect him again in 1887, or whenever the election comes on. I could see it sticking out all the time. He made a great bid to-night. Well, that speech of his will be taken at a discount when it reaches Huron. He said that the Orange society was not a benevolent society. I know that they do not give the large amounts of money that he gives, that he dispenses, that he distributes. I know that they do not give these large amounts of money, but can he point to an Orangeman's wife or family in distress in Huron that are not attended to by the Orangemen? Can he? If there are any such let him speak. He tells you that it is not a religious society. Does he know the constitution? Does he know the obligation? Does he know the by-laws? He is a perfect stranger to all these things, and yet he tells this House that there is no benevolence in the order. He tells this House there is no religion in the order. And yet there are members of the Presbyterian Church, ministers of the Presbyterian Church, ministers of the Church of England, ministers of the Methodist Church, and members of all Protestant Churches, and yet there is no religion in the order at all? Now, if I understand the Orange order, it is this: All it wants is to be dealt with as other people are dealt with. Its fundamental principle is to do unto others as they should do to you. It is a society set apart and consecrated to the high office of defending truth and freedom against all traitors, from generation to generation. Can you find fault with that? If there is a man found in any part of the country that tramples down truth and freedom—the Orangemen will not persecute him; that is against his religion, it is against the constitution to persecute any man, but he will, by his talk, by his actions uphold truth and freedom. Our friends on the opposite side would not allow freedom of speech in this House if you were not in that chair, Sir. I would not get the liberty of talking here to-night—and I have already had to work hard to get it while you are in that chair. The men on that side would not allow me to say what I am saying here to-night if you were not in that chair. You can tell that by their cries, by their obstructions, by their war whoops. The great offence charged against the Orangemen of this country to-night is that they do not vote right. Now, how is it that the majority of them vote Conservative?—though all of them do not vote Conservative. I will tell you. They believe that the Conservative party of this country is the best party, a party of progress; they believe that the party called Conservative is the loyal party. Now that is one of the chief planks in the Orange society—connection with Great Britain. I know what I am saying now, and I know this will be read in the *Hansard*, and I know it will be published in our local papers, but I say it—I have heard plenty of Grits in my neighbourhood say it would be a good thing, it would be a happy thing for Canada, if she was connected with the United States. I do not say that the majority say that, but I know that plenty of them say that, and I do not believe I would have far to go to find them here. It has been made a point against us to-night that the Orange society is a political one, though one-quarter of them vote reform. Now, is it not well known that a majority of the members of the Church of England vote Conservative? It is well known; therefore you must come to the conclusion, according to the theory of the hon. member for West Durham, that the Church of England is a political society. Now, it is a well known fact that the Scotch Presbyterians of this country, as a general thing, are Grits, therefore, according to his argument, the Presbyterian Church is a political society. Now, I suppose he thinks that is good logic. There is another point I wish to make before I sit down. I think a great insult has been thrown to-night by the hon. member for West Durham—and I am sorry for it—against all the secret societies in existence in Canada—in the world. He does not believe in them. Now, what does that mean? It means an insult to the Good Templars—that is a secret society. It means an insult to the Sons of Temperance—that is a secret society. It means an insult to that large and influential society, the Foresters. It means an insult to nearly two-thirds of all the farmers in Ontario—they are Grangers, and they have a secret society; and they got all they wanted to carry on their business. They got a fine charter from this House, and I cannot see why the Orangemen should be denied that privilege. Every society in Canada has been dubbed by the hon. gentleman, but I have not the least doubt in my mind that the hon. gentleman has done himself more harm than good. Another word. I have nothing to say against my Roman Catholic fellow subjects. I have lived on good terms with them both here and at home. I have found them very true, politically, and also true as friends. I do not find fault so much with my Roman Catholic friends because they do not support this Bill. I know the reason why—their church prohibits them from voting for us. What I do find fault with are these Grit Protestants. What church do they belong to? Some of them are Church of England, like the hon. member for West Durham. Does his church prohibit it? Some of them are Presbyterians, does the Presbyterian Church prohibit it? Some of them are Methodists, does the Methodist Church prohibit it? Does the Baptist Church prohibit it? Does any other Protestant Church prohibit it? Your excuse is worthless. You have no real excuse. You stand doggedly against giving rights to Orangemen in this House. Why? Because the Orangemen do not vote for you. That is the reason, the real reason, advanced to-night; you cannot advance any other reason. You are not prohibited by your churches; you have only the paltry, miserable excuse because they all do not vote with you.

Mr. BEATY. I am very glad that the last two speakers have removed this question from the theological arena in which it has been moving for the last five hours. There is an important question involved in this Bill, and I propose to occupy a few minutes in endeavouring to draw attention back to the question involved in the Bill itself. The first point which struck me as peculiar, looking at it from a political aspect was, that Liberals of all shades in this country should oppose this Bill. I, as a Liberal-Conservative and a Conservative-Liberal wonder at the fact that Liberals should prevent their fellow-citizens who happen to be Orangemen from obtaining that right which is given to every other class. The principle of Liberalism as I used to learn it was equal rights for all, giving to every class that which another class obtained. But we find to-night that hon. gentlemen opposite claiming to be Liberals oppose this proposition, this just demand on the part of Orangemen to become

incorporated, and we find the opposition coming most largely and vehemently from the other side. This is a most astounding manifestation of liberalism which I would not have expected. Two or three points have been urged against the Bill which are worthy of notice. The Orange Association of British North America seeks incorporation simply for the purpose of holding lands and using those lands for the benefit of widows and orphans, and for the purpose of lodges in which to meet. The first objection of importance made to the Bill is, that this is a question which does not belong to the Dominion Parliament, but is one which should be dealt with by Provincial Legislatures. I will read a few words from a case before the Privy Council in England, page 283, of Cartwright's reports on cases on the British North America Act, in which the Law Lords declared the competency of this House to deal with the matter of lands and the incorporation of companies for buying and selling lands. Speaking of the power of the Dominion Parliament to incorporate such companies, the Privy Council says as follows:—

"The authority would belong to it by its general power over all matters not coming within the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the Legislature of the Provinces, and the only subject on this head assigned to the Provincial Legislature being 'the incorporation of companies with Provincial objects,' it follows that the incorporation of companies for objects other than Provincial, falls within the general powers of the Parliament of Canada. * * * Suppose the Dominion Parliament were to incorporate a company, with power, among other things, to purchase and own lands throughout Canada in mortmain, it could scarcely be contended, if such a company were to carry on business in a Province where a law against holding land in mortmain prevailed (each Province having legislative power 'property and civil rights in the Province'), that it could own land in that Province in contravention of the Provincial Legislation; and, if a company were incorporated for the sole purpose of purchasing and holding land in the Dominion, it might happen that it could do no business in any part of it, by reason of all the Provinces having passed mortmain Acts, though the corporation would still exist and preserve its status as a corporate body."

If we have this right as is set forth here in respect to incorporating companies to purchase and hold lands, we should exercise it; and if the Provincial Legislatures act in contravention of that power, that is not our fault and we are not to blame.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What case is that from which you quoted?

Mr. BEATY. (Citizens and Queen Insurance Company *vs.* Parsons. That seems to make it clear, as far as this particular claim is made, that it is competent for this Parliament to deal with the subject. The next important objection is that the Orange body is a political organization. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow) has answered that point pretty effectively. Why has it been said that the Orange organization is a political one? Simply because it is claimed that nine-tenths of the members of that organization support the Conservative party. The hon. member for East Huron has well answered that point by asking whether, if a majority of the Church of England supports the Conservative party they are necessarily a political body because of that fact, so with respect to other church bodies. No one would pretend to say that such was the fact. In regard to the Orange association, of which I am not a member, but of which I have had some knowledge for many years, it is well known to be a benevolent organization in some respects, and also a *quasi*-religious organization; but in no sense, except in the action of its members individually, can it be said to be a political organization. Another objection which has been put forward, and which is perhaps the strongest adduced, is that the Orange body is a secret society. What does this idea of a secret society mean? It has been properly said that if an incorporated body should obtain from the Government a grant of money, the company or body should be under the supervision of the Government That is a point which must be conceded by every hon. member, but what claim has the Government or the House to examine into the affairs of the Orange Association when it claims nothing from Parliament in the nature of a grant. They only claim the right to use their own money, and buy up their own lands and sell their own lands and exercise those powers given to almost every religious denomination, which is given to every other class of persons such as Masons, Oddfellows, Foresters, Grangers, Good Templars, Convents and various religious associations and denominations. We had only the other day before the House a bill to incorporate the Bishop of Ottawa as a sole corporation for the purpose of holding lands in Quebec and Ontario. What reason can you give why a benevolent or *quasi*-religious institution should not possess rights equal to those who have already obtained them. It seems to me that no reasonable objection can be offered to this proposition. And why is this society called secret? I do not know why, except that members of the Order use signs, and strangers cannot enter the lodges and take part in the proceedings. But is not that the case in almost every class of organization in the country. In almost every incorporated body there is some system of initiation, and it is no objection to have an initiatory ceremony, either riding the goat or doing any other peculiar act as is represented by persons who do not belong to the Orange order. Now, if they possess this element only, if they do not in their secret acts conspire against the Crown, and become traitors to the Constitution of the country, if they are not disloyal citizens in their conclaves, then, what point is there in urging against the society that it is a secret organization? if it were such a society as I have described, then I could understand why it should be suppressed, why it should not be recognized by law, why an appeal should be made to all loyal and true citizens, to all who are interested in the good fame of their country, to oppose organizations of this character. But no such pretense is made; no allegation is made that these men are not loyal citizens as ordinary men go, that they do not possess the qualities pertaining to good citizenship. Now, the leader of the Opposition made strong point with reference to the secret character of this and other societies. He did not confine himself to this institution, but he assailed every society of that kind in the country, the Masons, the Foresters, the Sons of Temperance, and others. Why does he not introduce a Bill and give practical effect to his sentiments with reference to this matter—a Bill for the purpose of suppressing all secret societies. But we find no such measure, and the hon. gentleman stands simply on the defensive in the matter, and the moving reason we find with reference to the question is—that it is said that nine-tenths of the Orangemen oppose the party to which he belongs. If nine-tenths of them supported him, I doubt if we would have heard the long and eloquent speech that we heard to-night, but the strong fact which presents itself to his mind is the statement—I do not know whether it is true or not—that nine-tenths of the Orangemen support the Conservative party. In this connection, it is a very remarkable fact that in looking over the names of the gentlemen from Ontario on the opposite side I do not find one Catholic representative in the Grit party. Now, why is that? Is it because they do not support them? Is it because of their illiberality in not supporting the Catholics that we find no representatives of that class among hon. gentlemen opposite representing the Province of Ontario. On this side, I find that we have a number of them. We had one whom they pushed out the other day, Mr. Hawkins; we have Mr. Bergin, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Labrosse, Mr. Tassé, Mr. Dawson and others. Now, I think it is important in the interests of immigration, and the progress of the country, that it should be understood that this House does not proscribe any class of citizens who do their duty to the Crown and the country. Why should it go forth to England and Ireland and Scotland where thousands of Orangemen live, that that class cannot have

the rights here that other classes have, that they cannot own property and stand on the same plane as their fellow citizens? On the contrary we should act upon the principle of doing justice to all classes of good citizens who pay their allegiance to the Crown, and maintain the institutions and the Constitution of the country. We should do this to all classes, no matter by what name they are known, no matter what private associations they may have among themselves; so long as they are good citizens they should not, in the interests of the country, be proscribed or tabooed. The Orangemen of the country, taken in the general, are just as good and industrious citizens, and, taking them as a class, as wealthy as any other, and if that is the case, why should we not promote the immigration of that class as well as of any other. But if we deny them this right, then, of course, they cannot be expected to come here if they cannot enjoy the privileges which are given to other classes. I was sorry to notice, from the observations of the leader of the Opposition, that he introduced a theological controversy into the House, that he introduced the firebrands of creeds, that he endeavoured to inflame the feelings of persons who were standing side by side, though they are opposed in religious opinions. If there is any particular idea which I entertain with reference to the future of this country, it is the duty of every person, and especially of every member of this House, to promote in the strongest possible way the harmony of Provincial action in conjunction with the Federal power, and the harmony of the several Provinces; that we should endeavour to unify the races of our nation and bring them into a homogenous whole, so that the country should not be disrupted by setting race against race, section against section, or Province against Province, but should, on the contrary, promote that which is true religion, the Christian, religion the promotion of the element of peace and good will among all classes of our countrymen.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion negatived.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I think I may fairly ask the indulgence of the House to make a few remarks on this Bill. I have sat here during the last two months, and have remained perfectly silent; and so I trust the House will indulge me for a short time, because, though what I have to say may not be new, certain personal allusions have been made to myself, and to a gentleman who lately represented, in the Local House, the county which I have the honour to represent here, which makes it my duty to reply to them. During the early part of the debate, the hon. member for Bothwell, as well as the hon. member for West Huron, endeavoured to convince this House that the Orange association was a political organization. I may say that I have been a member of the Orange association during the last twenty years; and during that time I have done what the hon. member for West Durham describes himself as having done in his communication with Archbishop Lynch—I have never yet mentioned politics. As that hon. gentleman has chosen to quote some remarks of mine, made at Rosemont, I think I can fairly quote a speech of his made in St. James' school house, in Toronto. The hon. gentleman did not take the trouble to mention a speech which I delivered last summer at Orillia, in which, alluding to the course pursued by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I spoke of him as the Hon. Edward Blake, who had heretofore, in the Province of Ontario, set himself up to be a Protestant *par excellence* above other Protestants—a man whose church was not sufficiently Protestant for him, and who wanted to form a church of his own. In the speech made by the hon. gentleman in St. James' school house, in Toronto—and a gentleman in this House can substantiate what I say—in which that hon. gentleman told those who were present that it was their duty not only to oppose Romanism in their own church, but to oppose it at every street corner.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I think my assertion is equally true with that of the hon. gentleman. He has also alluded to a speech delivered by Mr. Parkhill, who formerly represented South Simcoe in the Local Legislature. Prior to that he alluded to a speech made by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) which that hon gentleman denies ever having delivered; so the chances are that Mr. Parkhill may never have delivered the speech to which the hon. gentleman allluded; but I have no doubt that whatever he may have said, like myself, he would not retract, like the hon. member for West Durham. He attempted to make it appear that I had retracted a remark which I made last year, for the simple reason that it did not appear in *Hansard*. If it was necessary to make the hon. gentleman believe it, I would repeat it again. I am not in the habit of doing as he does—making statements and then retracting them when it is convenient to do so. The hon. member for Bothwell tried to make it appear that the Orange association was a political association more than anything else. I can only say as proof that his statement is incorrect, that a gentleman sitting in this House last Session, representing the constituency which he represents, though a Roman Catholic, saw fit to vote for the Orange Bill for the simple reason that he had received, I have no doubt, a large support from that body.

Mr. MILLS. And on political grounds.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Very well; say on political grounds. At the same time, if the hon. gentleman did not say so, some of his friends have said during the debate that Orangemen were obliged never to support a Roman Catholic. I may say, in further contradiction of what has been said against my friend, Mr. Parkhill, that he spent a good deal of time in North Simcoe in promoting the election of Mr. Long. Now, it has been said by several hon. gentlemen that in our lodges we speak of Grits and Catholics together, and make a common cause against them both. I may say that in the county I represent, we always class Grits with Canada thistles; we speak of them as noxious weeds, and they are never mentioned in the same breath with Roman Catholics. As it appears to me that the true way of looking at the Bill before the House is from the legal point of view, and as I, being a layman, am not able to throw any light on the subject, and as I am to be followed by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who, I have, no doubt, will present the subject to the House in that light, I conclude by saying that I am in favour of the Bill, and that I trust it will be carried.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the debate closes, I have a pleasant duty to perform. I have in my constituency a fairly large and very intelligent class of citizens, who have asked me, if this Bill came into the House, to vote for it. I had the pleasure of casting a silent vote for it last year. This year I merely want to add a word to my vote. So far as the Orangemen of my own county are concerned, or the Orangemen of the Province of New Brunswick—and I have had a fairly wide knowledge of them for the last fifteen years—I can say truthfully two things: first, that no religious war has been proclaimed, and, secondly, that they are not *par excellence* a political body. I believe that they live in peace and harmony with their fellow citizens, and that their chief object is the exercise of benevolence—and they carry that out—to those who are more particularly connected with their organization. I have just to add to this remark one other. A grievance will always exist so long as there is any one Province in this Dominion to which we, from any other Province, go, and in which we cannot enjoy the same privileges that we had in the Province from which we came. Orangemen have their organization, and they own their

property and they do their work, as a society, in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. They go to another Province of the Dominion and they naturally look to enjoy the same privileges there as in that from which they come. The hon. gentleman who spoke so long, and, I am bound to say, so eloquently to-night, said he did not think it was right for the Parliament to force a Province to allow what the Provincial Legislature did not wish to grant. I do not think that doctrine has always been lived up to nor do I think it has been lived up to in Federal countries. In the United States, for instance, that doctrine has not been lived up to. The strong power of the Federal Government has been brought to bear in a very decisive way into compelling certain States to admit what the State Legislatures would not admit, in giving certain definite and necessary rights to the citizens of that country. Not long ago, in the State of Kentucky, where the State authorized a lottery which was supposed to be contrary to the general order of morals of the United States, Congress legislated on the subject; that legislation is to-day stronger still through being put through Congress and by means of which that lottery will be suppressed, even after the State Legislature said it did not think it should be suppressed. In the case of countries constituted federally, as ours is, this will happen over and over again, that the General Legislature will have to look to certain particular rights that I hold may be easily asked and demanded. The Orangemen in my own Province are satisfied with the measure of liberty they have there under our Act of Incorporation, but they do consider it a grievence that when they go into another Province, they are not allowed to have the same right of owning their property and being able to devise, bequeath or manage it in a corporate capacity.

Mr. BAKER. I should consider myself wanting in my duty if, as the Grand Master of the Free Masons in British Columbia, I did not give an unqualified denial to the statements made in this House concerning the Free Masons. Whether the hon. leader of the Opposition gave utterance to the impression that was in his own mind, or whether the language he used was quoted, I did not exactly notice, but he certainly did say that the Masons were guilty of misrepresentation, malignity and bitterness.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All secret societies.

Mr. BAKER. All secret societies certainly includes the body of Free Masons; and if so, I hold it to be my bounden duty not to be behindhand in repudiating the charge, and in acknowledging that there is no class of the community which has done greater good to the whole world than the Free Masons. The society is composed of every nationality and creed; we know no difference between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and there are many members of the Roman Catholic persuasion in the body of the Free Masons. I know there are some in my own lodge; what the penalty may be for their being there I do not know, nor did I ever seek to find out. As regards the Orangemen in the city of Victoria, we have quite a number there, among the best citizens in Victoria, and I quite agree with the member for East Huron that, whatever Bill comes up in the House of this particular nature, inasmuch as we have passed Bills of a similar nature for other persuasions, we should, in common justice to the Orangemen, pass this Bill, and I shall have very great pleasure in giving my vote in favour of it.

Mr. WALLACE, (York). I was much interested in the remark made repeatedly by the hon. member for West Durham, that Orangeism was a political organization. I suppose he will remember the time when he tried to get the Orangemen to follow him and make it a political organization for his own purpose, about twelve years ago, and I was amused to hear him say that the Local Legislature has exclusive control of such Acts as the Orange Corporation Bill. About 1872 the hon. gentleman was Premier of Ontario, and the right hon. leader of the House was Premier of the Dominion; and at that time the question of Orange incorporation began to be mooted among the members of the Orange order. The question was brought, I believe, before the notice of the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WALLACE. I am informed so.

Mr. BLAKE. Your information is not true.

Mr. WALLACE. I am informed on very good authority; and also that the hon. gentleman said: "Do not bring the Orange Incorporation Bill before the Local Legislature of Ontario, because I am Premier; but bring it before the Dominion Parliament, and I will assist it there."

Mr. BLAKE. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. WALLACE. I have my information from a very reliable authority. At that time it was the proper thing to bring the Orange Bill before the Dominion Parliament, because otherwise it might embarrass the Premier of the Local Government. We have had several hours to prove that it has no right to come here. Another thing he mentioned as a good reason for not bringing the matter before the Dominion Parliament was that, in three Provinces of the Dominion, it was brought before the Local Legislatures. The majority of the representatives of the people passed it, but, for some reason or other, it failed to become law. The hon. gentleman repeats that the order is political in Ontario. If he had his way he said he would abolish private canvassing all through the Dominion, and have all political canvassing on the public platform. If that had been the case, the hon. gentleman would not have been able to write to Mr. Wood, the celebrated letter: "You had better speak now;" and he would not have gained the man he was supposed to have bought on that occasion. He also said as a reason why the Orange Bill should not be passed—it has been stated by some hon. gentleman in his remarks—that nine-tenths were Conservatives, and that they were a political organization. He might as well say that because nine-tenths of the Church of England are Conservatives, that church was therefore a political organization, and that because nine-tenths of the Church of Scotland were Reformers, that was also a political organization. If the Orange society is a political body, which I do not admit, that is not a crime. Are we not taught that it is the duty of every good citizen, who has a vote, to record his vote, and to take that interest every citizen should take in the politics of his country. If the Orangemen are active in politics, as many are, that is one of the highest recommendations—it teaches the duties of good citizenship to the members of the order. If the Orange order should not receive to-day its Act of Incorporation, it will be the means of increasing the power and influence of the Orange order. It will not do it any injury, because the hon. members will feel that they have a good right and a strong claim, notwithstanding the arguments of the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. SPROULE. Before this vote is taken, I would like to say a few words on this question, especially in view of the fact that I represent a constituency, a large number of whom belong to this order. I have only to say, in reference to some of the charges made by the hon. member for West Durham, against this association receiving an Act of Incorporation, that they appear to me to be of a very flimsy nature. He first starts out by saying: "I am opposed *in toto* to all secret societies." That appears to me to be a very sweeping remark, especially in view of the acknowledgment that he made only a few minutes after, saying: "I do not know anything about these societies." Is it well to

condemn what we do not know, but the evidences that we have from time to time, and from year to year, of the Acts of many secret societies, I think ought to be sufficient to give them some standing in our community, and to allow us to give them credit for something that is good. If, as the hon. member for West Durham admits, he does not know anything about their organizations because he never belonged to them, either this or any other secret society, how can he be sufficiently intelligent in reference to that body to condemn it? But what societies does he condemn when he uses this expression? He says, I condemn the Good Templars, and yet he professes to be a temperance man, and tries to enunciate his temperance principles in various parts of the country. He says, I condemn the Sons of Temperance, because they, too, are a secret society; but he goes into a Sabbath school, and endeavours to promulgate the principles of these temperance organizations, and believes them to be good. He condemns the Oddfellows, and yet they are a philanthropic society, and are doing a great deal of good in the world to day. He condemns the Ancient Order of United Workmen, a class of men who are universally respected wherever they are known, and who are quiet, respectable, industrious members of society. He condemns the Tents of Macabees, another organization of a similar nature, a secret society, and adding to that an insurance association. He condemns the Foresters, he condemns the Masons, and he goes even further, and condemns the great body of agriculturists of this country, known to-day as the Grangers, because he is not admitted to their secrets. They are a secret organization, and, if that sweeping condemnation he has expressed against them holds good of the Orange society, it holds also good of these organizations. He condemns the Band of Hope and every society he knows nothing at all about, because he admits he knows nothing about it. Again, he condemns it because it is a political organization. I heard, at the same time, in answer to that, the melodious voice of the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), saying, "hear, hear;" and yet, notwithstanding that, I know that in one of the important lodges in South Grey, nearly half the members of the order are his strongest supporters. I know that the Master of the Orange lodge in my own village was going round canvassing in his interest, any yet he adds "hear, hear." He says he condemns the organization because it stirs up strife. If I know anything of that organization, it is to be slow to take offence and to give none. The hon. member for Huron said members were expelled from the lod ge because they voted for Roman Catholics. Well, I can on ly say that that hon. gentleman must be as ignorant of the natnre of the rules, of the regulations, and of the obligations of the Orange order, as the hon. member for West Durham is, or he would never make such a statement. In substantiation of that, he gave a quotation, and it was simply the opinion of a man feeling very strongly on the question, after the chagrin which had been experienced by the society when the Bill of Incorporation was refused. I can tell you, as one who has stood in connection with that order, that there is nothing to prevent any member supporting the rankest Roman Catholic the country brings forward to-day. I can tell you that there is nothing to prevent an Orangeman from supporting a Reformer or Grit, nothing that binds him to any political party—one more than another. Again, he condemns the organization because he says it is a secret one. What is there secret about it, I would like to ask. He says it is an oath-bound society, and he says that, notwithstanding the fact that their oath has been published, time and again, to the people of the world. He condemns it because its by-laws are secret, and yet, when anyone wants to join an Orange lodge, he has the by-laws handed to him and he can read them before he joins. Is there anything secret about that? Their by-laws and rules and regulations are, at any time, laid before the public, and will stand the severest scrutiny that any organization will stand. But the only secrets that appear to be connected with the association are the same as you find in the Oddfellows, in the Tents of Macabees, in the Good Templars, in the Sons of Temperance, or in any other such organization. If I meet an Orangeman in the night, I give him a word and he replies, and that tells he is an Orangeman. If I meet him in the daylight, I give him a sign. But these are the only secrets connected with the societies. There is no oath-bound organization which compels them to stick together against the interests of the general community, or against any class, or religion, but it is as much the duty of an Orangeman to defend the rights and the religion of one Roman Catholic among ten thousand of them, though he should be only one, as to defend the religion of his own persuasion. If that is the case, and I know it is the case, why should we pass this sweeping condemnation of them. If I know anything about secret societies that entitles them to be condemned, it is based on what I see as the outcome of these societies, why the secret societies should be condemned, it is the outcome of those societies. And what societies of a secret nature should be condemned? Those which conspire against the general good of the public; those that endeavour to undermine the general foundations of society; those which band together and conspire against the interests of Government, or introduce treason into their organization. These are the societies that should be condemned, and not those which we find in every part of the country, amongst whom are enrolled the finest members of religious denominations or industrial pursuits in the country. So long as we find ministers, so long as we find men in the highest ranks of professions and in the highest walks of life, in agricultural or industrial pursuits, worthy and respected members of organizations that are universally acknowledged to be doing incalculable good in the country, we have no right to pass this sweeping condemnation upon them. This Act appears to be a simple one. Whether we have or have not the right to give that association incorporation here, I am not going to discuss, because I am not sufficiently conversant with the nice legal points which may be raised to say that we have, but that large number who represent that association in this country, if we have the power to confer that right, we would be doing great good to in giving them the Bill they ask. If there are objectionable clauses in it, as was said by the hon. member who introduced it, they can be arranged in Committee, so as to make them acceptable to the majority of this House; but, if we throw it out of the House, we are only leaving them with a grievance which will tend, more than anything else, to increase their numbers at the rapid rate they have been increasing during the last few months. If this were settled, we would hear very little of the Orange association as being disagreeable or distasteful to the other members of the community. If you go down to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where they hold Acts of incorporation, you do not hear the objections that are raised here, you do not hear that the Orangeman are increasing. But we find that wherever you give a large and respectable class of people, like the Orangemen, a grievance, it has a tendency to induce thousands to go into the ranks who would never have thought of joining them if they were receiving the same consideration that other classes of people are receiving.

Mr. CAMERON (*North Victoria*). I had hoped that the suggestion I made in moving the second reading of this Bill would have been adopted, and that we would have been able to come to a vote on the subject at an early period in the evening, without what I must call a waste of time; and when I say waste of time, I do not mean that the Bill, with which I have the honour to

be charged, or its merits, have suffered in the discussion that has taken place, but because I am quite satisfied that all the discussion has not influenced one solitary vote or the opinion of one member of this House. I, therefore, think that when a subject is well worn and has been so well discussed as this was on a former occasion, that it was an utter waste of time to discuss it as it has been to-night. I feel that no new light has been shed around it, and not a single argument has been advanced that is likely to influence any member of this House. But, notwithstanding I made the suggestion in a spirit of peace and harmony, with a view to avoid any disagreeable and acrimonious discusion, the olive branch has not been received in the spirit in which it was held out to the other side of the House. When my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stood up, I wondered at his halting accents; I wondered at that scarcity of words, at that want of fluency which, for once, characterized him to-night. I saw he was not prepared to speak, that he was talking against time. He enunciated a constitutional proposition which I shall refer to soon. After he had enunciated what, with all respect to him, I must call bad constitutional law, he soon became exhausted, and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) took up the running, and he soon made it palpable to everybody that he was talking against time. He kept taking out his watch from time to time and looking at it with anxious feelings, in order to see if it was not time for his great leader to arrive, and how many more minutes he had to talk before his leader would arrive—because the word had been passed round that the leader of the Opposition had prepared a three hour's speech on this question which he proposed delivering here to enlighten this House to-night; that he was going to hold out a bid for the French Catholic vote from the Province of Quebec; that he was going to make a bid for the Irish Catholic vote of Ontario and the rest of the Dominion; that it was necessary for the good of the party that he should make a great speech on this occasion. Unfortunately he was detained elsewhere in making another bid for the Catholic vote, at St. Patrick's meeting, or somewhere else, to-night. But with hurried steps he came in, and then we saw the member for West Huron sitting down; but the taunts and jokes from this side of the House brought him to his legs again, and he turned over his manuscript notes of quotations from speeches of hon. gentlemen of this side of the House, and talked on for half an hour longer in a vain attempt to show that he had not been talking against time—a fact, however, which was palpable to everybody. Then we had the great speech of my hon. friend from West Durham. It was a great speech so far as I heard it. I listened to it as long as he was discussing the question seriously, and was advancing arguments that he was desirous of being assented to, and being answered; but when he resorted to that copious manuscript of quotations from the speech of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) delivered in various parts of the Province, when I saw that he had got into that part of the speech which may be termed, I believe, in language which is used by most literary people, as padding, then I thought it was not necessary to occupy my time further in listening to what I had read in the newspapers, and which had nothing to do with the question, but was intended solely for political effect. I believe my hon. friend from East Hastings has fully and satisfactorily answered that part of his speech. There was one part, however, of the speech of my hon. friend from West Durham, in reply to which I purpose now briefly saying a few words, and that was what may be termed the constitutional aspect of the question. He enunciated the doctrine that this Bill was not within the jurisdiction of this House—although I thought he did that even very cautiously. He did not fully and thoroughly commit himself, so far as to make the bold declaration that it was not within our jurisdiction.

He said the principle he had laid down for the guidance of himself and the great party which he leads, in reference to legislation of this kind, was that we should only supplement local legislation, that we should not initiate legislation upon subjects that were within the functions of the Local Legislatures, but he did not go so far as to say that it was not within our power and within our functions to initiate, carry through, and complete legislation to apply to the whole Dominion, upon subjects that were within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. That principle he did not enunciate, if I heard him rightly. Then he said that we had come here with this Bill because some of the Local Legislatures would not pass it. I confess I was a little surprised to hear him make that statement with reference, more particularly, to Ontario; because if there is one single subject upon which the Reform party, the Grit party, and the leader of the Grit party in Ontario, ought to be ashamed, and thoroughly ashamed of themselves and of their party, it is the way in which they acted in reference to the Orange Bill. When the leader of the Government of Ontario spoke in favour of the Bill, voted in favour of the Bill, and did his best to get the Bill passed, and then was mean enough, dishonest enough—and I say the term is not too strong to characterize him—to go and advise the Lieutenant Governor to refuse his assent to the Bill, I say it was comtemptible, it was dishonest it, was unworthy the trade of an official politician, let alone an honest and Christian politician as the leader of the Government in Ontario has claimed to be. And I say the Opposition in this House, and the Reform party in Ontario, has no occasion to refer with pride to the course of their party in the Province of Ontario upon this Orange Bill. When, by a majority of the Legislature of the Province, they had deliberately expressed the opinion that this society ought to be incorporated there, it was the duty of the leader of the House to have carried out the dictates of the majority of that House, and not in a mean and contemptible way, try to stifle the Bill after making a judicious arrangement by which he managed to get some members of his Government to vote for the Bill and some against it, so that they might be safe before the country, that they might blow hot and cold, that they might keep favour both with the Orange and with the Green; and he arranged the votes as it might suit his purpose best in each constituency. Then, what is the value of the argument arising from the fact that that Legislature has not passed this Bill? Why, the Legislature did pass it, but the Government stifled it and destroyed it; so that the argument of my hon. friend that we were over-riding the legislation of the Province of Ontario, certainly does not apply. In Prince Edward Island, the Bill, although passed by the Legislature there, has not been sanctioned, owing to the Lieutenant-Governor of that Province not thinking fit to assent to it. But so far as I am aware, the leader of the Government had himself voted for the Bill, as was the case in Ontario. I am aware of the difficulties, with reference to this question, in the Province of Quebec. I had hoped there would be some general legislation that would have removed the difficulties surrounding that question in that Province. I do not believe that the skilful, and able, and eloquent, and fluent speech of my hon. friend from West Durham, will have the effect he has intended, I believe it should have, in making himself more favourably esteemed by the Conservative Catholics of the Province of Quebec, no matter of what nationality they may be, and attracting them to his side. I believe they see through and understand the reason of his new-born zeal against secret societes. I believe they are not to be tempted from their party allegiance by the effort which the hon. gentleman has made to-night to hold out to them the idea that he is their friend, that he is the man to whom they should look for an alliance. I believe they too

thoroughly realize who have been their true friends in the past; I believe they are too loyal to their Conservative allies in every other part of the Dominion to be tempted by the—I was afraid I was about to use an unparliamentary word—speech which the leader of the Opposition has delivered to-night. They know that the Orangemen of the old Province of Canada were always their best friends, and that hon. gentlemen opposite were always their enemies. They know that they owe many of the advantages they now possess to their Conservative allies. They know that among these measures was the Separate School Bill, which was passed in the interest of the Catholic population of Ontario. They know that the passing of that Bill was due to the support which Orangemen of the old Province of Canada were prepared to give to secure freedom of religion in every part of the country. They know that leading Orangemen have steadfastly voted for Catholic incorporation measures whenever a Bill was brought forward. They know that the Orangemen of Canada are Conservative and are liberal in spirit. They know the Orangemen have no bigoted prejudices which would lead them to oppose the granting of equal rights to all, and it is on that ground, and on that ground only, we come and ask the House to give the body incorporation, in order to enable it to hold its own property, a privilege which has been granted to-day to two Catholic bodies. Before I conclude, I must say one or two words on the constitutional right of Parliament to pass this Bill, lest it might be supposed that the objections put forward on that ground are in my judgment well taken, and that I feel unable to answer them. I had no hesitation, whatever, in agreeing to take charge of the Bill, from any doubt that it was not within the province and functions of this Parliament. The true doctrine is this: that this Parliament is seized of the right to legislate for the incorporation of any company or society whose operations are to extend to the whole Dominion, and that when once seized of that right, it has power to give all incidents necessary for the exercising and working out of that right. When we come to the question of the tenure of real property and the application of the Statute of mortmain, the legislation which we may get here will be subject to any legislation which the Provinces think fit to pass on that particular point. A question has recently arisen on this point, and a late decision has been given by the Privy Council—a later case than that referred to by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty)—this was the Attorney General *vs.* the Building and Investment Company of Quebec, in which decision it was held that the power to incorporate that company and invest it with the right to take and hold real estate in every part of Canada, was vested in this Parliament; but that notwithstanding that power is capable of being granted by this Parliament, the society could take and hold such property as it acquired, subject to the laws of each particular Province, as affecting the real property of the character which it held and possessed. So if there happened to be a mortmain law in any Province, the society would take the property only subject to those laws. If there were not such laws in the Province, the society would take the real estate, in consequence of the incorporation by virtue, of the power conferred on it by this Parliament, without any local incorporation. That is the latest decision of the Privy Council, and it is in accord with the principles laid down by our own Supreme Court. In the case of the Quebec Lumber Company, the question of incorporation was raised, as the company intended to do business in several Provinces of the Dominion, and it was contended that the case came within the functions and powers of each Legislature, and not within the functions of the Dominion Parliament. The matter was referred by the Senate to the Judges of the Supreme Court, and they reported that the Bill was within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. A similar question was raised in regard to the Canadian Provident Association, and a similar report was made in that case, the Judges laying down the doctrine, which is admittedly the correct doctrine, that where the Bill seeks to incorporate the society or company with power to do business in more than one Province, it is within the function of Parliament to pass such Bill, although, if the power is limited to one Province, it must go to the Provincial Legislature. If that be good law, it is beyond question that this Orange Bill is within the functions of this Parliament. I do not intend to say more, but I thought it my duty, as mover of the Bill, that I should justify the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and I must now leave the result to the House.

Motion for second reading negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Haggart,	Ross,
Allison (Lennox),	Hay,	Scriver,
Baker (Victoria),	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Beaty,	Hickey,	Small,
Bell,	Hilliard,	Smyth,
Benson,	Homer,	Sproule,
Bowell,	Irvine,	Stairs,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jamieson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Campbell (Victoria),	King,	Tilley,
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper (Pictou),
Cochrane,	Mackintosh,	Tyrwhitt,
Davies,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	McCraney,	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	McDougald,	Watson,
Dundas,	McLelan,	White (Cardwell),
Farrow,	McNeill,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	Moffat,	White (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,	Wigle,
Foster,	Orton,	Williams,
Gordon,	Reid,	Wood (Brockville),
Guillet,	Robertson (Hamilton),	Woodworth.—68.
Gunn,	Robertson (Hastings),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Daly,	Macmaster,
Armstrong,	Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Auger,	De St. Georges,	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Desaulniers,	McIntyre,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Desjardins,	McIsaac,
Béchard,	Dundas,	McMullen,
Belleau,	Dupont,	Massue,
Benoit,	Fairbank,	Méthot,
Bergin,	Fisher,	Mills,
Bernier,	Fleming,	Montplaisir,
Blake,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Blondeau,	Fortin,	Ouimet,
Bossé,	Gagné,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Geoffrion,	Patterson (Essex),
Bourbeau,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Brecken,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Burns,	Girouard,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Cameron (Inverness),	Guilbault,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex)	Hackett,	Royal,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Caron,	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Hurteau,	Springer,
Casey,	Innes,	Tassé,
Casgrain,	Kaulbach,	Thompson,
Chapleau,	Kirk,	Trow,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Cimon,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Colby,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vanasse,
Cook,	Langevin,	Weldon,
Costigan,	Laurier,	Wells,
Coughlin,	Lister,	Wilson,
Coursol,	Livingstone,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Wright,
Cuthbert,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Yeo.—105.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney) has not voted.

Mr. KINNEY. I paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton.

An hon. MEMBER. Which way?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; the ground upon which the hon. gentleman is excused from voting is, that he stated the conditions on which he paired.

Mr. KINNEY. I intended voting for the second reading of the Bill.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 3:30 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that as the time for the reception of the reports of Committees on Private Bills will expire on Thursday next, the same be extended for a further period of one week from that time.

Motion agreed to.

REPEAL OF THE LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Notice of Motion given by Mr. Houde for a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution, namely: "That this House is of opinion that the Liquor License Act, 1883, should be repealed," shall be the first Order of the Day.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HOUDE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

Whereas the Speech from the Throne, delivered on the 9th of February, 1883, contained the following paragraph: "I am advised that the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, delivered last June, on the appeal of Russell *vs* the Queen, goes to show that, in order to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors, and for that purpose to regulate the granting of shop, saloon and tavern licenses, legislation by the Dominion Parliament will be necessary, your earnest consideration of this important subject is desired." Whereas in pursuance of this recommendation, and on the representation made to this Parliament by the advisers of His Excellency that it was not a matter of policy, but a matter of necessity, an Act intituled: "The Liquor License Act of 1883," was passed by this Parliament last Session.

Whereas since then, the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have rendered another judgment in an analogous case, "Hodge *vs.* the Queen," in which their Lordships explain their decision in the case of Russell *vs.* the Queen, and declare that—"that decision, when properly considered, has not the effect supposed, and that it should be taken rather as an authority in support of the judgment of the Court of Appeal" (of Ontario).

Whereas the necessity of keeping in force "The Liquor License Act of 1883" has thus ceased to exist, and whereas it is desirable, and in the interest of the harmony of relations between the Federal Power and the Provincial Powers of this Dominion that this Parliament do not interfere with the legislation of the different Provinces on the subject of liquor traffic, for the preservation of good order and morality within their limits, therefore be it resolved that the House form itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution: "This House is of opinion that 'The Liquor License Act, 1883,' should be repealed."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion raises two points: first, can this Parliament vote to repeal the License Act of last year without contradicting itself? And secondly, if it can consistently and logically do so, is it expedient and desirable that it should do it? I will try to demonstrate briefly that we ought to solve both these propositions in the affirmative.

Mr. KINNEY.

It is a well known fact in this Parliament, at least among members who have followed the debates of last Session, that the necessity of having that Act passed was indicated in the Speech from the Throne, only and simply because of the interpretation then given by a decision of the Privy Council in the appeal of Russell *vs.* The Queen, and only and simply upon the assumption that that decision had left no other alternative in order to prevent the unlimited sale of intoxicating liquors, at least in Ontario, than to have recourse to the legislative interference of the Federal Parliament for removing the impending evil. Had not that decision been rendered, or had it been then interpreted in the new light in which it is to-day, it is fair to assume that the Government would not have asked this Parliament to pass the License Act of last year, nor would they have thought proper to interfere at all in that matter. For fear lest there might be persons taking a great interest in the present question who would hesitate to accept my statement as well-founded, I beg the House to allow me to quote the declarations of the Government themselves on this important point. The Speech from the Throne delivered on February 9th, 1883, contained, among others, the following paragraph:—

"I am advised that the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, delivered last June on the appeal of Russell *vs.* the Queen, goes to show, that in order to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors, and for that purpose to regulate the granting of shop, saloon and tavern licenses, legislation by the Dominion Parliament will be necessary. Your earnest consideration of this important subject is desired."

Three days later, that is on the 12th February, the right hon. the First Minister was still clearer in his declaration, and thus explained in the course of the debate on the Address the reasons why the Government intended to ask Parliament to legislate on the subject of the liquor traffic. The right hon. gentleman, answering the leader of the Opposition, spoke as follows in regard to the proposed legislation with respect to liquor licenses:—

"That subject was not willingly undertaken by the present Government. They were quite satisfied that the law as it obtains in the different Provinces, should be continued. They were quite satisfied that each Province should, so far as the law would allow it, to enact such Statutes, deal with the subject of shop, tavern and saloon licenses. Neither the Government nor the Parliament of Canada, I take it, wish to interfere; and it was only when the decision, which was given in June last upon the Scott Act, a Dominion Act, and the subject was forced upon them that they thought it their duty to bring it before Parliament. I never had any doubt that when the question was brought before the Courts, it would be decided that the different Provincial Legislatures have no right whatever to deal with that subject, except for revenue purposes—for the purpose of imposing taxation for provincial or municipal purposes. I expressed the opinion in Parliament years ago, and last year I expressed it at a public meeting in Toronto, or its vicinity."

We know that at the beginning of this Session the right hon. the First Minister, much to his credit, acknowledged that he had gone a little too far last year in the expression of that personal opinion. I continue quoting from the same declaration:

"But while that opinion was strongly impressed upon my mind I took no steps, nor did the Government of which I was a member, take any steps for the purpose of interfering with the legislation of the different Provinces, or forcing Dominion legislation on the country, or trying to centralize such powers in this Parliament."

And a little further on the right hon. gentleman added:

"Sir, if there be any value in that decision, and there is every value in it, because it is the law of the land, there is no check at this moment in the Province of Ontario against the unlimited, unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. This is not a matter we can play with. It is not a matter of policy; it is a matter of necessity. If we wish to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors we must legislate immediately. For I take it that any man in this city or in any other part of Ontario can open a saloon and sell liquors, and there is not a court in the world can prevent him doing so * * * If the Provincial Legislatures are insufficient, if the Provinces have not power enough to introduce wholesome regulations in restraint of the sale of intoxicating

liquors, we will supplement any such power as they have by bringing the full power and the full authority conferred upon this Parliament by the British North America Act to the aid of the different Provinces in the cause of morality, to prevent the mischiefs that are caused by the unrestrained use and sale of intoxicating liquors throughout the different Provinces of Canada."

So, Mr. Speaker, being under the impression that the Provincial Legislatures had not the necessary powers to enact wholesome regulations in restraint of the sale of intoxicating liquors, this Parliament considered as a matter not of policy but of necessity, as the Prime Minister stated, so to come to the aid of the different Provinces in the cause of public morality, and for that reason, Sir, it passed the License Act of 1883. But we know very well, Sir, to-day, that if that Act is allowed to stand on our Statute Book, so far from lending our aid to the Provinces, it will be, on the contrary, a cause of great embarrassment, for you are aware since the Act of 1883 was passed the Privy Council has rendered another decision in a similar case—the case of Hodge *vs.* the Queen, a decision which sets clearly that their lordships fully admit the constitutional right of the Provinces to legislate on this subject of the liquor traffic, not only for the purpose of raising a revenue, but also for the purpose of promoting good order and public morality within their borders, or the limits of the municipalities created by them. Let us see what their lordships say. First, they give the true meaning of their decision in Russell *vs.* the Queen, which had been misunderstood, and secondly, they affirm the right of the Provinces to legislate on this subject of the liquor traffic. I quote from the *Legal News* of the 19th of January last, pages 21, 22 and 23:

"The appellants contended that the Legislature of Ontario had no power to pass any Act to regulate the liquor traffic; that the whole power to pass such an Act was conferred on the Dominion Parliament and consequently taken from the Provincial Legislature by section 91 of the British North America Act, 1867, and that it did not come within any of the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures by section 92. The clause in section 91 which the Liquor License Act, 1877, was said to infringe was No. 2, the regulation of trade and commerce, and it was urged that the decision of this board in Russell *vs. Regina* was conclusive—that the whole subject of the liquor traffic was given to the Dominion Parliament, and consequently taken away from the Provincial Legislatures. It appears to their lordships, however, that the decision of this tribunal in that case has not the effect supposed, and that when properly considered, it should be taken rather as an authority in support of the judgment of the Court of Appeal. * * *

"It appears to their lordships that Russell *vs.* The Queen, when properly understood, is not an authority in support of the appellant's contention, and their lordships do not intend to vary or depart from the reasons expressed for their judgment in that case. The principle which that case and the case of the Citizens' Insurance Company illustrates is, that subjects which in one aspect and for one purpose, fall within section 92, may in another aspect, and for another purpose, fall within section 91."

In the following paragraph their lordships analyze the Ontario License Act, and they say:—

"Their lordships proceed now to consider the subject matter and legislative character of sections 4 and 5 of the Liquor License Act of 1877, cap. 181, Revised Statutes of Ontario. That Act is so far confined in its operation to municipalities in the Province of Ontario, and is entirely local in its character and operation. It authorizes the appointment of License Commissioners, to act in each municipality, and empowers them to pass, under the name of resolutions, what we know as by-laws, or rules to define the conditions and qualifications requisite for obtaining tavern or shop licenses for the sale by retail of spirituous liquors within the municipality; for limiting the number of licenses; for declaring that a limited number of persons qualified to have tavern licenses may be exempt from having all the tavern accommodations required by-law, and for the regulating of licenses in taverns and shops, for defining the duties and powers of License Inspectors, and to impose penalties for infraction of these resolutions. These seem to be all matters of a merely local nature in the Province, and to be similar to, though not identical in all respects with the powers then belonging to municipal institutions, under the previously existing laws passed by the Local Parliaments.

"Their lordships consider that the powers intended to be conferred by the Act in question, when properly understood, are to make regulations in the nature of policy or municipal regulations of a merely local character for the good government of taverns, etc., licensed for the sale of liquors by retail, and such as are calculated to preserve in the municipality, peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct. As such they cannot be said to interfere with the general regulation of trade and commerce which belongs to the Dominion Parliament, and do not conflict with the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act which does not appear to have as yet been locally adopted

"The subjects of legislation in the Ontario Act of 1877, sections 4 and 5, seems to come within the heads Nos. 8, 15, and 16 of section 92, of the British North America Statute, 1867.

"Their lordships are, therefore, of opinion that, in relation to sections 4 and 5 of the Act in question, the Legislature of Ontario acted within the powers conferred on it by the Imperial Act of 1867, and that in this respect there is no conflict with the powers of the Dominion Parliament."

So it is clear by the decision of the Privy Council that the Local Legislatures have the right, first to enact laws in reference to the sale of intoxicating liquors, to regulate the sale by retail of intoxicating liquors, to appoint License Commissioners, and to give to such Commissioners power to pass regulations to regulate the sale of liquors in taverns, saloons and hotels, and even to decide, furthermore, the qualifications required to obtain licenses; and finally—which is the chief point—to limit, at the discretion of the Local Legislatures, or of the persons to whom they delegate their powers in reference to this question, the number of licenses, in the interest of temperance, or to preserve good order and public morality within their limits. I ask you if this does not comprehend power as complete as the Federal Act of last year can comprehend—a thing which I think nobody will deny. Now, Mr. Speaker, the circumstances having thus changed, the necessity of having the interference of this Parliament in order to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors has ceased to exist. Therefore am I not right in contending this Parliament can repeal the License Act of 1883 without contradicting itself? The reason given last year to justify the interference of this Parliament in that matter was, under the circumstances, a plausible one, but it seems to me that such interference would be a mere pretence to-day. To the authority of the Privy Council on this point we must add the authority of the Court of Appeal of Ontario in the same case, and the authority of the Court of Appeal of Quebec in the case of the City of Three Rivers *vs.* Sulte, all affirming without doubt the constitutional right of the Provincial Legislatures to legislate on this subject of the liquor traffic, not only for the purpose of raising a revenue, but also for the purpose of maintaining good order and public morality within the limits of the different Provinces. It is true, the Government have officially published the limits of the license districts created under the authority of this Act, as well as the names of the Commissioners required to carry it into operation. But, Sir, the setting aside of this measure would have no bad consequences of this Parliament thinks there are good reasons why it should abstain from interfering in that matter. Last year there were doubts as to whether or not it could abstain; but to-day, I think, there cannot be any longer doubts that it can, and I hope the Government will take advantage of that circumstance to consider this Resolution on its merits. I do not wish to cast any blame on the Government for having put into operation a measure passed by this Parliament; but, on the other hand, I claim for the House the right to modify its views and its Acts according to circumstances. I trust that for that reason the Government will leave this an open question. If the Resolution was adopted, a Bill based on it would be introduced, and a clause might be inserted in it to the effect that licenses already granted under the Act it is proposed to repeal should be valid until May, 1885, in order to save loss and trouble and damages to parties holding such licenses. I come, now, Sir, to the second point: Is it expedient and desirable that we should repeal the License Act of 1883? I believe it is, if we are to accept the opinion which, apparently at least, guided the Government when they said, through the hon. First Minister, that they did not wish to ask this Parliament to

interfere with the powers of Provincial Legislatures, nor to centralize such powers in this Parliament, and that the intention was only to come to the aid of the Provinces, which were then believed, on account of certain circumstances which have since totally changed, not to be possessed with the necessary powers to legislate on the subject of the liquor traffic. To-day, Sir, we know that they have such powers. We know, besides, that our so-called aid, seeing the change of circumstances would be more embarrassing than useful to the Provinces. I am not arguing against the Government. On the contrary, I am relying on their policy so clearly propounded in the words I have quoted, and it is in relying on that policy that I have made this motion. As a matter of justice, I am ready to allow them the merits of it. I may be asked if I propose to repeal the License Act of 1883, as being an unconstitutional law, or a law otherwise objectionable in itself. Well, Sir, I am not a constitutional authority but, I must have some kind of an opinion on constitutional matters, as they are forced upon our consideration; and my opinion on this subject is that, although the letter of the British North American Act perhaps permits the concurrent exercise of this power by the Federal Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures, its spirit, interpreted as it ought to be, in the sense of harmonizing the action of these different bodies, instead of placing them in antagonism, militates rather in favour of the Local Legislatures. As to the Act itself, I look upon it as a good step in the direction of promoting the great cause of temperance, as are also the Dunkin Act, the Scott Act, and the Crooks Act. But, however good it may be, that is not a sufficient reason why we should assume to legislate on a question which ought rather to come properly under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures. The question is not whether we are of opinion that we can make better laws than the Provincial Legislatures on this or other subjects; but the question is whether it is wise for us to assume to legislate on questions which the Local Legislatures are fully qualified to deal with, for the good of their respective Provinces, and which, from the very nature of things, come rather within their jurisdiction than ours. Whatever may be the decision of this House, the authors of the Act of last year will not have worked in vain; for I have no doubt that the friends and advocates of temperance will avail themselves of it, in order to induce the Provincial Legislatures to improve their local laws in this respect, where there is any improvement possible. I understand that in some Provinces, at least in Manitoba, the local laws are better than our law of last year. In Ontario, on the other hand, I see that the Local Legislature is introducing into its own Act of 1877, several wise provisions from our Act of last year. What this Government and this Parliament can do in the cause of temperance is to impose heavy import and excise duties on intoxicating liquors, and I have no doubt that, with the present Minister at the head of the Finance Department, that good part of the work will not be overlooked. I say, then, to the advocates of temperance: Turn your praiseworthy efforts towards the Provincial Governments and Legislatures; try to influence them in favour of your noble work, and you will have at the same time served two great causes, temperance and provincial autonomy. I have heard complaints made by hon. members from Ontario about the manner in which the Provincial License Act of that Province, known as the Crooks Act, is administered. It is alleged that the License Commissioners of the Government of Ontario are political partizans, and that they act with partiality in the discharge of their official duties. If that be true, Sir—and it is not necessary for me here to say whether it is true or not—I would suggest that the remedy is to be sought for, not in the interference of this Parliament, but in the Legislature which controls that Provincial Government; and if that first attempt fails to bring the desired redress, in must be sought for by an appeal to the electoral body, which is the final resort for the settlement of all like political matters We have heard leading Conservatives in this House and out of it telling the Liberals that these gentlemen ought to have patriotism enough to place public interests above party interests. Well, I would ask my hon. friends from Ontario in particular, and my hon. friends from all the Provinces in general, whether this is not a fit occasion to put that principle into practice, and to place provincial privileges above party exigencies. For we must be frank; we must ask ourselves what we would do if the Liberals were in power to-day at Ottawa; we must ask ourselves whether we would stick very much to that famous License Act of 1873. Perhaps I am asking a question a little indiscreet, and for that reason I will let everybody answer it for himself. For my part, I would not stick to it, and I do not stick to it, although it so happens that the Conservatives are to-day in power here. The change of men at the head of power does not affect the principles which must be the basis of all sound politics; what is wrong for a party cannot be right for another, and *vice versa*. My conclusion is that when it is recognized that the Provincial Legislatures have the necessary powers to deal with questions which necessarily do not belong to this Parliament, and more especially, as it is in this case, on a question on which the Local Legislatures have had the undoubted privilege for years of legislating, my opinion is this Parliament ought to abstain from interfering, although, as it may be claimed in this case, it has perhaps a strict legal right to enterfere. In acting so, we would create sound precedents that would determine the broad spirit in which our constitution ought to be interpreted, and we would make our constitution what it ought to be after its model the British Constitution. For what is the British Constitution, if not the whole of established precedents or respected usages passed into law rather than the letter of a written law? Besides, the letter of our Constitution is far from being clear on more than one point. Take for instance section 91 with sub-section 3, and section 92 with sub-section 2 of the British North America Act, and you will see that they exclude each other totally. In fact section 92 with sub-section 2 reads as follows:

"In each Province the Legislature may make laws in relation to matters coming within the class of subjects hereinafter enumerated—that is to say direct taxation within the Province in order to the raising of a revenue for Provincial purposes."

On the other hand, section 91 with sub-section 3 reads thus:

"It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the class of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces, and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of the section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the class of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say, the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation."

We have it declared in this constitutional Act that the right of raising money by any mode or system of taxation belongs exclusively to the Federal Parliament, and also that it belongs exclusively to the Local Legislatures to impose direct taxation within the Provinces. It is, therefore, obvious that the letter of our Constitution has nothing well defined in this respect, and that we must look for the spirit from a reasonable standpoint, and this applies more especially in regard to the question now occupying our attention. We must not allow ourselves to be deluded by the idea that it is necessary to have uniformity of legislation on the subject

of liquor traffic throughout the Dominion. What does it matter whether the saloons in Victoria, B.C., do or do not close exactly at the same hour as those in Halifax, N.S.? But it matters much whether this Parliament shall or shall not assume, when it can help it, to grant licenses and to regulate the sale of liquors by retail in municipalities created by and holding their powers and privileges from Local Legislatures and having the constitutional right to impose by-laws and regulations for the preservation of order and public morality within their limits. I believe that the time has arrived when we should unite together not one party alone, but both parties, to recognize and affirm the importance of Provincial Legislatures, and surround their autonomy by the proper safeguards. Legislatures which have to deal with the grave subjects of property, civil rights, education, religious liberty and the like, are not inferior in importance even to this Parliament itself, which has chiefly to legislate on financial, commercial and other material interests. We have seen, since the establishment of Confederation, the Lieutenant-Governors of Provinces denied the right of having the title of Excellency applied to them, although it has never been thought that the dignity of the President of the United States, for instance, was lessened by the fact that the State Governors bear the title of "Excellency." We have seen the Ministers of the Provinces denied the right of bearing the title of "honourable" after their having ceased to be Ministers. We have seen it decided that Provincial Ministers, even during their holding of office, rank after simple members of the House of Commons in official ceremonies. All that and similar measures which have been adopted surely tended to minimize, so to speak, our Provincial institutions, and yet the Provinces are and must be considered sovereign within their sphere of action. It is not only my humble opinion; it is also the opinion of the highest tribunal of the land, the Privy Council itself, which, in this same decision rendered in the case of Hodge against the Queen, says:

"When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a Legislature for Ontario, and that its Legislative Assembly should have exclusive authority to make laws for the Province and for Provincial purposes in relation to the matters enumerated in section 92, it conferred powers, not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from, or as agents of, the Imperial Parliament, but authority as plenary and as ample, within the limits prescribed by section 92, as the Imperial Parliament, in the plenitude of its power, possessed and could bestow."

So much, Mr. Speaker, for those—and I allude especially to eminent jurists outside of this House, having great influence on the politics of the country—so much, I say, for those who try to assimilate the Provincial Legislatures to mere municipal bodies. I need not add, Mr. Speaker, that those who, for the reasons which I have just so imperfectly developed, or for other similar reasons, believe that the License Act of 1883 should be repealed, could not approve or sanction the course which I have heard suggested outside of this House, and which would consist in enforcing the said Act for the sake of having a test case of its constitutionality before the Supreme Court and the Privy Council. I cannot see what good could be derived from that course, but I can well apprehend the evil which it could bring on. First, it would be to express a grave doubt about the constitutionality of what this Parliament did last year. It would be to question the constitutionality of what this Parliament did last year on the recommendation of the Government in passing the said Act. For my part, I have not questioned that point, because I did not think it was necessary to do so in order to argue my cause, and also because I did not wish to make this Parliament and this Government appear inconsistent with themselves. But I am much afraid that they will appear inconsistent with themselves if they adopt the course I am speaking of. I wonder—I see my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Landry) before me; I have him in my eye—I wonder how that hon. gentleman and many other hon. members of this House, who, it is well known, like so much the centralizing views of the learned Judges of the Supreme Court——

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Hear, hear.

Mr. HOUDE. I wonder how they will relish the idea of preparing test cases of that kind for the pleasure of affording an opportunity of jeopardizing the privileges of the Provinces. Besides, the step I have just alluded to could have only, at least in my mind, this meaning, that this Parliament, although it is convinced to-day that the Provincial Legislatures have the constitutional right and the necessary powers to deal with the subject of liquor traffic for other ends than revenue purposes, wishes to supersede that right, to supersede those powers, if it can only obtain some legal sanction for that attempt, notwithstanding the official declarations of last year which I have quoted, notwithstanding the ministerial protestations of last year, which I have also quoted, that, when absolute necessity did not require it, this Government and this Parliament did not intend and did not wish to interfere with the legislation of the Provinces on the subject of liquor traffic. I ask myself why in the world we should need the Supreme Court or the Privy Council to tell us what our dispositions are or ought to be towards the Provinces. We have here, to-day, to choose between a friendly and generous attitude, or a hostile and selfish attitude towards the Provinces, and our votes on this question will tell. It becomes us to avoid side issues, and to pronounce ourselves on the main issue squarely, like men who are not afraid of showing their true colours. Consequently, I think that the duty of every hon. member of this House is clear. Those who are in favour of curtailing the privileges of the Provinces as far as strict legality or the obscure letter of our Constitution will permit it, or the centralizing views of high tribunals will allow it, those gentleman—whose honesty I do not intend to contest for a moment, for opinions are free on such a question as this—will try to keep that License Act on our Statute Book, will try to go before the Supreme Court and the Privy Council with the hope of obtaining some sanction of one kind or another for their centralizing policy, if they think such a policy to be the wisest, and I suppose there are hon. members who honestly think it is the wisest. But other members, entertaining different opinions and principles on this question will say, this License Act of 1883 is no longer a necessity, therefore we will vote for its repeal without looking for any loophole to hide our responsibility. Before resuming my seat, I must call attention to a danger which, I believe, threatens us if we do not repeal the License Act of 1883. We are aware that the Privy Council, the Court of Appeal of Ontario, the Court of Appeal of Quebec, have rendered decisions, all affirming the right of the Provincial Legislatures to legislate on the subject of liquor traffic, for the purpose not only of raising a revenue, but also for the purpose of advancing the great cause of temperance and protecting good order and public morality within their limits. Knowing they have that right, it is not likely that the Provinces will abandon the exercise of it, and thus sacrifice a portion of their autonomy. That will not be done at least in three Provinces, I mean Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick. Of Quebec I can speak through personal knowledge of the popular feeling there, a feeling so general, so strong, so deeply rooted in the hearts of the mass of the people that any Local Government who would be blind enough to ignore it, would be sure to be swept away from power upon the first occasion presenting itself. I can speak of Ontario from the determination of its Legislature to enforce, by all means, its own laws on this subject; and of New Brunswick I can also speak from the announcement made lately in the Speech from the Throne, that the Legislature of that Province would be asked to protest against the enforcement of the Federal License Act, 1883. More than that, the capital of

Nova Scotia, the city of Halifax, has also pronounced against the advisability of enforcing that Act. Here, then, Sir, is a conflict, a serious conflict, which we are called upon to avoid, and which we can avoid without lowering our dignity. For we are here as the guardians of the autonomy of the Provinces as well as the interests of the Dominion at large, and we would be acting in the interests of both by declaring that it was through necessity alone that the License Act, 1883, was passed, and by declaring that this Parliament does not wish nor intend to interfere with the legislation of the Provinces in respect of the liquor traffic as long as, in the words of the First Minister in the course of the debate on the Address, last year, the Provincial laws obtain in their respective limits; and in giving, in fine, to the British North America Act, the broad and generous interpretation which alone can render its working harmonious and truly beneficial to the people of this country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must congratulate my hon. friend, the mover of this Resolution on his re-appearance amongst us, and I hope that he may long remain here. I may also congratulate him on the moderation of his remarks and the temperate way in which he has discussed this temperance matter. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has reasoned from beginning to end as if there was a disposition in this House to interfere with the rights, powers and privileges of the Local Legislatures. I am quite sure that I am speaking on behalf of my colleagues as well as on behalf of the party to which we belong and who works with us, in saying that there is no intention whatever to interfere with the rights, powers and privileges of the Local Legislatures. We are all in favour of the autonomy of the Provinces. From the beginning I had much to do with this Act of Confederation. It is a measure of which we all have reason to be proud, and I, who was actively engaged in arranging the preliminaries of that Act and went to England to secure its passage, may say to the hon. gentleman and to this House that I would not have remained a single day in London attending to those duties if I had thought for a moment that this Act would affect or weaken the autonomy of the Provinces. On the contrary, we took care that the autonomy of the Provinces should be secured, that their rights, privileges and powers should be defined in order that we might not have repeated in this country the difficulties and struggles that had recently occurred in the United States, and had caused the shedding of so much blood. Since that time I have always been a member of the Conservative Governments which, for most of the time, have conducted the affairs of this country, and at no time have my colleagues or myself had any desire or disposition to interfere with or curtail the rights and powers of the Local Legislatures; on the contrary, when there was a doubt, we always gave the benefit of it to the weaker body, to the Local Legislature. I would remind the hon. gentleman that when the Bill which has become the Act entitled: "An Act respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors and the issuing of licenses therefore," was introduced into this House, it was founded upon Resolutions that had been prepared, not by a Minister of the Crown, but by a large Committee composed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, a Committee that had worked for weeks and weeks, and that had the advantage of all the experience that could be brought to bear upon this subject, and the result of their labours received the sanction of this Parliament. The object we had in view is stated by the preamble, which is very short and which reads:

"Whereas it is desirable to regulate the traffic and the sale in intoxicating liquors, and it is expedient that the laws respecting the same should be uniform throughout the Dominion, and that provision should be made with regard thereto for the better preservation of peace and order, therefore Her Majesty enacts, etc."

That was the object of this measure. It was for the purpose of making the law with respect to the traffic and the sale of intoxicating liquors uniform throughout the Dominion, and secondly, for the better preservation of peace and order. These two objects are not destroyed to-day, they have not disappeared. The same reasons exist to-day which guided us then in trying to regulate the traffic and the sale of intoxicating liquors, and in making the law uniform, and also to preserve peace and order throughout the Dominion. These objects still remain good objects, and this House and Parliament decided, after full deliberation, after examining and studying the subject for weeks and months, that this should be the law of the land, and it was accordingly made the law of the land. Now my hon. friend says that at that period we had only the judgment in the case of Russell *vs.* the Queen, that there was a doubt as to our jurisdiction, but that that doubt has since disappeared by the judgment of Hodge *vs.* the Queen. Well, Mr. Speaker, these decisions were both concerning certain laws that were in force then, and the questions decided by those judgments had nothing to do with and did not affect the present law. This law was not *en cause*, there was no question about it before the Privy Council; therefore, those judgments do not bear upon this law, and do not affect it. No court of justice has yet decided whether this is a constitutional law or not, whether it is *ultra vires* or not. We have had no decision on that point yet, and why should we, the Parliament of Canada, we the representatives of the people in the House of Commons, declare that because a judgment has been rendered under another law different from this one, we will accept that judgment as rendered upon this law, and say that this law is not constitutional, and confess, after a period of but a few months, that we were in error last year in passing this law, and that we submit to a judgment which really has nothing to do with this law? I say no, Mr. Speaker, we should not put ourselves in that position; and no doubt the hon. gentleman, when he thinks again about it, will see that it would be doing exactly what he says we would be doing if we adopted another course, of which I shall speak in a few minutes. He says this would be questioning the legislation of last year; it would be not only questioning, but it would be deciding here by our votes that this law is not law, that we had no right to pass that Act, and we are very sorry for having done so; we immediately pass a Bill this Session, send it to the Senate, and ask the Governor General to concur in it that it may be placed on the Statute-Book, because we are now of the opinion that the law which we took so much trouble to pass last year, after duly considering and weighing it well, is a mere piece of waste paper, and an Act which we had no power to pass. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is the course we should adopt respecting a solemn Act. We should not say that this judgment on a case under the Crooks Act, the Scott Act, or the Dunkin Act, is a final decision on our own Act, respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors and the issue of licenses, the liquor License Act of 1883. The mover of the Resolution goes further, and enters into the grave question of the interference of—he did not say whom—but the interference of some one with the Provinces; and he remarked that since Confederation, for example, the question of titles and precedence has been regulated against the Provinces. The hon. gentleman must know, and no doubt he will admit it, that the question of titles and precedence is not a question settled by us, or one with which we have anything to do. It is a prerogative of the sovereign of this realm, and what the Queen has done was no doubt well weighed in the Councils of the Empire; and though we may differ about certain details of the tables of precedence and titles, nevertheless they have been sent to us in that form from England and Her Majesty, the Queen, has said these shall be tables of precedence. What does it matter

whether the Lieutenant-Governor of our Province, and not of our Province alone, but of all the Provinces, has the title of His Honour or His Excellency? I must say that at the beginning of Confederation the title of His Excellency was given to Lieutenant-Governors, and I know that more than one of them would have preferred that at once the title to which they were properly entitled, that of His Honour, should have been given them; because, after all, it is no compliment to give a man a title which he is not entitled to bear. In this world each man has to take his place, and the Queen has determined there shall be certain rank among the public men of this country. Her Majesty has also determined what shall be the position of the Governor-General, the rank of the Commander of the Forces, of a Lieutenant-General, a Major-General or a Colonel; of the Ambassador when he comes here from Washington, of the Bishops as well as Ministers of the Crown and others. These tables of precedence have not been settled by us, I repeat, but were settled in England and sent out here. No doubt in England they thought they were doing it for the best, and they must have followed certain rules established in such cases. At all events I do not think the fact as to whether a Provincial Minister comes after a member of the House of Commons, or before him, lowers him in any respect. His position is always the same. He is a Minister of his Province, he has his position, his title, his power and his influence; and whether he comes after me or before me matters little—he has always the position which the constitution gives him. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, this question of title or precedence should weigh much in this matter, though I must say if I had had to make the list, I might have made some modifications in the direction to which the hon. gentleman referred. But as I had nothing to do with it, it is not a matter on which I am required to give an opinion. The mover of the motion has also referred to the Constitutional Act, and said there are certain matters which are not perfectly clear. Unfortunately it is about the same with all laws passed, even by this Parliament, and it is also the case in the English Parliament, and will continue, no doubt, down to the end of the chapter. These laws are made by men, and we do the best we can in framing them, nevertheless there are always loop-holes. Some people say that as we lawyers have something to do with the framing of the laws we try to make difficulties in order that lawyers may have a chance to live. No doubt that is a great calumny on the profession; I do not know that such a case ever occurred, but when difficulties happen we are all very glad to secure a good lawyer in order that the difficulty may disappear. My hon. friend (Mr. Houde) spoke, among other things, of the 91st and 92nd clauses of the British North America Act of 1867, and he sought to show that the third sub-section of the 91st clause gives to the Parliament of Canada power to raise money by any mode or system of taxation, and that the 92nd clause gives the exclusive power to the Provincial Legislatures to impose direct taxation in order to raise revenue for Provincial purposes. I do not see any contradiction between the two clauses. One gives to Local Legislatures the power of direct taxation within the Provinces, for the raising of revenue for Provincial purposes. The other clause provides that the Dominion Parliament shall have power to raise money by any mode of taxation.

Mr. HOUDE. It is an exclusive right in each case.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Exclusive no doubt. The Local Legislatures have, under this clause, the power to impose direct taxation for Provincial purposes, and for that only; but the Parliament of Canada has to deal with all the Provinces, has to raise money for large public works, and all purposes, and it is given power to raise money by any mode or system of taxation. It raises money by Inland Revenue, by Customs, and by direct taxation as well; but that does not prevent the Local Legislatures raising money by direct taxation. Some have tried it to a very small extent I am glad to say, and they never found their Acts set aside for that reason. So I do not think that although the British North America Act is not a perfect Act, and although it is one in which certain flaws may be found, yet all in all we must congratulate ourselves on the result of that legislation. It is a good Act and though certain difficulties will occur in the working of it, they have been very small indeed in the past. To revert to the motion of the hon. member by which he wishes to declare that the Liquor License Act of 1883, should be repealed, I must say that I do not agree with the hon. gentleman upon that point. I do not think the Liquor License Act should be repealed. I think we should put ourselves in the same position in which we were by the laws existing previous to the Act of last Session—that is the Crooks Act, the Dunkin Act, and the Scott Act—that is we should have the best judicial or authoritative judgment on the subject. We should know whether this Act is one which we have a right to pass, whether we have gone beyond our powers, whether it really infringes upon the rights, and privileges, and powers of the Local Legislatures. If we had a decision of that kind we would be in a position to decide what is the next step to take. If the law is declared unconstitutional, *ultra vires*, that law will have to be put aside, and it will be for Parliament to say whether something else should take its place, and how far we should go. Under these circumstances, I move in amendment to the motion, that all the words after "that" be replaced by the following:—

"In the opinion of this House it is expedient that the question of the competence of Parliament to pass the Liquor License Act of 1883, should be submitted with all convenient speed to the Supreme Court of Canada, or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or both."

By this means we will obtain a decision from a proper tribunal. We can obtain a decision from the Supreme Court on the question being put by the Government to them, and if we are not satisfied with that, we may go to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or we may have a decision from both; but at all events we will be in the position of obtaining an authoritative decision on the constitutionality of this law. My hon. friend may say: what will happen in the meantime? He may say there will be suits entered and penalties imposed, and the law may be worked in that direction, at the same time that it may not be constitutional. I may say that the Government intend bringing in a Bill to amend the law during this Session, and that one of the provisions of that Bill will be that until a decision is obtained from the proper tribunal, as stated in my amendment, the penalties of the Act shall not have effect. They will not be exacted during that period, and thus nobody will suffer. Some of my friends have spoken about the time for the reception of applications for licenses under the Act. They say the time is so short that parties who wished to apply for their licenses had not time to do so. Well, the intention of the Government is to provide for an extension of the time, and there will be several other amendments proposed which I need not dwell upon just now. I hope, therefore, the House will accept the amendment which I have just put in your hands. It is one which should be accepted because it is a reasonable one. It is one we should adopt out of self respect to ourselves and to this Parliament. We passed this law hardly ten months ago, and I think we should not repeal it without having a decision of a judicial tribunal, and when we have that decision, if it is against the law, we will have to submit gracefully and provide some other remedy, if a remedy is required. If the law is maintained we will apply ourselves to modify and improve it, if it requires modification or improvement. I hope, under the circumstances, that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. AMYOT. I have heard with a great deal of pleasure the declaration of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the effect that this Government is opposed to the interference with the powers of the Local Legislatures. I believe that such is the case, because if I did not believe it I would not give my humble support to the present Administration. But they are to-day in a position to give proof of that disposition. We have to-day before us a decision of the highest judicial authority of the Empire, the Privy Council, which declares that the regulation of the trade and sale of liquors is within the jurisdiction of the Provinces—that they are within clause 92 of the British North America Act, which says the power is an exclusive power. If that power pertains to the Local Legislatures, it is an exclusive power, and if it is exclusive, it cannot belong to others. This is obvious. Could I say to a man: Sir, I have a house, I give it to you, and then turn round to another man and say: I have this house, I give it to you? No; there is only one power according to section 92, and if that power fails us, then it is exclusively in favour of the Local Legislatures. The decision that has been given is as clear and plain as possible; and this Parliament, which is not in favour of interference with the Local Legislatures, which had not that decision before it last Session, should take this position, that in view of its love for the Local Legislatures and its jealousy for their exclusive powers, it will not again fight this question through the courts, or expose the power of the Local Legislatures to be interfered with, or expose this Parliament to the humiliation of having its law of last year declared unconstitutional. Such is the position of the case. Either the decision will be favourable to the Local Legislatures or to the Federal Legislature. If it is favourable to the Federal Legislature, it will be adverse to the last decision given by the Privy Council, adverse to the exclusive power which we claim for the Local Legislatures and adverse to that love for Provincial autonomy which is professed by this Government. On the other hand, a decision which would be favourable to the Local Legislatures would be equivalent to saying to the House of Commons: The law that you passed was *ultra vires*; you had no power to pass it; you committed a blunder, and you come twice or three times to us to ask for decisions to tell you that you are wrong; you have been declared wrong by the Courts of Ontario, by the Courts of Quebec, and by the Privy Council, and you come to be declared wrong again. That is the position, Sir. For my part I believe that when Confederation was accepted, the Local Legislatures had all the powers possible; but they consented, for the sake of the new confederation, to delegate some of their powers; but the understanding was that the Provinces would retain enough power and enough autonomy to accomplish the share that was given them by the Confederation Act. That is the reason why the word "exclusively" is put into this section 92. It was well understood that within the limits of its attributes every Province should be supreme, and that there would be no possibility of interference; it was understood that the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario or the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, or those of the other Provinces, should represent Her Majesty the Queen just as fully as the Governor-General in the Parliament of Canada. Well, the judgment given says that our local laws are within that exclusive jurisdiction, and when we say that we love that autonomy of the Provinces, we should not expose that autonomy and those powers to be denied by the Courts. Last year, when we were asked to pass a License Bill, I felt surprise and hesitation. For 17 years the laws of the Local Legislatures had been administered in the different Provinces without anybody grumbling, these Provinces knowing what was for their welfare and harmony, and collecting revenues under these laws; but we were told by a gentleman, whom we are in the habit, with good right, of

respecting, that the decision in the case of Russell *vs.* the Queen, was throwing the country into confusion and uncertainty, and we were asked to pass a general law. In the presence of that interpretation of a decision of the highest Court of the British Empire, we consented. We were told distinctly in the Speech from the Throne that this was the only reason for passing that law. Well, we are told by the Privy Council in another case that that decision was not properly and rightly understood; and the last decision of that Court says that the laws passed by the Local Legislatures for nearly all the objects mentioned in our law are constitutional. What is then our duty towards the dignity of this Parliament and towards the welfare of the country? Our duty is to say: Well, we have been led astray by a decision of the highest tribunal in the country, which we did not understand properly; and, as we have acted once under the dictation of that Court, we will act a second time under its dictation, especially when the second dictation is much clearer and more to the point than the first. Our duty becomes imperative; we should say that we will restore to the Provinces their autonomy, their power, their resources. As to the unconstitutionality of the law, I have no doubt; and it was only in view of that decision of Russell *vs.* the Queen, that a doubt, or rather a hesitation came into my mind. If you look at section 8, of clause 92, you will see that municipal institutions are assigned to the Provinces. What is the keeping of good order in a hotel? What is the closing of the doors of an hotel at a certain hour? Municipal organization, nothing else. What is the granting of licenses? Municipal organization. Then if you look at section 13, you will see that property and civil rights belong exclusively to the Local Legislatures. What is the right of selling liquor or merchandise or timber in the country? It is a civil right; and when the Federal Goverment goes into a Province and says that nobody but such and such a party will be allowed to sell liquor, it infringes on the rights of the Local Government in the matter of property and civil rights. If you look at section 9, you will see that another exclusive right of the Local Governments is to issue shop, saloon, tavern, auctioneer, and other licenses, in order to raise a revenue for provincial or municipal purposes. What have we been saying in our Act? We say that to obtain a license, a man must pay a certain amount. That amount will go first to pay the salaries of municipal officers; and secondly, it will go into the municipal fund. What right has this Parliament to interfere in the raising of money for municipal purposes? We have no such power. We are infringing upon the municipal institutions; we are infringing upon the civil rights of the Local Provinces; we are infringing upon the right of the Local Parliaments to institute those officers and to provide money for them. That is one of the reasons why this law is unconstitutional. We have no power to fix the number of licenses, because that is a municipal affair. Each municipality knows better than another the number of licenses required within its limits. We form an immense country, and in some of the Provinces which are two, three or four degrees more to the north than others, they may require more licenses; and much more liquor may be drunk there than in the southern Provinces, yet this Parliament is asked to declare that a certain amount would be fixed for each place. We have no right to do so. It was understood each Province would regulate for itself all matters concerning its municipal institutions. There is, perhaps, only one feature of this Act which is constitutional, and that is the part which provides against the adulteration of liquor. That may come properly within the clause relating to traffic and commerce, but I do not see why we should insert such a little part which is constitutional in the centre of an Act all the rest of which is unconstitutional. There are certain reasons why the Act should be repealed which have not yet been touched. If a concurrent power exists, as is

claimed, I ask myself can there be two or three fathers with the same authority in the one house, two Kings in the same Kingdom? And why should we contribute to the existence of that concurrent power? Why go on with a system that provides first for the general organization—three commissioners and one license inspector, and notices in the *Gazette* and at the church doors and elsewhere, a very elaborate system under the Federal Act—and then go to the local system where licenses are required for local revenue, and where you have license inspector, notices of applications signed by a certain number of electors and so on; you pay a certain amount and then you have to go to the municipalty itself and there pay another amount; so that there are three different necessary modes to be taken to obtain a license. And at what cost? At the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the country. I do not see why we should keep up that system since we admit the Local Legislatures have all the necessary powers. The very proposition made by the hon. Minister of Public Works is the best proof that in the eyes of the Government there is a doubt. They are not certain that the law is constitutional; they are no longer certain after this judgment in the Privy Council, and they want the case decided. I have and have always had as much confidence in the members of the Administration who are lawyers as in any Judge of the land, and I think it is not fair to ask us to vote that we cannot be bound by their opinion. If we cannot be bound by their opinion, I think I owe it to my dignity, as a representative of the people and as a member of the legal profession, to take my own opinion and go according to it. Why go before the Courts? Because the Courts have not decided? If they have not, why did we pass the law last year? Have they decided? That is what is pretended since; then let us abide by the last decision. In whose interest should we go before the Courts? It was insinuated slightly by the hon. gentleman that it was for the benefit of the lawyers. Well, I do not see any force of argument in that, nor do I see any great compliment to the profession to which I am proud to belong. Are we not able, when there are so many lawyers and legislators in this House, to decide that question for ourselves? Let us take the law as given by the Privy Council, and as inserted in the British North American Act, and we will have enough to guide ourselves. There is another reason. I said in the beginning that when Confederation was created, it was understood everywhere that sufficient resources would be given to the Local Governments to accomplish their share in Confederation. This Act that we passed has been declared by the Treasurer of one Province—I am not sure whether it has not been declared by the treasurers of two Provinces—that it will diminish the Provincial revenues by over $100,000 a year. We know that the Confederation Act, which is as perfect as a human thing may be, yet contains some little mistakes. We did not foresee that the revenues of the Local Government would diminish, and their expenses increase, and we all know that since 1867 that has been going on, and that to-day some of the Provinces are not in a position to educate their people, to keep up their reformatory schools, gaols and asylums, to open colonization roads or do their share in the work of Confederation. This is the time not to take away any of their resources but to give them more. This Act takes away from their resources. Is that in the name of autonomy and devotion to the Local Governments? It may be, but I admit that I cannot understand it at all in that way. But they say we will give give back the penalties or we will not exact them. Let there be one or two suits by municipalities, let there be some two or three hundred thousand dollars expended, and then we will come before this Parliament and say refund that please. Well, I would have preferred an amendment which I was expecting declaring this law would be suspended for one or two years. There is one legislation I would prefer in the name of our love for the Local Parliaments. I would like this Parliament to say that as there may be a doubt in the Confederation Act, we will give voluntarily to the Local Provinces all the powers we can pretend to have. That would be a proof of devotion to the local autonomy of the Provinces that we could understand. The object of the Bill, we are told, is to make the laws uniform. But if I mistake not this would be legislative union. What do we mean by legislative union if not that the laws of all the Provinces and of every part of the Dominion should be uniform. But that is not what we want; Ontario does not want her laws to be like ours, nor do we want ours to be like hers. We have been born and brought up with certain laws, we are in the habit of living in a certain way, and we do not want to change; so that is no reason for us to pass that law, and if we consented last year it was because the Government declared that without it there would be anarchy. To-day, however, that reason has disappeared. Uniformity—well, if you want it for liquor licenses, you will want it for nearly every one of the powers given by the 92nd section of the Act. You will want it for the lands; you will want it for the gaols. For the gaols it would appear more plausible. Those who go into the gaols have been generally condemned under the laws of the Dominion. There would be more reason then to say: as they have been guilty under the general law, we should make all the gaols uniform. Though power has been given to each Province in reference to municipalities, would it be just to say that all the municipalities will be under the same system? But we do not want it. We want our own system. Every Province wants its own system. Then, as to the incorporation of companies, how often have I not heard in this House and in the Private Bills Committee, we must pass this Incorporation Bill of a local society, because it will give universal law, general law, in every part of the Dominion for it? But the answer is that every local Province wants to have its own incorporation of companies, wants to regulate that itself, as it pleases. And then, there is the solemnization of marriage, would we want also a uniform law in that? What would be the object? All that would tend to a Legislative Union, and that is what we do not want, and we will not have it, and as long as we may oppose it, we will oppose it. I am sure the sentiment of this country at large is formed well enough for that. I think we may live happily under the Confederation if it is properly interpreted, if the rights of every Province are kept, if each one stands within its own jurisdiction and there is no infringement; but, if there is infringement, if the door is opened to that, if there is not sufficient resistance, if we begin in the evil path once, we do not know where it will end, we will be exposed to constant danger in regard to Confederation, and the happiness and prosperity of Confederation will disappear fatally. We do not know where it will end: perhaps it might end not in the way that all those great patriots who established Confederation were then dreaming and hoping. We have been told—I speak of it only incidentally, and to answer it—that the title is nothing, "Excellency," or "Honour," or "Gentleman," or gentleman-barber I suppose—that makes no difference! Well, I have not been brought up in that idea. I think under the British Crown titles are something, because they come from the Crown—the source, the fountain of all dignity—and the nearer a man is to the Crown the higher generally is his title. We are not here a republic; I am not going to discuss whether we should be or not, but we are under the British Flag, and we like it, we like to live under that flag and under that Crown; and I say that under that Crown a title is something, and I am most happy to see in this House, gentlemen, our compatriots, who have been leading a life honourable, intelligent and patriotic enough to have deserved those titles. I see some on both sides of the House, and I am only desirous to see

all whom I see in my presence on both sides who deserve it, receive titles as soon as possible. The more titles we have and the better titles we have on this continent, the better it is for the tie with the British Empire. It is to be deplored that the British Crown was not advised that, in giving a title to the Lieutenant-Governors, they should have given the same title of "His Excellency" as to the Governor-General. The reason is obvious. The Lieutenant-Governor represents the Queen; so does the Governor-General. He is not appointed in the same way, it is true, but when appointed he represents the Queen. Why is he not as excellent as the other? He has not the same attribution, he has not the same matters to deal with; true, but, in every matter dealt with by the Local Government, he acts as authoritatively as the Governor General when he acts under the Federal authority. So both are entitled to the title of "His Excellency," and it is to be deplored, from a conservative point of view and from the point of view of British respect, British institutions, these title have not been given. I had not intended to speak of that, and only do so because certain words have been spoken about it. I could not allow them to pass without saying from a conservative point of view what I think of titles. The most important objection, I think, urged by the Minister of Public Works is this—it is true that in the Russell case there was a judgment, and it is true that in the Hodge case there was another judgment, but, he says, on this liquor Act there was no judgment. Well, are we going in every act of our life to go before the Court and say: "I want a judgment!" When it is decided that a promissory note signed in such a way is valid, are all those who have to pay similar promissory notes to go before the Courts and say: "I want a judgment before paying!" When there is a judgment that has a general bearing, that says the laws passed by such and such a Province are constitutional, legal, and valid, when that judgment is given by the highest authority of the land, why is it necessary to go back? We said here last Session that these laws were not valid. All right for the time being. Since that, we have a judgment which decides that these laws of the Local Legislatures are valid. We cannot presume that the Privy Council will stultify itself. It has given its decision as clearly as possible. Why is it necessary to go back and say: "Was your statement in the Hodge case true? Did you study your case? Are you sure you are not mistaken?" That is the position we take in my humble opinion. That is my humble way of looking at it. I give my reasons humbly and frankly as I think I should do before this honourable House. I hope, with the mover of the Address, that this will be left an open question, but, open or not, I cannot disguise my opinion; I had to tell you what I think about the question, more especially when the question is one that affects the vitality of the Confederation itself.

Mr. FLEMING. When the License Act of 1883 was under the consideration of this House last year, I had the honour to draw the attention of the House to a proposition to which I beg to draw the attention of the House again. On the motion for the third reading of the Bill, I had the honour to propose in amendment:

"That the Provincial Legislatures have since Confederation exercised legislative powers in the regulation of the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and the hours and certain other incidents of the sale; that the Appeal Courts of Ontario and Quebec have each decided in favour of the exercise by the Provinces of the Dominion of this jurisdiction, and the Appeal Court has further determined that the judgment of the Privy Council in Russell and the Queen does not decide that the Provincial Legislatures have not this jurisdiction; that the questions involved are now under the consideration of the Supreme Court of Canada and will shortly be brought under the consideration of the Privy Council; that the Parliament of Canada should not assume jurisdiction as proposed by the said Bill until the question has been settled by the court of last resort."

In view of what has transpired since that motion was proposed, I submit that it would have been prudent for this House then to have adopted it, because I see to-day that the hon. Minister of Public Works is proposing for the consideration of this House something very like what was proposed then, because after that proposition was rejected and after the License Act was adopted, the Privy Council has given the decision which that motion indicated, and that decision is to the effect that the Provincial Legislatures had the jurisdiction which they had exercised since Confederation. Now, Sir, there is nobody in this House who will undertake to say that the late decision of the Privy Council in Hodge and the Queen is not a decision assuring full power to the Provincial Legislatures for dealing fully with shop and tavern licenses, and for the complete regulation of the liquor traffic. But, Sir, it appears to me that in that state of the law, and with these facts before us, we ought at once to retrace the steps that were taken last year under a mistaken notion of what the law was, because at that time this House assumed that the previous decision in Russell and the Queen was to the effect that the Provincial Legislatures had not the jurisdiction which they had exercised since Confederation. I notice in the observations made by the hon. Minister of Public Works to this House that he says that the Act of last Session was not the Act of the Government, but the Act of the Committee; yet this House took its law from the Government; this House took its law from the declaration contained in the Speech from the Throne; this House took its law from the First Minister when he declared that there was a stern necessity for the interference of this Parliament, otherwise there would be unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors throughout the Dominion. Now, Sir, that was clearly a mistake. The hon. First Minister had, at the opening of this Session, admitted himself that it was a mistake. It was not then the fact that there would be the unrestrained traffic in intoxicating liquors unless this Parliament interfered. That reason for the legislation of last Session has been removed, and if there were that determination, that desire which is declared by hon. gentlemen in this House, to allow to the Provinces the exercise of those rights which they always have exercised—those rights which the people of all the Provinces supposed they had a right to exercise when they entered into this Confederation contract—if there were that desire upon the part of members, they would rejoice at this opportunity of retracing the steps that were taken last Session. But, Sir, I am sorry to say that there is a disposition in some quarters, at least, to assert a jurisdiction—not on the ground of necessity, not for the reason that was put forward last year for the interference of this Parliament, not because the Provinces have not plenary power in this respect—but we are asked to adopt the amendment to the hon. member's Resolution for the purpose of ascertaining if perchance some court cannot give power to another Legislature than the one we always supposed had that power. Now, Sir, is that the policy? The Act of last Session recognized the propriety, if the First Minister's law had been right, of this Parliament interfering. I doubted that law at the time, but of course I would not presume to put my opinion against the opinion of the First Minister on a constitutional question. However, it does appear that even great constitutional lawyers may sometimes be mistaken in the law. If we had a declaration now from the First Minister, and from the Minister of Public Works, that they would gladly give the Provincial Legislatures that jurisdiction which nearly everybody in this Dominion—because I except the hon. First Minister—believed that they had a right to exercise, then I could conceive that the Government here were doing something to remove the suspicion that exists in some minds, at all events, that this Government and this Parliament are encroaching in every possible way upon the autonomy and jurisdiction of the separate Legislatures. But, Sir, what is proposed? Last year we were told by the First Minister in the debate upon the

Address that this subject was not willingly taken up by the present Government; we were told that the law as it obtains in the different Provinces should continue. Are they satisfied to-day that the laws in the separate Provinces should continue? If they are satisfied that the laws of the different Provinces should continue, then we will find them supporting the Resolution of the hon. member. I proceed to read:

"They were quite satisfied that each Province should, so far as the law would allow it, enact such Statutes and deal with the subject of shop, tavern, and saloon licenses. Neither the Government nor the Parliament of Canada, I take it, wishes to interfere; and it was only when the decision which was given in June last on the Scott Act, a Dominion Act, and the subject was forced upon them, that they thought it their duty to bring it before Parliament."

Sir, it was because of the decision in Russell and the Queen, or at least their interpretation of that decision, that they thought themselves burdened with the duty of interfering in this matter. The subsequent decision has removed that burden from their shoulders. Do we see any signs of relief when the burden is removed? Do we see any sign of rejoicing because that burden is taken away? If we do, we will find the hon. gentleman standing up and supporting the Resolution moved by the hon. member. I proceed to read further:

"I never had any doubt that when the question was brought before the courts, it would be decided that the different Provincial Legislatures had no right whatever to deal with that subject, except for revenue *purposes—for the purpose of imposing taxation for provincial or municipal purposes.* I expressed the opinion in Parliament years ago, and last year I expressed it at a public meeting in Toronto, or its vicinity. But while that opinion was strongly impressed upon my mind I took no steps, nor did the Government of which I was a member take any steps, for the purpose of interfering with the legislation of the different Provinces, or forcing Dominion legislation on the country, or trying to centralize such powers in this Parliament."

What is the position of the hon. gentleman to-day? Last year under the plea of necessity this Bill was passed; this year when that necessity is removed, when there is no longer any necessity, to use the words of the hon. gentleman himself, to "centralize power in this Parliament," in what position does he stand? Is it a position to dispute the suggestions made that the Government are endeavouring to centralize power? Is it a position to declare his satisfaction that there is no necessity for centralization? I fear that the attitude taken by the hon. gentleman is not the attitude we would expect from the declarations he made last year. It was solely on the plea of necessity that this House was asked to interfere last year. It was solely on the plea of necessity, I submit, that a great many members consented to interfere last year. I am satisfied from the speeches to which we have just listened that hon. members in this House supported legislation last year because they took their law from the First Minister and believed there was necessity for interference. But even the hon. gentleman's law must be admitted to be superseded by the law laid down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that removes from every hon. member the necessity, if such a necessity exists, of subordinating his own opinion as to what is the true policy in the interests of the country or what is the law, to the opinions of the First Minister. So the matter stands at present. There is now no necessity and no reason why the rights which the Provinces held dear, which the Provinces when they entered Confederation declared they held dear, should be interfered with. Sir, what was the stipulation on the part of the Provinces? The hon. Minister of Public Works in words, which I was proud to hear, as a member of this House, declared that he being present in London at the time of the passing of the Confederation Act, would not have remained a single hour if any of the rights of the Provinces had been attempted to be taken away. When the Parliament of Canada passed an address to the Imperial Parliament asking for the Confederation of the Provinces, among the subjects that were declared to be exclusively within provincial jurisdiction, which the people of the Provinces of Canada expressly claimed they should still continue to exercise separate and provincial jurisdiction over, was this very subject of shop and tavern licenses. I have before me the words of the original address passed by the Parliament of Canada on February 3rd, 1865. Section 43 of that address, sub-section 12, says;

"The Local Legislature shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects:—11. Municipal institutions. 12. Shops, saloon, tavern, auctioneer and other licenses."

There are no words in the original address in anyway limiting the power of the Local Legislatures with respect to those subjects. But it is claimed now that the words which were introduced into the Act in England—words added to the original declaration—"for provincial and municipal revenues,"—it is claimed that those words have the effect of limiting the Provincial jurisdiction to the power of exercising authority on those subjects for revenue purposes only. I should like to have asked the hon. Minister of Public Works, if he had been in his place, this question categorically: If when he consented as a delegate from Canada to the addition of those words in the Act, he had any idea that he was taking away any of the powers contained in the original address of the Provinces? I am satisfied he would answer me, as he did state to-day, that he had no such idea; that it never was in the contemplation of the framers of the Confederation Act that they would depart from the text of the original contract and original address and engraft upon the Imperial Act words that would limit the jurisdiction of the Provinces—that jurisdiction which the Provinces in their address to the Imperial Parliament had declared they desired to continue to exercise. But, Sir, we are told to-day that the License Act of last Session has not been tested in the Courts, and that the decision in the case of the Queen *vs.* Hodge was not a decision on the validity of that Act. That was not the question here last year when we were asked to pass the Liquor License Act. I have already indicated the ground upon which the Government asked the House to interfere. We are asked to go further. The Court has not declared that the Act of last Session was *ultra vires*, and therefore we are to ask the Court to declare whether it is or not, and in the meantime we are to suspend all penalties under the Act until a decision is obtained. Was ever a Parliament asked to assume so humiliating a position? An Act of Parliament solemnly passed, after long consideration, is the subject of so much doubt as to its legality that all its penalties must be suspended—in fact if its whole operation was suspended it would commend itself more to my judgment—but its penalties are to be suspended, its *validity is to be questioned* and submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and in the meantime we are asked to retain on our Statute Books an Act of Parliament for which even the First Minister will not say there is any necessity, until we have obtained a declaration from the Courts as to whether it is constitutional or not. I was sorry to hear that the hon. Minister of Public Works departed, as I thought, from the solemn dignity of the debate in an attempt to answer the almost unanswerable, yes, the unanswerable, speech of the mover of this Resolution. In the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman took up some of the small incidental subjects which were touched upon and dealt with them at very considerable length—in fact he occupied the greater portion of his time in dealing with them. I propose briefly to address myself to those points, not because I think they are of any importance, but because they show that the hon. Minister felt that the arguments used by the hon. gentleman who moved this Resolution could not be answered in any other way. The hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) mentioned as an incidental not that the Provincial jurisdic-

tion and the autonomy of the Provinces were disregarded—relegated to an inferior position. He mentioned as an incidental fact that in the table of precedence the advisers of the Crown in the several Provinces were put after members of this House. Now that had nothing to do really with the argument of the hon. gentleman. It was merely introduced incidentally to show that the tendency was to elevate to an undue position members of this Parliament, and relegate to an inferior position the advisers of the Crown in the different Legislatures. And when the Minister of Public Works dealt so long upon this small part of the argument, it proved to me, at all events, that the great constitutional questions underlying the argument of the hon. gentleman were such as could not be successfully answered in the face of a free people, desiring to exercise that freedom which the British Constitution has secured to them, and which we thought, and still think, the British North America Act secures to us.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FLEMING. When this House rose at six o'clock I had drawn attention to the original address presented by the Parliament of Canada to the Imperial Parliament upon which the Confederation Act, which is now the constitution of this Dominion, was based. I stated then that I regretted the absence from his seat of the Minister of Public Works, because I desired to know from him if, when in London, he had believed he was taking away from the Provincial jurisdiction any of the powers which were contracted for in that address by consenting to the words which were added by the Imperial Parliament, and are now a part of the British North America Act. The Confederation I then stated was based upon an agreement made between the Provinces, and formulated in the form of an address passed by the Parliament of Canada. I pointed out that in that address the contracting parties had expressly stipulated that the Local Legislatures should retain the power which the Provinces had theretofore exercised with regard to shop and tavern licenses; that the words in the address were that "the Local Legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects," among others, "shop, saloon, tavern, auctioneer, and other licenses." Those are the only words contained in the address on this subject. Now if I rightly understand the position of the opponents of Provincial jurisdiction they contend that the words added in the Act in sub-section nine of section 92, making it read as follows: "Saloon, tavern, auctioneer and other licenses, in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes," limit the jurisdiction. I said I rejoiced to hear the words spoken by the hon. Minister of Public Works when he declared that he would not remain a single hour in London if any of the powers stipulated for on behalf of the Provinces had been attempted to be taken away by Imperial legislation. I stated that if he had then been in his place, I would have put the question to him whether he supposed, at the time the Act was being passed, that the addition of these words did limit the Provincial jurisdiction? I beg now to call the hon. gentleman's attention to that question, and I would like to have an answer from him. The hon. gentleman does not condescend to give an answer. I assumed from the words he uttered in the House to-day, that he did not suppose he was taking away any part of the Provincial jurisdiction; and I presume that that is his position still, although he declines to give an answer The answer might perhaps prove embarrassing, if the policy which is foreshadowed by the attitude of the Government to-day is to be carried out. Now, Sir, before recess I drew attention to the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and now I beg to direct the attention of the House to its *ipsissima verba*. It is proposed to ask this House to say that in its opinion it is expedient that the question of the competence of Parliament to pass the Liquor License Act of 1883 should be submitted with all convenient speed to the Supreme Court of Canada, or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or both. Now, I submit that before the House is asked to adopt that proposition, it ought to be informed what is the intention of the Government regarding that submission. Is it the intention of the Government to submit the question to the Supreme Court under the powers given to the Government by the Supreme Court Act? Is it the intention of the Government to have a case between the Government and some individual who may infringe on the provisions of this Act, submitted to the Courts? Is it the intention of the Government to introduce, as one of the contestants in such a case, the Provincial Government of any of the Provinces of this Dominion; or is it the intention of the Government, of their own motion, to submit a case without argument to the decision of either one or other of the courts? This House is entitled to some information on this subject; because if it is the intention of the Government to submit this question under the powers conferred upon them by the Supreme Court Act, then there is no appeal from such a decision; and that decision would not be a final one, because a case might arise afterwards, from the infringement of the Act by a private individual, which would proceed from the provincial tribunal direct to the Privy Council, without the intervention of the Supreme Court of Canada; and it might be that the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on the case submitted by the Government would be overruled by the court of last resort in England. But, Sir, it is proposed that a case shall be submitted by the Government to either one or other of the Courts without the intervention of counsel on the part of those who are opposing Federal interference. Is it to be understood by the House before they commit themselves to this proposition that the whole thing is to be left in the hands of the Government, and that the Government, with the desire which seems to be manifested to retain this new jurisdiction, shall have the whole control of the preparation and the argument of this case before either one or other of the Courts? Is it proposed by the Government that it shall be submitted alone to the Supreme Court? Is it proposed that it shall be submitted alone to the Privy Council? Or is it intended that the case shall go before both of these tribunals? There can be no final decision of this question until it is disposed of by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Now, Sir, suppose the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as the court of final resort, should determine that this Act is within the competence of this Parliament? Sir, if it should so find, I for one will never concede that as a part of public policy that decision should be sought. I for one contend that this Act should be repealed, irrespective of the question of its legality. I take that higher ground. I have not attempted to argue it upon the legal ground; that is the lower ground. I argue it upon the ground of public policy; and as this question involves the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures over a matter in which they have exercised jurisdiction for the last 17 years, I hold that it is inexpedient, it is impolitic, it is dangerous to the best welfare of this country to interfere with that jurisdiction. I believe that when the Parliament of Canada in the year 1865 sent its address to the Imperial Parliament asking that Municipal institutions, and the control of shop and tavern licenses should be retained in the jurisdiction of the Provinces, the people of Canada intended that that jurisdiction should there remain. I believe that the people of Canada universally understood, when the Imperial Act passed, that that jurisdiction was secured to the Provincial Legislatures. I believe that no one had a desire to question that jurisdiction, and I accept

the statement made by the hon. leader of the Government last Session, that although he had questioned the right of the Local Legislatures for the last 17 years, yet he never had interfered or desired to interfere until a necessity pressed him to do so. I believe that the people of this country who stipulated for this jurisdiction will not part with it without a struggle; because if we stand by and part with this privilege of our Provincial Legislatures, to-morrow a new aggression may be made upon us. We do not know where this aggression may stop. We may find by-and-by that the rights for which the people of this country contended previous to Confederation will be gradually taken away. We may awake some day to find that an aggrandizing Parliament at Ottawa has assumed jurisdiction over those local affairs which the people of Canada stipulated should be subject to local control when they consented to Confederation. I beg to direct the attention of the House to the language of the Hon. Chief Justice Spragge, of the Court of Appeal of Ontario, in the case of the Queen *vs.* Hodge:

"One other consideration presents itself which is, to my mind, conclusive. This matter of licensing and of the regulation of places and persons licensed pertains to municipal institutions, and is moreover of a local nature. Now, the making of laws in relation to both these objects being committed exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures, and legislation by any other power being thereby excluded, it follows that the British North America Act operates to withdraw from legislative control by any power or body whatever, the licensing and regulation of places and persons licensed; powers, in regard to which, they have hitherto unquestionably exercised. The effect in that case would be more and other than a distribution of legislative power. It would be an extinction of legislative power in regard to subjects which up to Confederation had been the subjects of Provincial legislation."

Now, I ask are the hon. members of this House—are the people of this country willing that there should be an extinction of the objects and the powers of Provincial legislation that were exercised by the Provinces previous to Confederation? What is the corner stone of this Confederation? What was the struggle which resulted in the compact that brought about Confederation? Was it not, on the one hand and on the other, a struggle for local control over local affairs? Local legislation and local control over local affairs is the key-stone of Confederation, and if you remove that key-stone—if you encroach upon its power—if you impair its efficiency, you are sapping the foundations of this grand Federal system of which the people of Canada are so proud. But I apprehend that possibly we may hear voices in this House declaring that this Act should be retained upon the Statute Book because it is an advance, in some respects, on previous legislation in the Provinces. I apprehend that possibly we may hear voices in this House declare that this Federal Parliament ought to interfere because they have put restrictions on the liquor traffic more severe in some of the Provinces than the Provincial Legislatures had put upon it. Last session, although I protested against the passage of this Act, as an interference with provincial jurisdiction, on every motion that was proposed to put greater restrictions on the liquor traffic, I voted for the greater restrictions. I do not pretend to be a temperance reformer, but, at the same time, I do say that whatever legislation may tend to put greater restriction on that traffic, whatever advance hon. gentlemen may propose in the way of restriction on that traffic, will have the support of my voice and vote; but there are dearer rights than any of the rights attempted to be secured by such advanced legislation. There are the rights of the people of the Provinces to deal with the affairs that are their own. There is an attempt on the part of this Parliament—I do not say a designed attempt because I desire to conduct this discussion dispassionately—but there is an attempt on the part of Parliament to interfere with what has hitherto been regarded by everybody as one of the powers which the Provincial Legislatures could alone exercise—an attemp attacking what is a dearer right than any power, a dearer right than any privilege, or than any advanced legislation in the direction of temperance, which this Parliament could pass, because this Parliament, if it passes that legislation to-day, may impose retrograding legislation upon any of the Provinces to-morrow; and we will be giving up the power o deal with a subject which, with others, is one of social order and Municipal government, peace and order of society among us. Now, Sir, I propose to revert to the question which I asked the leader of the Government at the outset of my remarks, and to remind him that this legislation was introduced last session upon the plea of necessity. His own declaration was that this was not a matter of policy but a matter of necessity. I ask now is it a matter of policy or is it a matter of necessity? The Privy Council has decided that it is no longer a matter of necessity; it therefore becomes now a matter of policy; and let us understand, face to face with this question—let there be no hedging about or hood-winking—let us understand whether it is to be the policy of this Parliament to interfere in a matter which, but last Session, it was declared could alone be interfered with on the ground of necessity. If that is to be the policy of the Government let us understand that that is the attitude to be taken by the Government, and I shall have great satisfaction is arraying myself side by side with the hon. member who moved this resolution and the hon. member for Bellechasse and the other hon. members in this House who are supporting this Federal compact. If this is to be a matter of policy, then I say this is a question above all other party issues. It is a question on which those who are faithful to the Federal compact, who desire that this country should grow up under a Federal system, should declare themselves hostile to any attempt on the part of Parliament to render, in fact, the Government of this country a Legislative Union, and I shall have great pleasure in joining the new party, the Federal party of this country, and in associating myself with the hon. gentlemen who have supported this resolution opposing every encroachment on the rights which have hitherto been exercised by the Provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. BOSSÉ. (Translation.) I desire, Mr. Speaker, to explain and justify, in as few words as possible, the vote that I am about to give on the present question. I believe that the real question we have to decide is not the one which has been discussed up to this moment——

Some hon. MEMBER. *In English.*

Mr. BOSSÉ. I am only too glad, Mr. Speaker, out of deference and courtesy to the hon. member, whoever he may be, to address the House in a language less familiar to me than French is. I would at the same time most cordially invite him to follow our example. We have studied, and we have learned to a certain extent, English, in order to be able to converse more freely with our English speaking friends, and, inviting him as I do to follow our example, I am sure that, if hon. gentlemen do so, and if they learn French, they will find very many compensations. Perhaps, our intercourse being freer and easier, we will learn to know each other better, and by-and-by, in a short time I would hope, we will not—we French Canadians—be bandied from one side to the other as something very terrible, something to be very much dreaded indeed, but we would be sought for our own qualities and for our own merits. I was about to state that I intended merely to qualify, to explain, and to justify the vote which I am about to give. The question before the House does not seem to me to be the question which has been up to the present time discussed. We are not here upon the motion now before the House, to decide whether or not the License Act of 1883 is *ultra vires*, unconstitutional, or whether it is constitutional. That question, I take it, with the present state of things, must be decided by another tribunal than this. It is very much to be regretted, and we must admit

with regret on all hands, that this question, as many other questions under the British North America Act, is far from being free from difficulty. Numerous judgments of our various courts are contradictory upon the same question. Several of those questions have been adjudicated upon by those courts, where we find the best men and the best Judges of the land have adjudicated upon them in contradictory ways. We, ourselves, in this House, are perhaps the best examples of the difficulty of applying and explaining the different sections of the Act, especially, and perhaps more than all, those which relate to this License Act. A year ago, or during last Session, it was thought by many that the decision of the Privy Council in the case of Russell and the Queen was decisive as to this question. Some did not think so, but this House took it for granted, at the time, that that case settled this question. Since, another case, that of Hodge, so much spoken of lately, seems to show that the case of Russell and the Queen did not decide the first point. Are we now, without further authority from the Privy Council, to take it for granted that this case of Hodge decides, and decides finally, the whole of the License Act, and decides it in such a way that we, the House of Commons of Canada, after having, barely ten months ago, adopted the Licence Act, will, upon the authority of that case alone, declare that the whole of the Act is unconstitutional, that this House has passed an unconstitutional law, and are we going to revoke it without further trial and without seeking further where in reality is the truth. It has been said that no decisions have been had upon the Act of 1883. I personally know of two in the city of Quebec, in cases in which I was personally engaged, and in which two of our Judges, one of them one of the most eminent Judges of our Superior Court, have declared that the law of 1883, the License Act, was constitutional, and it was applied by them in their judgment as being a constitutional law. In the face of those facts, I ask again, are we to take it upon ourselves, exercising our own judgment, to declare that the law is unconstitutional, and recall what we passed ten months ago as being constitutional? If the question had been squarely and fairly put, if we were called upon to declare whether or not this law is constitutional, I am free to say that I, for one, would have been inclined to vote in the negative, and to say that our Act of 1878, in the Province of Quebec, that the Ontario Act mentioned in the Hodge case, were both within the limits of the powers of the Local Legislatures; but the question now before us is not that. The question before us is one of expediency. We have facing us the very great difficulties I mentioned a moment ago, the conflicting judgments, the diversity of opinions not only in this House but all over the country. How are we best to remedy this? Are we to allow the difficulty to continue by simply abolishing the Act of 1883? Are we to leave the courts of justice open to all the litigants? Are we to witness the array, the interminable array, of lawsuits that will result from that state of things? Or are we to go back to the Constitution and find, under our Federal Act, the remedy to be applied to cases like this one, which have been foreseen by that Federal Act? Up to this time, we find reported cases under that Federal Act which fill two large volumes. They will go on growing and growing until some remedy is found—I am wrong in saying until some remedy is found, for the remedy is already found—but until that remedy is applied as it ought to be applied. We find in other countries that remedy or a remedy very similar applied to similar cases. The Court of Cassation in France was established by the sittings of all the Chambers of that Court, to decide questions differently decided by the different courts of the country. They pronounce what they call *arrêts de réglement* and these *arrêts* decide on the questions in dispute and establish what the law is upon each of these points. That court has been established one or two years, after the Code.

Mr. FLEMING.

Code Napoleon has been in existence for nearly a century, and the Court has settled very numerous questions, and still settles at this day new questions which have not arisen before. Are we to believe that when we have to deal with the whole Constitution of our country, with the relative rights of the Provinces between themselves, and with the relative rights of Provinces with the Dominion, that the questions arising will be either not numerous or not important? They certainly will be very numerous, and they have been, and will of necessity always be, very important, for the simple reason that each of them touches the very heart of our Constitution. Therefore, lawsuits will be numerous, and they will be conducted with a vigour such as might be expected from the nature of the cases. Therefore, I say that under these circumstances, the road seems to be clearly indicated for us, and that instead of encouraging continued lawsuits, we ought to refer the question to the court which is pointed out by our Constitution as being the tribunal to decide and to decide finally, these questions. But, Sir, I must say that I, for one, and I am sure many others, would not rest satisfied with only a judgment of the Supreme Court upon these questions. Rightly or wrongly, I will not say which, our people have become accustomed to consider the judgments of the Supreme Court as not having all the value they ought, perhaps, to have on questions of this nature; they have been accustomed to look for the authority of a higher tribunal, and I take it that in questions of this nature, especially, the authority of a higher tribunal ought to be sought. But besides, if we only refer the question to the Supreme Court the result would be practically useless, for the very simple reason that the opinion given by the Judges of the Supreme Court would not prevent litigants from seeking a remedy before the ordinary courts of law. From these courts appeals would be taken to the Court of Appeal, from the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court, and from that Court to the Privy Council where, perhaps, the original opinion of the Judges of the Supreme Court might not be confirmed, and where, perhaps, a decision contrary to that opinion might be obtained. Therefore, I say, as a matter of public convenience, as a measure of necessity, if we want to arrive at something definite, a recourse to the Privy Council must be adopted. Then the question could be virtually decided, and, acting constitutionally, under the tenets and according to the precepts of the Confederation Act, avoiding the difficulties and expense of prolonged lawsuits, we would obtain once for all a decision to be followed. I say again, Sir, that the mode suggested is all the more advantageous, because from this time up to the date of the decision which we are to expect in the Privy Council, all the rights of the Provinces will be maintained and will not be infringed upon. The Local Governments will collect their revenue, the licenses will not be interfered with by the Federal authorities, and the result, practically and virtually, will be the suspension of the License Act of the Dominion until such time as the question is settled.

Mr. LAURIER. In view of what has been stated by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé) I must refer to the language which was made use of last year by the Government and contrast it with their language of to-day. It is within the recollection of everybody, and has been mentioned several times to-day, that last year the Government proposed this legislation, which it is now sought to repeal, under the absolute plea of necessity. The Prime Minister stated that there was no law to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors; that all the laws which have been passed by the Provinces were null and void, and that at any moment any man could open a shop, and there was no power on earth to prevent him from selling liquor. In view of the attitude

taken by my hon. friend, the words of the First Minister, though they have been already quoted in this debate, will bear repetition. The Prime Minister then said :

"That subject was not willingly undertaken by the present Government. They were quite satisfied that the law, as it obtains in the different Provinces, should be continued. They were quite satisfied that each Province should, so far as the law would allow it to enact such Statutes, deal with the subject of shop, tavern and saloon licenses."

Then later, the right hon. gentleman, speaking of the decision in Russell and the Queen, said :

"Sir, if there be any value in that decision, and there is every value in it, because it is the law of the land, there is no check at the present moment, in the Province of Ontario, against the unlimited, unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. This is not a matter we can play with. It is not a matter of policy; it is a matter of necessity. If we wish to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors we must legislate immediately; for I take it, that any man in this city or in any part of Ontario, can open his saloon and sell liquors, and there is not a court in the world can prevent his doing so."

Mr. Speaker, this was very strong language, and it was owing to this language that that law was put upon the Statute Book. It is within the knowledge of many members of this House that it was with the greatest reluctance that many supporters of the Government, especially those representing Quebec constituencies, voted for that law. They looked upon it as an infringement upon the rights of the Provinces, they looked upon it as an infringement of the powers which rightly belong to the Provinces. But when they were told by so high a constitutional authority as the Premier of this Dominion that all the laws which had hitherto regulated the trade in liquors, were null and void, that the Provinces had absolutely no power to legislate upon this matter, that the only power to legislate upon this matter resided with this Parliament, that any man could open a shop and sell without restraint, the consequences were appalling, and the prospect was such that they yielded to those considerations and enacted that law. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction, that had it not been for the strong language used by the Prime Minister, had he not given it as his deliberate opinion—and his opinion was entitled to great credit—that the Provinces had no right to legislate upon this matter, this Bill would never have become law. But his authority was great with his followers. It was so great that it induced a great many of his followers to vote for that Bill, against what they believed to be the best interests of the Provinces. There can be no doubt, in view of what has since transpired, that that obnoxious legislation has been obtained, as it were, under false pretences. There can be no doubt that the opinion then expressed by the First Minister was wrong. It is now judicially established that the Provinces have the power to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors. This cannot be longer disputed. No one can say, in view of the decision rendered in the case of Hodge, that the Provinces have not the power to regulate the liquor traffic. On the contrary, the decision has been rendered upon that very point—it was the only question submitted to the Privy Council, and upon that very point the Privy Council has rendered a decision which is clear and manifest; and the decision is to this effect, that the regulation of the liquor traffic is within the powers assigned under the Constitution to the Provinces. It seems to me that under such circumstances, when the Government declared last year that the only motive which impelled them to legislate was the simple fact that the Provinces had no power to legislate, that they would have been satisfied to leave the matter within their control. They should declare to the House that they have been in error and will restore that power to the Provinces. That course would seem to be obviously the correct one; yet what do we see? Do we see the Government rising in their places and saying: We thought the Provinces had no power, but now we see that the Provinces have the power? No; they say we want to test whether we have not the same power as is possessed by the Provinces. That is the position taken. I venture to say this: the true inwardness of this legislation is not to be found in Ministerial explanations or in the language of Ministers, but it is to be found in the Conservative press of Ontario. Anyone who has followed the Conservative press of Ontario for the last few years is aware that since the granting of licenses has been placed in the hands of Commissioners appointed by the Provincial Government, complaints have been loud and frequent against that system. Complaints have been loud and frequent that the commissioners were partizans.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I see the complaints are even repeated in this House. I believe that the true inwardness is not only to be found in the Conservative press of Ontario, but also in the following of the First Minister from Ontario. If we have this law placed on the Statute Book, it is simply because these complaints have been loud and many. I am sure that every disappointed tavern keeper who has been refused a license has declared that it was because he belonged to the Conservative party; that every low and dissolute man whose application was refused, did not place the reason at his own door, but at the door of the Commissioners, and complain that the reason accusations were brought against him was because he was a Tory. The reason we have this measure is simply for party gain and advantage. It is to have the issue of licenses placed in the hands of Commissioners appointed by the Conservative Government. I believe if it were not for that consideration we would not have had this law. The placing of the present law on the Statute Book is, in my opinion, an attack on the powers of the Provinces. What is the amendment moved by the Minister of Public Works? It reads as follows :—

"That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the question of the competency of Parliament to pass the Liquor License Act of 1883, should be submitted, with all convenient speed, to the Supreme Court of Canada or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or both."

Why is this amendment moved, I ask? Is there any doubt as to the power of the Provinces to legislate upon this matter? I could conceive the propriety of the amendment, if it were still an open question as to whether the power to regulate the liquor traffic belongs to the Provinces or to the Dominion. That was the question last year. But this year, in view of the decision rendered in the case of Hodge, can it be doubted any more, is it not in fact determined, that the Provinces at this moment have power to regulate the trade. Is it not now a certain fact that all the legislation passed by the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec is law within the respective Provinces. But the aim of the Government, which last year would have been satisfied to let the matter rest with the Provinces, now wish it to be tested whether they themselves had not also the power which the Provinces possess. What is the question involved in the amendment? It is to determine whether the Act passed last Session is law or not I say, and I submit it to my colleagues, from Quebec especially, that the amendment is an assault on the rights of the Provinces. We have this fact on the one hand, which should not be lost sight of, that at this moment and according to the decision in the case of Hodge, the legislation of the Province is law. If the amendment is carried, what will be the result? We will have the question submitted to the Privy Council as to whether the Act passed by the Dominion is not also law. It has been well argued by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) that the power to legislate upon this matter cannot be confirmed. If it rests with the Provinces it cannot rest with the Dominion, and *vice versa*. It is now determined that it rests with the Provinces. Suppose the question which it is intended to submit to the Privy Council be

answered in the affirmative, and judgment be rendered that the law passed by the Dominion last year is valid and within the power of the Dominion Parliament—what then? The consequence will be that we shall have a double power, having authority to deal with this matter—the power already admitted as being possessed by the Provinces, and that which would exist in the Dominion. Then we would have two powers legislating concurrently in this matter—the Dominion power and the Provincial power. If the Dominion has power to legislate in this matter and the Provinces have the power also to so legislate, what will be the consequence? The consequence will be that the legislation of the Dominion Government will over-ride the legislation of the Provinces, and the powers which the Provinces now exercise must diminish. It is quite manifest that if this law, which it is intended to refer to the Privy Council, is not an attribution of the Dominion, what would be the consequence? We would have two concurrent powers to legislate over this matter, and what would the consequence be? The consequence must necessarily be that the power of the Provinces would be curtailed by so much, that all the legislation which now exists in Ontario, Quebec, and the other Provinces of the Dominion, would be over-ridden by this law, and the laws which are now administered by the Provinces, to the benefit of those Provinces, would be superseded by the Act passed last year, on the plea that they were compelled to pass that Act. Let us see the road we have travelled since last year. Last year the law was introduced as a matter of necessity; it was not a matter of policy. It was not the desire that the Dominion should have power to legislate over this matter; the Government were willing that that power should be retained by the Provinces. But we find that what was last year a matter of necessity is this year a matter of policy, and it is sought to have the question determined whether this Dominion cannot also have legislation in this matter. In my humble judgment, this is an infringement upon the power of the Provinces. It cannot be otherwise; and I ask the attention of those who value this Federal system, when I enquire if the object of the amendment is not, in the end, to deprive the Provinces of the right which legitimately pertains to them to-day. Now this is a serious matter, in my humble opinion. It is a step towards legislative union, as has well been said this afternoon. I say that every successful attempt made, on the floor of this Parliament, to deprive any Province of any power now exercised by that Province, however insignificant that power may be, is a successful step in the direction of legislative union. Now, I am well aware that legislative union is more in the favour of many members of this House than a federative union. I know that many hon. members would view the change to a legislative union without any alarm whatever. For my own part, I believe that the federative system is the best of all systems which can be devised to govern this large territory. We are all aware that the fact of our having the present system of Confederation is largely due to the peculiar position of the Province of Quebec; it is largely due to the fact that the elements to be united were not homogenous. It is possible that if the elements had been homogenous the union would have been a legislative and not a Federal one, but whether or not those elements were all homogenous, I still submit that the best system, the only system by which to govern this great territory, is a federative and not a legislative union. Upon this question, let me quote the opinion of a man whose ideas I am sure will commend themselves to, and whose authority will be respected by, all the members of this House, and especially the members of French origin. I refer to Montesquieu, who, in his "Spirit of the Law" speaks thus:

"If a Republic be small, it is destroyed by a foreign force; if it be large, it is ruined by an internal imperfection. To this twofold inconveniency democracies and aristocracies are equally liable, whether they be good or bad. The evil is in the very thing itself, and no form can redress it. It is, therefore, very probable that mankind would have been, at length, obliged to live constantly under the Government of a single person, had they not contrived a kind of Constitution that has all the internal advantages of a Republican, together with the external force of a Monarchical Government. I mean a Confederate Republic. This form of Government is a convention by which several petty States agree to become members of a larger one, which they intend to establish. It is a kind of assemblage of societies, that constitute a new one, capable of increasing, by means of farther associations, till they arrive to such a degree of power, as to be able to provide for the security of the whole body."

Now, it is to be remarked that at the time Montesquieu wrote these words, the world had not seen the large Confederation which has since sprung up on this continent. At the time he thus wrote, the only Confederacies which he touched upon in the book were the Dutch Confederacy, the Swiss Confederacy and the German Empire. Now all these three put together would not exceed in size one of our Provinces, and any one of them singly would not exceed the size of one of our counties, and the danger which he thus foresaw, and which were obviated by this form of Government, are magnified by the magnitude of our territory. According to that authority, it would be impossible to govern these large territories, extending from one ocean to the other, by a single Government, unless, indeed, that Government were despotic, in which case there would be rupture. But our system obviates all these difficulties; our municipal and provincial divisions, our Federal system, all these wheels within wheels constitute a mechanism which is at once elastic and strong. Therefore, I say, that this system is the best which can be devised, and it behooves every man in this Parliament, every friend of this country, to see that no attempt is made upon this form of Government. I can well understand the conduct of the present Premier; but I confess I am surprised at the attitude taken by the Minister of Public Works and by some of the members from the Province of Quebec. I can understand the attitude of the Premier, because I do not think it is slandering him to say that his preferences are not in favour of a federative union. I believe it is a matter of history that at the time the Provinces were united, if that hon. gentleman had had it in his power to stamp the Constitution with his full mind, the bond of union would not have been a federative but a legislative one. It is a matter of history that the men whose ascendency at the time prevailed were Sir George Cartier, and the Hon. George Brown. It is a matter of history that it was through their combined efforts that the Constitution received the federative character which it did receive. They were both in favour of a federative union, and they were both at the head of large majorities, each one from his own section of the country, and their efforts prevailed in that direction. I believe I can also say that it is a matter of history that ever since, and especially since the hon. gentleman returned to power, he has endeavoured to forward legislation which is gradually superseding the federative character of this union and making it a legislative union. The outward forms are maintained: no letter of the law is attacked, but gradually and surely new principles are introduced, new features are added, and though the superstructure is untouched, there is underneath it an interpretation of the intent of that Constitution which makes it just as much legislative in its character as if it had been so made and decreed. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Roman Legislator never changed one single syllable of the law of the Twelve Tables; but by means of edicts successively introduced, the Roman Legislator introduced a new code of laws which, however, left the laws on the Tables intact. The hon. gentleman is following a similar course though with a less laudable object. The vetoing of numerous laws, admittedly within the power of the Provinces to enact, the present attempt to take from the Provinces legislation which belongs to them, and which

has judicially been determined to belong to them the new Franchise Bill, which we see looming up in the future, are all attempts in the same direction—in the direction of legislative union—and if all these measures are carried we will be nearer and nearer to a legislative union. If the same course is persisted in, unless it is checked by the members of this House, we shall have by-and-by a Confederation in name, but a legislative union in fact; the Local Legislatures will be preserved, but they will be simple costly ornaments, and nothing more. As I have said, I am not surprised at the conduct of the hon. Premier; he is consistent; he is true to himself. Whether acting consciously from design, or moved by the unconscious bent of his mind, I cannot say; but the fact is there, that he is all the time gradually approaching towards a legislative union. I am not surprised at his conduct, but I must say I would be surprised at the conduct of any member from the Province of Quebec who would vote for the amendment now before the House. I would venture to say that if the great man who was instrumental in assisting to frame the Confederation, such as it exists, were still in his place, his work would not be demolished as it is now attempted to be; and I venture to say that if the teaching which he instilled into the breasts of his followers remains with them still, this law will be repealed even this evening. It will, perhaps, be vain for me to invoke the testimony of the press. I did it once before, but in vain; but hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec are aware that the whole of their press, with one exception, are opposed to this liquor law. They all declare that it is an infringment upon Provincial rights. *La Minerve*, which is edited by my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), on the 18th of February, said:

"It is certain that the Lords of the Privy Council have declared in their last judgment that a wrong interpretation had been placed upon the decision which they had rendered in the case of Russell, which had been taken as the basis of the law of 1883. Sir John A. Macdonald himself declared at the opening of the present Session, that he had gone too far last year, adding, however, that he did not intend to be infallible in matter of constitutional law. The interpretation which was given last year to the judgment rendered in the case of Russell was all the more unfortunate in that it undermined the very basis of our Provincial institutions, and that the new law would have, amongst other results, the result of depriving the Government of Quebec, in particular, that Government already so poor, of a revenue of $100,000, as Mr. Robertson declared at Sherbrooke. Under these circumstances, it is fortunate that the Privy Council now admits either that it had not expressed itself clearly or that its language was wrongly interpreted. This enables us to treat the law of 1883 in consequence."

Then another Provincial paper, *Le Canadien*, of the 7th of March, speaks thus:

"When, for example, concerning the license law, an undeniable infringement of our powers, we are appealed to on the ground of our party, on the ground of our sentiments of loyalty towards Sir John, we have reason to answer that the most sacred of all ties is the tie which binds us to our Province, and that the want of loyalty would be in those who would persist in taking our rights from us. The License Law and the Franchise Bill, which Sir John has been endeavouring to impose upon us for the last two Sessions, show with too much light the end towards which he aims, to make it possible for those who are opposed to legislative union to longer keep silent."

I could multiply these citations, but I will not do so. These are sufficient to show the tendency of the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec. I do not speak to my own party. I address myself to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I appeal to them to maintain the constitution. In speaking as I now do, I do not want to be sectional. I would not make any sectional appeal on this or on any other occasion. When I ask my colleagues from the Province of Quebec to vote in favour of the motion of my hon. friend from Maskinongé, I make no sectional appeal. It is an appeal in favour of the Constitution, such as it is. All the Provinces are interested in the integrity of the Constitution, but no Province so much as the Province from which I come.

Mr. GIROUARD. I agree with the mover of this resolution that, as a rule, not only in this country, but everywhere, and I may say in all ages, it is the natural tendency of the larger power or body to absorb the smaller one. I do not believe that since the Confederation has been established in this country, we have been an exception to the general rule; but I do not think hon. gentlemen have reason to blame the present Government for that, more than the previous one. The question under consideration is: Does the Licence Act of 1883 encroach upon provincial rights? If that Act is so clearly unconstitutional, as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has endeavored to show, I would not hesitate to vote against the amendment of the hon. Minister of Public Works. The autonomy of the Provinces is as sacred to me as to any other member of this House; and if I had even the slightest hesitation or doubt upon the subject, I would give it in favour of the smaller power, the Provinces. But has it been decided that the regulation of the liquor traffic belongs to the Provincial Legislatures? If it has, it does not belong to this Parliament. Let us look, in the first instance, at the case of the Queen *vs.* Hodge, for it is well known that the whole question turns upon the decision in that case. If that decision is against the law which we passed last Session, we should repeal it; but if it is not against that law, if it does not affect that law, we should take means of having a decision, and having it as soon as possible, in order to avoid further conflict. Now let us see what was the question at issue in the case of the Queen *v.* Hodge. Hodge was accused of having unlawfully allowed a billiard table to be used, and a game of billiards to be played in a tavern during the time prohibited by the License Act for the sale of liquor therein. He was, therefore, accused of having kept open after hours his billiard table, which, according to a certain by-law of the License Commissioners, was to be closed at seven o'clock at night. That conviction was based upon the following by-law of the License Commissioners of Toronto:—

"Nor shall any licensed person, directly or indirectly, as aforesaid, permit, allow or suffer any bowling alley, billiard table or bagatelle table to be used, or any games or amusements of the like description to be played in such tavern or shop, or in or upon any premises connected therewith, during the time prohibited by the Liquor License Act, or by this resolution, for the sale of liquor therein."

This by-law of the License Commissioners was based upon sections 4 and 5 of the Liquor License Act of 1877, of Ontario. Section 4 says:

"The License Commissioner may, at any time before the first day in each year, pass a resolution or resolutions, for regulating and determining the matters following, that is to say:

"(1.) For defining the conditions and qualifications requisite to obtain tavern licenses, for the retail, within the municipality, of spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors, and also shop licenses, for the sale, by retail, within the municipality, of such liquors in shops or places other than taverns, inns, beer-houses, or places of public entertainment.

"(2.) For limiting the number of tavern and shop license respectively, and for defining the special respective times and localities within which, and the persons to whom such limited number may be issued within the year, from the first day of May, in the one year, till the thirtieth day of April, inclusive, of the next year.

"(3.) For declaring that in cities a number not exceeding ten persons, and in towns a number not exceeding four persons, qualified to have a tavern license, may be exempted from the necessity of having all the tavern accommodation required by law.

"(4.) For regulating the taverns and shops to be licensed.

"(5.) For fixing and defining the duties, powers, and privileges of the Inspector of Licenses of their district.

"Section 5.—In and by any such resolution of a Board of License Commissioners, the said Board may impose penalties for the infraction thereof.

Now, it is contended that the case of the Queen *vs.* Hodge has decided the principle that a Province may pass a law to regulate the sale of Liquor. I say it has not; I say it has only decided that, as a matter of police regulation, the License Commissioners or the Provincial Legislature may prevent an inn-keeper from keeping open his billiard table after the hour of seven o'clock, and no more than this has been decided. Let us look at the decision:

"Their Lordships are, therefore, of the opinion that in relation to sections 4 and 5 of the Acts in question (the very sections that I have read), the Legislature of Ontario acted within the powers conferred on it by the Imperial Act of 1867, and that, in this respect, there is no conflict with the Dominion Parliament. Assuming that the Local Legislature had power to legislate *to the full extent of the resolutious passed by the Licensc Commissioners, etc.*"

What is the result? It is that no tavern keeper shall keep his billiard room open after the hour of seven o'clock. This is all that has been decided. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any doubt on this question, that will disappear on reading the following passage from the decision of the Privy Council in the same case:—

"Their Lordships do not think it necessary, in the present case, to lay down any general rule or rules, for the construction of the British North America Act. They are impressed with the justice of an observation by Hagerty, C. J., that in all these questions of *ultravires* it is the wisest course not to widen the discussion by considerations not necessarily involved in the decision of the point in controversy. They do not forget that in a previous decision on this same Statute (Parsons *vs.* the Citizen's Co.) their Lordships recommended that in performing the difficult duty of determining such questions, it will be a wise course for those on whom it is thrown, to decide each case which arises, as best they can, without entering more largely upon the interpretation of the Statutes than is necessary for the decision of the particular question at hand."

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I hear the hon. member for Bothwell say, "hear, hear." Do you want anything more precise and more definite? Their Lordships say: we intend to decide only the point at issue, the point we have at hand, and nothing more. Were they called upon to decide that the Province had the power to regulate the liquor traffic? Nothing of the kind. The question at issue was whether the by-law or the resolution of the License Commissioners in prohibiting the opening of a billiard table after a certain hour was valid or not; and that is the point they decided I contend, therefore, there was no decision whatever as to the constitutional question raised on the present occasion, to wit, whether it is in the competency of this Parliament to the Provincial Legislatures to regulate the liquor traffic. I presume it would be very immaterial to the decision this House may come to, to know what my private opinion is on this constitutional question. However, I have no hesitation in saying that, after having given to this matter the most serious consideration, I believe the Liquor License Act of this Dominion Parliament, passed last Session, to be constitutional, and I will give you my reason. My reason is because that Act is intended for the good government and order throughout the whole Dominion, and that is a subject given by section 91 of the British North America Act, exclusively to the Dominion Parliament. Section 92 of the same Act, says: The Provincial Legislatures have the right to exact licenses from inn keepers, shop keepers or others; but that same Section adds that this right shall not be for the purpose of regulating the liquor traffic, but for revenue purposes, and nothing else. I would ask whether, under that clause, the Provincial Legislatures have the right to regulate the liquor traffic. Let us look at the shop keeper, from whoma license may also be exacted by a Provincial Legislature. Are we to be told that a merchant from whom a license may be required by a Provincial Legislature may be subject to the regulation of the Provincial Legislature, as far as his commerce is concerned? That he cannot, is a proposition too clear to be contradicted. It is clear that the Local Legislatures have no right to regulate the commerce of merchants, although they have the right to impose licenses on them to carry on their business. I believe the Privy Council has said enough in the case of the Queen *vs.* Russell, which caused the passing of the License Act of 1883, to anticipate what the decision is going to be on the present occasion. Their Lordships, on that occasion, after comparing the Temperance Act with the clause relating to the sale of poisons, observed:

"Laws of this nature, designed for the promotion of public order, safety or morals, and which subject those who contravene them to criminal procedure and punishment, belong to the subject of public wrongs rather than to that of civil rights. They are of a nature which fall within the general authority of Parliament to make laws for the order and good government of Canada."

And this is the principle that has been laid down in the very preamble of the Dominion Liquor License Act. I will vote without hesitation for the amendment of the hon. Minister of Public Works. Having no decision before us as to the constitutionality of the Dominion Liquor Act, I think our thanks are due to the Government for preventing more litigation between the Provinces and the citizens living in the different Provinces. Instead of having numerous lawsuits and litigation in the various Provinces, we will have only one; and this litigation will not start by a proceeding before an inferior court and then be carried to a higher court by appeal. We shall proceed immediately before the highest court of the land, the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. How?

Mr. GIROUARD. It is going to be provided by Bill. It cannot be done otherwise. I presume a Bill will be based upon this resolution. I say it will be by Bill, because I do do not know any other proceeding by which it can be done. This principle has been laid down several times during the debates of this Parliament during the previous Sessions. We have decided, on several occasions, that we have no right to decide at the following Session that the law which has been passed by this Parliament is unconstitutional. The hon. gentleman, the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), has quoted *La Minerve* and *Le Canadien*, but I do not think we are going to take *La Minerve* and *Le Canadien*, as authorities upon constitutional questions. I am not going even to take the opinion of this Parliament upon constitutional questions as a binding authority. I say the tribunals of the land are the only known authority for deciding constitutional questions. Last year, when we had a debate upon the King's County, P.E.I., election case, some Statutes were quoted as unconstitutional, and I then expressed the opinion that they were unconstitutional, but I said we were not the proper authority to decide the constitutionality of these Statutes, and that I, for one, was therefore willing to accept them as the law of the land until the constituted authority, the courts of justice of the country, had decided that they were unconstitutional. That is the reason why, on the present occasion, we have no right to say, in this Parliament, that the Dominion Liquor License Act is unconstitutional. We have no right to do so; courts of justice only have that right; and I approve of the course which has been proposed by the hon. Minister of Public Works, to put a case before the Supreme Court, and to put it in a speedy manner. This case will be put before the Supreme Court, and the Local Legislatures will have the right to be represented there by counsel, and to lay their views before that tribunal, and I hope they will do so, and I hope the whole question of jurisdiction between the Dominion Parliament and the Local Legislature will be discussed. We have an admirable Constitution here. We hear the cry of centralizing powers in the Dominion Parliament, but that centralization is impossible. We have courts of justice to decide where the power lies, whether in the Provincial Legislatures or in the Dominion Parliament. In this case, the Supreme Court, and, I hope, the Privy Council, too, will consider the question; because, as has been well remarked by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé), the people of this country have the greatest confidence in the decisions of the Privy Council. There is another reason why this case should be referred to the Privy Council ultimately. If we want to have a final decision, if we want the citizens of this country to submit to the decision of the case, we must have that decision rendered by the Privy Council, otherwise they will not submit to the decision of the Supreme Court and will ultimately appeal, in their own private cases, to the Privy Council, in regard to

the question now under consideration. For that reason I will vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and, I hope, the members for the Province of Quebec, who desire more, perhaps, than the members from the other Provinces, to see their Provincial rights maintained, will vote for that amendment, because in the future, when some rights more sacred to them than the liquor traffic, will be in question—I hope that time will never come, but if it does—the members from the Province of Quebec will have the right to rise in Parliament and say, let us refer this important question concerning our institutions, our religion, or our language, to the decision of the Supreme Court and Privy Council, and I am not afraid that there, before the Privy Council, the Province of Quebec, as well as all the other Provinces, will obtain justice. For these reasons, I will vote for the amendment of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has been consistent in his argument, at any rate. He contends that it is eminently desirable that this Legislature, and this Legislature alone, should possess the right to legislate on the question we are discussing, and that it is undesirable that the power should be vested in the Local Legislatures, and as far as he can do so, by his voice and by his vote, he is determined that that power shall vest in this Legislature and in this Legislature alone. I can therefore understand clearly why he can consistently support the resolution moved by the Minister of Public Works. But I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman in this House, who thinks differently from him on this question, I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman who believes that the right to legislate on the subject of the liquor traffic belongs to the Local Legislature and to the Local Legislature only, any hon. gentleman who believes that the power should belong to them because it can be exercised by them better than it can by this Legislature—I cannot understand how anyone holding these opinions should vote in favour of the resolution of the Minister of Public Works. Now, I contend that *primâ facie* the Local Legislatures are best fitted to grapple with laws of this kind. The Local Legislatures possess a local knowledge which enables them to judge better what laws are suited to the respective Provinces than this Legislature does. The question is peculiarly a local one. As was well remarked by an hon. gentleman who spoke in the afternoon, a law which might suit Montreal might be very unsuitable in British Columbia. The times for closing shops, the persons to whom liquor might be sold, the times when liquor might be sold, the persons who are qualified to sell liquor, all these things could be better settled, as regards Quebec, by a Quebec Legislature, composed of gentlemen who know the wants of the people and the wants of the localities, than it can be by a large Legislature, composed mainly of people who do not know anything of these wants and these requirements; and the same argument applies to all the other Provinces. Therefore, *primâ facie*, the right should belong to the Local Legislatures; and, further I say, the right did belong to the Local Legislatures and was exercised by them for nearly sixteen years, and I say the result of the exercise of that right by these different Provinces was that there were laws enacted in each of these Provinces which gave satisfaction to the people of the Provinces. We have had it stated time and again, not only in this debate but during last Session, that the result of many years of legislation on the liquor traffic in Quebec, had been to give them a law suitable to their people and approved by their people. The same remark was made by gentlemen from Nova Scotia, that they had been legislating for fifteen or twenty years, amending and amending their Acts, year after year, and getting their law as near as possible towards perfection. We had it stated from the Province from which I come, that the same process had gone on, and from all the Provinces gentlemen expressed their opinion that the local laws regulating this traffic had been so perfected as to give almost general satisfaction to the people of the several Provinces. Had we then litigation on the question whether these local laws were *intra vires* or *ultra vires*? Was everything in a mess? Were people undetermined and uncertain as to what was and what was not the law? Nothing of the kind. The law was known, the law was obeyed, the law was being carried out, and peace and good order were reigning throughout the different Provinces of the Dominion, until, in an unfortunate moment, the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government put his hand to legislation on the subject, and determined to carry out the opinion which he alleges he held many years ago, that these Provinces had not the right, but that it belonged to the Dominion. Then, for the first time, we had these great troubles. Now, what have we got to-day? What is the result of this? We have two sets of laws in force, we have two sets of licenses, we have two Boards of License Commissioners, we have two sets of rules as to the hours for closing public houses; men engaged in the trade do not know from whom to take their licenses; when they get their licenses and pay for them, they do not know whether those licenses are good or not. And what is the result? Litigation in almost every Province of the Dominion where these licenses have been granted, Local Legislatures asserting, as they have a right to assert, and as I hope they will successfully assert, their right to maintain a privilege and a power which they have exercised ever since Confederation was consummated, a right which was never questioned until the hon. gentleman laid his hand last year upon this article of the Constitution. Now, to come to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He has alleged that it is desirable that this House should usurp to itself the sole power of enacting measures in in relation to this subject.

Mr. GIROUARD. I never said that it was desirable, because that would be a question of policy. I said this Parliament alone had jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood the hon. gentleman to argue that it was eminently desirable there should be one law passed.

Mr. GIROUARD. Never.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's denial, but he will allow me to say what the effect of his argument was, as understood, I think, not only by myself, but by nearly by everybody on this side of the House; I understood the hon. gentleman to argue that it was eminently desirable there should be one law passed by this Parliament which should operate throughout the whole Dominion, so that we might know what the law was. I understood him to go further and express his constitutional opinion that this Parliament was vested with that power.

Mr. GIROUARD. Yes; only that portion.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood him to argue as a reason that this Legislature ought to assume that power, that there would be many suits, many difficulties in all the Provinces arising out of local legislation.

Mr. GIROUARD. No; that is not the reason. I never said that.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's retraction, if I misunderstood him. Now, what does he say? The hon. gentleman says there has been no decision on this subject, that the case of Hodge only decided the point about the legality of playing a game of billiards, and he quoted that judgment to show that he was right. He went further, to show that the British North America Act only gives authority to license for the purpose of raising a

revenue. Well, the hon. gentleman, I believe, is a good lawyer and in good practice, and I understand, also, he is a gentleman who gives a good deal of his time to the study of these subjects. I would ask him if he has read the judgments of the highest Courts of Appeal in all the Provinces, or all the larger Provinces of the Dominion upon this subject? Has he read the judgment of the Appeal Court of Ontario wherein it it is determined by the Judges there that the authority given to legislate upon this subject is not derived from the clause in the British North America Act, which gives Local Legislatures power to license shops for the purposes of raising a revenue, that clause being only complementary to the powers vested in them to legislate upon municipal institutions, and that it is not because they have power to license for purposes of revenue, but because they had, at the time of Confederation, municipal institutions which possessed the power to control this liquor traffic, and that it was the intention of the British North America Act to continue to the Local Legislatures those powers, and upon that ground, mainly, it was that they decided that those powers continued up to this time. Now, in the celebrated case of Hodge, to which he refers, I do not think the hon. gentleman has fairly stated the points decided, at all. The hon. gentleman will see, by referring to the case, that when it came up for argument, the appellants, who were acting for Hodge, and who were contending that the Local Legislature had not the power, wished to place before the court the very point we are discussing, namely, whether the power to legislate upon this traffic was vested in the Dominion Parliament or in the Local Legislatures, and the judgment as reported goes on to say:

"Mr. Kerr, Q.C., and Mr. Jeune, in their full and very able argument for the appellant, informed their Lordships that the first and principal question in the cause was whether 'the Liquor License Act of 1876," in its fourth and fifth sections, was *ultra vires* of the Ontario Legislature, and properly said that it was a matter of importance as between the Dominion Parliament and the Legislature of the Province."

Now, there is the very identical question raised expressly for decision, raised explicitly, so that there can be no evasion, and when you turn to the fourth and fifth sections, what do you find? You find these sections appointing License Commissioners for the regulation of this traffic, for defining the conditions necessary to obtain a tavern license, for limiting the number of taverns, for declaring the number that may be licensed in cities, for declaring the number of persons in a city who may be entitled to have licenses granted, for regulating tavern and shop licenses, for fixing and defining those powers, and for the imposition of penalties for the infraction of those laws. Why, every point which we have attempted to legislate upon in the Act we passed last Session, every main point was legislated upon by the Statute which came before the Privy Council, and was raised expressly before that court as to whether the Local Legislature had power to pass it or not. What do their Lordships say:

"The appellants contended that the Legislature of Ontario had no power to pass any Act to regulate the liquor traffic, that the whole power to pass such an Act was conferred on the Dominion Parliament, and consequently taken from the Provincial Legislature, by section 91 of the British North America Act, 1861; that it did not come within any of the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the Provincial Legislature by section 92."

So, the hon. gentleman will see that no language could have presented the points more clearly to their Lordships for their decision than was used by the counsel for the appellants in presenting them on this occasion. They had the express point before them; they were asked so decide the express point, and when we come to their decision, what do they say? After explaining the decision in Russell and the Queen, showing how that decision had been misinterpreted and misunderstood, and saying that they never attempted to lay down any such law as the First Minister intimated that they had laid down, they go on to say:

"Their Lordships proceed now to consider the subject matter and legislative character of sections 4 and 5 of 'The Liquor License Act of 1877, cap. 181, Revised Statutes of Ontario.' That Act is so far confiend in its operations to municipalities in the Province of Ontario, and is entirely local in its character and operation It authorizes the appointment of Licence Commissioners to act in each municipality, and empowers them to pass, under the name of resolutions, what we know as by-laws, or rules, to define the conditions and qualifications requisite for obtaining tavern and shop licenses for sale by retail of spirituous liquors within the municipality; for limiting the number of licenses; for declaring that a limited number of persons qualified to have tavern licenses may be exempted from having all the tavern accommodation required by law, and for regulating licensed taverns and shops, for defining the duties and powers of licensed inspectors, and to impose penalties for infraction of their resolutions. These seem to be all matters of a purely local nature in the Province, and to be similar to, though not identical in all respects with, the powers then belonging to municipal institutions under the previously existing laws passed by the Local Parliaments.

"Their Lordships consider that the powers intended to be conferred by the Act in question, when properly understood, are to make regulations in the nature of police or municipal regulations of a merely local character for the good government of taverns, etc., licenses for the sale of liquors by retail, and such as are calculated to preserve, in the municipality, peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct. As such, they cannot be said to interfere with the general regulation of trade and commerce which belongs to the Dominion Parliament, and do not conflict with the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, which does not appear to have as yet been adopted.

"The subjects of legislation in the Ontario Act of 1877, sections 4 and 5, seem to come within the heads Nos. 8, 15 and 16, of section 92 of British North America Statute, 1867.

"Their Lordships are, therefore, of opinion that, in relation to sections 4 and 5 of the Act in question, the Legislature of Ontario acted within the powers conferred on it by the Imperial Act of 1867, and that in this respect there is no conflict with the powers of the Dominion Parliament."

Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier has altogether misunderstood and misread this judgment. They declare that the Crooks Act——

Mr. GIROUARD. Read the line immediately after.

Mr. DAVIES. I will read it in a moment, if the hon. gentleman wishes. They declare that the Crooks Act, upon which the Act passed by this Legislature last Session is largely based, was calculated to preserve in the municipality peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct, and that it was directly within the powers conferred by the Act upon the Local Legislature. The question was not evaded by any technicality. It was presented by the counsel for the appellant broadly and squarely. Had the Ontario Legislature, under the British North America Act, power to pass this License Law? Their Lordships said they had—they said so expressly. I will read the next line, although I do not see any particular bearing in it.

Mr. GIROUARD. The words are: "The Imperial Parliament had conferred no authority in the Local Legislature to delegate those powers to the License Commissioners or any other persons."

Mr. DAVIES. Has the hon. gentleman read the four or five sections of the Act which declares that the Local Legislatures can delegate to Commissioners the power to determine what licenses shall exist in the community, who shall get them, how much they shall pay, and how long the taverns shall be kept open, and all the other rules and regulations which we attempted to incorporate in the License Act of 1883. The courts have declared that this subject, being within the exclusive power of the Local Legislatures, they can delegate their powers to Commissioners. I will read another extract:—

"Assuming that the Local Legislature had power to legislate to the full extent of the resolutions passed by the License Commissioners, and to have enforced the observance of their enactments by penalties and imprisonment, with or without hard labour, it was further contended that the Imperial Parliament had conferred no authority on the Local Legislature to delegate those powers to the License Commissioners or any other persons."

I need not go into the question of delegating powers to Commissioners, as it is notraised here. Their Lordships determined: First, that the Provincial Legislatures had the power to legislate on this question; and second, that inasmuch as

they possessed that power, they had the right to delegate it to License Commissioners. They decided both points in the affirmative. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) bases his opinion on his understanding of this decision, I must say that his understanding of it is altogether wrong. But the hon. gentleman says: I will not take the decision of the Prime Minister, or of Parliament, upon this constitutional point, but I appeal to the judgment of the legal tribunals of the land. I will accept his challenge, for no doubt he intends it as such, and consider in what manner those tribunals have considered this question. The hon. gentleman is well aware that in his own Province, in the case of Sulte *vs.* Three Rivers, a point almost analogous to the one in question was decided. What did the Judges of the Court of Appeal in his own Province say in that case? The decision was given by the eminent Chief Justice and a full court of four or five other Judges. Here is what the Chief Justice said:—

"But we have still to determine another question, whether sub-section 8 does not cover the exercise of the power assumed by the Legislature of Quebec. It may be at once conceded that the prohibitory liquor law is not essential to the existence of municipal institutions, and that consequently, in a very restricted reading of sub-section 8, it would not justify the Local Legislature in passing a prohibitory liquor law. But it may fairly be asked, whether it was the intention of the Imperial Parliament, in an enumeration of this sort, to confine 'municipal institutions' to those matters only which are of the essence of municipal institutions? If such was the intention of Parliament, a wide field for speculation was left open, or it was contemplated to restrict municipal institutions within very narrow limits. It would seem, however, we have not to determine what institutions are essential to municipal existence in the abstract, but the meaning of the term at the time of Confederation. We cannot help thinking that this was sufficient to bring prohibitory liquor laws within the powers of local legislation, as forming part of 'municipal institutions' within the meaning of the British North America Act. With Chief Justice Richards, we think that we ought to look 'at the state of things existing in the Provinces at the time of passing the British North America Act, and the legislation then in force in the different Provinces on the subject, and the general scope of Confederation then about to take place,' when determining the value of indefinite terms in the Act. But in the case of the City of Fredericton *vs.* The Queen, it was decided by the Supreme Court that the Dominion Parliament has alone the power to pass a prohibitory liquor law. It is true this decision goes somewhat beyond the real issue, which is as to the right of the Dominion Parliament to pass a prohibitory liquor law, which is quite a different thing. Still, we presume the point was fully argued before the court"

Then the learned Judge goes on to argue that it was not the intention of the Imperial Parliament to confine the meaning of the term "municipal institutions" to the technical meaning but that it was their intention to use it in the sense in which the word was used in the Dominion at the time the British North America Act came into force, and the words should have a broader and more general signification than that given to it in England or when applied in a technical sense. Then the Judge goes on to argue the case; and what is the conclusion of the court? It is as follows:

"We hold, then, that under a proper interpretation of sub-section 8, the right to pass a prohibitory liquor law for the purpose of municipal institutions has been reserved to the Local Legislatures by the British North America Act."

That is the judgment of the highest Court of Appeal in the Province of Quebec, from which the hon. member from Jacques Cartier comes; and this decision was rendered after the case Russell *vs.* the Queen had been laid before them, with full knowledge as to what the decision of the Privy Council of England was in regard to it. The hon. gentleman says he prefers to appeal to the judgment of the tribunals of the land. I have already shown him that the highest tribunal in his Province has expressly decided that the power to legislate on the subject is vested in the Local Legislatures, and not in the Dominion Parliament. If the hon. gentleman will go to Ontario, he will find a similar judgment delivered there. I will not weary the House by reading it at any length; but I will ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) to give me his attention while I read one or two paragraphs from the decision of Chief Justice Spragg and the other Judges who agreed with him in his judgment. This was rendered in the case of Regina *vs.* Hodge, before it went to the Privy Council. Chief Justice Spragg says;

"Looking at the classes of subjects legislation upon which is committed exclusively to the Provinces, it is very apparent that it was that their legislatures should possess very large and ample powers in relation to all subjects of a local and domestic nature. They had possessed plenary powers upon these subjects before Confederation; and the general scheme of Confederation appears to have been to leave them the plenary control of these subjects. They were, under the Act, Legislatures, in regard to these subjects, in the true and full sense of the term. This is the more apparent from the use of the words 'exclusive' and 'exclusively' (and they are used repeatedly) in the Imperial Act. Other legislation upon these classes of subjects is excluded. No alteration, no amendment, no perfecting of any measure falling within these classes of subjects can be made by any authority outside of the Provincial Legislature. It is therefore necessary that the Provincial Legislature should possess plenary power in relation to all these subjects, to change, amend, repeal, re-enact, and in short to deal with them as change of circumstances or other exigencies might render proper; the propriety of changes in any shape made, not to be challenged by any other legislative authority, and the power to make them being limited only by the rule whether the law making the change is within the class of subjects legislated upon which is assigned to Provincial Legislatures."

The Chief Justice lays down the general principle which should govern the courts in construing the British North America Act; and he applies it to this particular case. He says:

"One other conclusion presents itself, which is, to my mind, conclusive. This matter of licensing, and of the regulation of places and persons licensed, appertains to municipal institutions, and is, moreover, of a local nature. Now, the making of laws in relation to both these subjects being committed exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures, and legislation by any other power being thereby excluded, it follows that the British North America Act operates to withdraw from legislative control by, any power or body whatever, the licensing and the regulation of places and persons licensed, powers in regard to which they had heretofore unquestionably exercised. The effect in that case would be more and other than a distribution of legislative power; it would be an extinction of legislative power in regard to subjects which, up to Confederation, had been subjects of Provincial Legislature."

No language could be stronger, clearer and more explicit, and to my mind the reasoning on which the conclusion is based is good and conclusive reasoning. Further, in that case the same Judge expressed himself with respect to the clause which the hon. member cited, sub-section 9 of section 92, giving the Local Legislature power to license for revenue purposes, and the hon. gentleman will see what the court thought on that point. The learned Judge who presided said:

"My interpretation of clause 9 is that it is cumulative to clause 8, and that it was intended to authorize provincial legislation (or at least to settle any doubts that might exist upon the point) in relation to the licenses enumerated for the purpose of raising revenue as well as for the regulation of matters of police. I have hesitated in placing this construction upon clause 9, because so far as I am aware the more limited construction placed upon it in the earlier cases after Confederation, has been generally accepted as the correct interpretation of the clause; but I am unable, myself, to concur in that construction."

So the hon. gentleman will see that Provincial Legislatures have not the power to issue licenses merely for the sake of revenue, but that the latter was a provision in addition to the power they possessed under the clause respecting municipal institutions. It is cumulative to that clause. The only other Judge who gave a written judgment on the point concurred with the Chief Justice. I will read a single extract from his judgment. Justice Burton said:

"Within its range, then each has an exclusive power; the only case in which a concurrent power is given is in section 95, to make laws in relation to agriculture and immigration, and there it is specially provided that the Provincial legislation may be over-ridden by the Dominion Parliament.

* * * * * * * * *

"Reading the powers granted in section 92, with the exceptions where they occur in section 91, the Local Legislature is absolute and supreme over those subject matters, with as ample power to legislate in respect of them as the Imperial Parliament, and without any possibility of interference by the Dominion Parliament."

The hon. gentleman has appealed to the constitutional authorities of the land, and I have read them, and I challenge him to produce any judgment from any Court of Appeal in any one of the Provinces, which does not coincide

with those I have read. He knows that a case came before the Supreme Court of the Dominion a short time ago—the Poulin case—and that though it was determined on another point, three of the Judges gave their opinion on this particular point we are now discussing, and that judgment was that the Local Legislature had power to enact such legislation as we have attempted to enact; that it does not pertain to both the Local and the Dominion Legislatures, but it is exclusively vested in the Provinces—that they possessing it, we do not possess it. I could not understand the argument of the hon. member for Quebec Centre. He was of opinion, he said, that if it was put to him now whether the power was vested in the Province or in the Dominion, he would rather be inclined to think it was vested in the Provinces; but he went on to argue, that inasmuch as we had passed the Act of last Session, it would not do to repeal it now. He said if we repealed it now it would bring about interminable lawsuits. My opinion is, that the refusal to repeal that law will bring about the interminable lawsuits. It is the only way in which they can be brought about, as any hon. gentleman can see by a little reflection; and why so? Because the power of the Local Legislatures to pass the laws they have passed, has been determined, not only by the highest Courts of Appeal in this country, but by the highest judicial tribunal to which we can appeal in the British Empire. That power is conclusively settled, and unless we attempt to interfere here, unless we attempt to usurp to ourselves powers which the courts have decided do not belong to us, it cannot be but that this litigation will ensue. And, therefore, the only way in which litigation and trouble, and confusion can be brought about, is by our proceeding in the face of these judicial decisions, by our keeping on the Statute Book a law for which we have no judicial authority, by our attempting to usurp an authority which, for sixteen years, has been exclusively exercised by the Local Legislatures, and which the courts of law have unanimously decided have been exercised by them strictly within their powers. I say, we are not justified in doing anything of the kind, and that nothing has been produced to justify any hon. gentleman in supporting the retention of that law on the Statute Book. If hon. gentlemen think that Dominion legislation is desirable, that it is preferable to local legislation, if they think it is desirable that the Local Legislatures should not have that power, then I could understand their carrying out that desire, by persisting to keep this law on the Statute Book, by proceeding to bring about this interminable litigation in the hope that that litigation will result in our finding that we possess that power. But we do not find one hon. gentleman rising in his place and stating that he hopes or believes that it may be ultimately decided that this power is vested in this Parliament; on the contrary, they say that they would rather see this power possessed by the Local Legislatures. I say, if they believe that this power should be in the Local Legislatures, when they find that the courts of the land have determined that it is in the Local Legislature, why insist that it is vested in this Parliament? I cannot understand their course in this respect, and we have not had it explained. We have had an attempted explanation by the Minister of Public Works, but to my mind, and with all deference to that hon. gentleman, it struck me as being a very weak and lame explanation. He says they have no desire to interfere with the autonomy of the Provinces, and that in cases of doubt his disposition is always to lean towards the Provinces, and to leaving the power with the Provinces. If that is his desire, why does he not carry it out? Why is he attempting to interfere here? Why is he attempting to over-rule the decision of the highest court of his own Province—the unanimous decision of that court? Why is he attempting to over-ride the decision of the Privy Council of England? Why is he attempting to usurp powers which he says himself he desires to leave to the Local Legislatures? The hon. gentleman does not explain his position in that respect. He says this License Act which we are called upon, by this resolution, to repeal, was not an Act of the Government, but was an Act brought in by a Committee of this House. In the strictest and narrowest technical sense, the hon. gentleman may be right, but substantially he is wrong. The hon. gentleman knows well that the Bill was a Government measure; it was not initiated by a private member, or in obedience to any demand made by a private member, but at the instance of the Prime Minister himself; that it was brought down in the Speech from the Throne, that it was declared by the Government of which he was a member to be not only desirable, but a necessity. The House will excuse me if I quote a sentence from the Speech, which was put in the mouth of the Governor-General, last year:

"I am advised that the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, delivered last June on appeal of Russell *vs.* The Queen, goes to show, that in order to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors, and for that purpose to regulate the granting of shop, saloon and tavern licenses, legislation by the Dominion Parliament will be necessary."

The hon. member, in his capacity as a member of the Government, recommended that legislation, he initiated it, and brought it down. And, Sir, at the time I entertained the opinion, and I still entertain the opinion, that it was not creditable to the Government to attempt to shift the responsibility from their own shoulders to the shoulders of a Committee, in a matter of legislation of this kind. His attempt failed, so far as this side of the House was concerned, because it will be recollected that the leader of the party to which I belong, and leading members of that party, expressed themselves clearly as being opposed to the initiation of this legislation by a Committee. We thought the Bill was unconstitutional and improper, but we declared that even if it was constitutional, the Government should themselves assume the responsibility of bringing in the Bill. They had assumed the responsibility of advising Parliament to legislate upon the subject; they told Parliament that it was absolutely necessary to legislate upon it, and when they came to draw the Bill, they asked that a Committee should be appointed to bring it down. The Prime Minister insisted on that occasion that he did not wish to take away this power from the Local Legislature, that he was only driven to it by dire necessity; that nothing but necessity would induce him to do it; that so highly did he value the privileges which the Provinces had exercised since the time that the Confederation was consummated, up to last year, that he would be the last man to lay his hand upon that power or interfere with it, and he apologized to the House, when he told them that he was only driven to it by dire necessity. He said:

"This is not a matter we can play with. It is not a matter of policy; it is a matter of necessity. If we wish to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquor, we must legislate immediately; for I take it, that any man in this city, or in another part of Ontario, can open his saloon and sell liquors, and there is not a court in the world can prevent his doing so."

There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman thought so at the time, or he would not have said so. But he was entirely wrong; he drew an erroneous conclusion from the case of Russell *vs.* the Queen, and he had the manliness to acknowledge that, this Session, himself. But I want to know, now that he has seen the error of his constitutional opinion, why he does not repeal this legislation. He says that he only passed the law last Session because he thought it was a necessity. He finds out now, from the judgment *in re* Hodge, that it was not a necessity. The grounds on which he told the House that the Act was necessary, do not exist; the law is not required; and that being the case, he should assent to the proposition of the hon. member who proposes that the Bill should be repealed. The hon. Minister of Public Works, in his apologetic speech,

said that no court has yet decided that this law is *ultra vires*. Well, perhaps not in the technical and literal sense, because the law has not yet been brought before the courts. But the courts have decided that there is not a concurrent right to legislate on this subject in both Legislatures; that the exclusive power to legislate is vested in the Local Legislatures, and that being the case, it follows that the power does not rest here, and the decision *in re* Hodge is, practically, a decision that this House has not power to pass a similar law. So the case has been decided. The hon. gentleman has hinted that a Bill is to be introduced, declaring that the penalties imposed by this License Law are not to be executed; yet he thinks it desirable that the opinion of the courts should be taken as to the constitutionality of the Act. I think the House is entitled to an explanation from the hon. gentleman, how the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is to be obtained. If the penalties imposed by the Act are not to be executed; if a law is to be brought in declaring that these penalties are not to be enforced, how is the hon. gentleman going to have a test suit tried? He cannot do it. I can understand that he has power to refer a case to the Supreme Court of Canada, but he cannot refer one to the Judicial Committee, unless upon some agreement. That ought, at any rate, to be explained. But, Sir, what would be the effect, I would like to ask, of repealing these penalties. By the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Act will be in force while the local Acts will not be in force, and the penalties will be repealed. Therefore, it will be open to any man in the Dominion to sell liquor without being liable to any penalty. If the hon. gentleman's constitutional position is good, that the local laws are not worth the paper on which they are written, then there will exist no law, with penalties attached, against the sale of liquors, and the unrestrained and indiscriminate sale of liquors from one end of this Dominion to the other will be the result. Does the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), and other hon. gentlemen engaged in the promulgation of temperance principles, desire to see that result? If the penalties are repealed, no man can be punished for selling liquor. Therefore, the hon. gentleman is going to bring about a state of confusion worse than has ever existed, worse than the Prime Minister stated last year, though erroneously, existed in this Dominion. If these penalties are repealed, how will the indiscriminate sale of liquors, whether retail or wholesale, be prevented?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the Provincial law

Mr. DAVIES. The Provincial law, the hon. gentleman says, is not good.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not say so now.

Mr. DAVIES. Then, do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the provincial law is good? If it is good, what does he insist on this law for? If the provincial law is good, then the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution is correct in the statement that this is a deliberate attempt to usurp the rights which the Local Legislatures possess and which they have exercised for sixteen years. There are two horns to the dilemma, and the hon. gentleman can take either, but he is in pain no matter which he takes. For my part, I am of opinion that it is better, in the interest of peace, good government, and good temperance legislation, that the power to legislate on this subject should remain where the British North America Act placed it, where it was intended it should remain, and where the hon. gentleman now says it does exist; and I am opposed to this attempt to over-ride the powers which the Local Legislatures possess, and which, in my humble judgment, they ought to continue to exercise.

Mr. MACMASTER. The hon. member who last addressed the House told us in explicit language that the decision *in re* Hodge is practically a decision that we have not the power to enact this law. The law to which the hon. gentleman was referring, and which is now occupying the attention of this House, is the Canada License Act of 1883. We have therefore the hon. gentleman committed to the explicit statement that the decision in the Hodge case is a decision that this Parliament had not the power to enact the License Law of 1883. That statement is quite in keeping with the statement of my hon. friend from Bellechasse who, in the able argument he addressed to this House, took the ground that we had already had a decision on this question in the case of Hodge, and that it was therefore a mere subterfuge to appeal a second time to the courts. So, my hon. friend from Bellechasse and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island are in perfect accord that the Hodge case should be taken as deciding the constitutionality of the legislation on this subject. Now, the statements of both hon. gentlemen, I submit, are entirely untenable. In the first place, as the hon. Minister of Public Works pointed out, we have had no direct decision on the constitutionality of the Canada License Act of 1883, and it is only inferentially that they come to the conclusion that the Hodge case affords a binding decision on that subject. The hon. member for Bellechasse also took the ground that we were robbing the Local Legislatures of their powers. Sir, we can do nothing of the kind. We cannot take away from the powers of the Local Legislatures, neither can the Local Legislatures take away from the powers of the Federal Parliament. The last court of resort in the Empire, the Privy Council, will be the final arbiter between the Provinces and the Dominion upon the question of their powers. It is not for us to take away or to give, or, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said, to have hopes or fears; but it is our duty here to give a correct interpretation to the laws under which we live, and if we cannot do this, we must refer it, as the hon. Minister desires to refer it, first to the highest court we have in our own country, and after that, to the highest court in the Empire, for supreme and final determination. Now my hon. friend from Quebec East said that the Federal system was the best system under which we could live; he said he preferred it to the legislative system. But it is not a matter of preference to us at this time. The fathers of Confederation, among whom are the right hon. the First Minister, the late Hon. George Brown and many other hon. gentlemen known to public life in this country, on both sides of politics, settled the Constitution of this country, and secured the fiat of the Imperial Legislature to its final enactment in England. So that it is not left to us now to express our preference for a legislative or a federal union. We have a Federal union, and we must endeavour to interpret it and to so work it as to subserve the best interest of the people of this country. I endeavoured to follow closely the argument of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) and I did so with that pleasure with which hon. members of this House, in common with myself, always follow his arguments. But I must say, I regret exceedingly that he relied very much on the case of Sulte *vs.* Three Rivers, decided by the Court of Queen's Bench of Quebec, and in citing this case, he omitted to state two things: first, that this case is now under appeal in the Supreme Court of Canada, where it runs the chance, not always very uncertain, of being reversed; and secondly, that the hon. gentleman, while putting forth the view of the Court of the Province of Quebec, that prohibition might exist as an incident of municipal institutions, unfairly omitted to inform hon. gentlemen that in a case in the same category, the case of Hodge *vs.* The Queen, the Privy Council in England, a higher Court than the Court of Queen's Bench of Quebec, seemed to indicate that the Crooks Act of Ontario would have been inoperative if the

Canada Temperance Act had been locally adopted in the county of York.

Now, under what circumstances was the Canada License Act of 1883 brought into existence? The decision in the case of Russell *vs.* The Queen had just been rendered by the Privy Council, and in that case their Lordships said:

"With regard to the first clause, No. 10 (that is with regard to shop licenses) it is to be observed that the power of granting licenses is not assigned to the Provincial Legislature for the purpose of regulating trade, but only for the raising of revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes."

Now, the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House came to the conclusion, last Session of Parliament, from the statement, that it was necessary to pass an Act which would restrict and regulate the trade in intoxicating liquors. Hon. gentlemen on the other side did not say that Act was unconstitutional. The hon. leader of the Opposition referred to several decisions of the courts upon this subject, but he never ventured to state that the Act then proposed to be enacted was unconstitutional, and during the discussion upon this question at the opening of this Session, when challenged by the right hon. leader of the Government to say whether the Canada License Act of 1883 was constitutional or unconstitutional, he refused to lend the credit of his name and deservedly high reputation to a statement as to whether it was one or the other. In view of the statement of the Privy Council in the case of Russell *vs.* The Queen, this Parliament undertook to pass an Act regulating the liquor traffic throughout the whole Dominion. It did not, however, coincidentally with that legislation, endeavour to rob the Provincial Legislatures of the revenues to which they are entitled, derivable from the granting of licenses; but, on the contrary, the Dominion Act expressly provided that the tax for licenses should go, not to the Dominion Government, for Dominion purposes, as was the case under the Scott Act, passed by hon. gentlemen opposite, but that it should go to support the Exchequers of the Provinces. Now, we have to consider first whether the Canada License Act of 1883 is constitutional or not. In doing that, we can take up first the rule laid down by the Privy Council as a safe course to be followed by those upon whom rest the responsibility of determining such Statutes. In the case of Hodge, the Privy Council said:

"In performing the difficult duty of determining such questions, it will be a wise course for those on whom it is thrown to decide each case which arises as best they can, without entering more largely upon the interpretation of the Statute than is necessary for the decision of the particular question in hand."

In that respect, it will be observed that the Privy Council, as pointed out by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, confined themselves strictly to the proposition they laid down, and determined the question whether it was legal or illegal in the Province of Ontario. I do not deny, because I do not wish to pass over any point in connection with this discussion—and moreover, in discussing a constitutional question, I think it would ill-become members of the legal profession, who are members of this House, to attempt to prostitute argument to political purposes—I do not deny that in the decision of Hodge *vs.* The Queen, the Privy Council went on to discuss other matters; but, following the rule laid down, which I have just cited as a criterion for their conduct, they did not decide these matters; they merely commented upon them, and seemed to say: when these cases come before us we will decide them under the circumstances under which they arise, but sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof; and, in the meantime, we only decide the question brought before us with respect to the keeping open of billiard saloons after seven o'clock. The Privy Council put down a rule in the case of Russell *vs.* The Queen, in regard to the interpretation of the Statute of 1867. It is this:

"The true nature and character of legislation, in the particular instance under discussion, must always be determined, in order to ascertain the class of subjects to which it really belongs."

Let us, under the guidance of that rule, take up the Canada License Act of 1883. What is the nature and character of that legislation? Let us look at the preamble. The preamble says:

"It is desirable to regulate the traffic in the sale of intoxicating liquors, and it is expedient that the law in respect to the same should be uniform throughout the Dominion, and that provision should be made in regard thereto for the better preservation of peace and order."

The scope and object of the enactment is uniform legislation and regulation of the traffic in intoxicating liquors throughout all the Provinces of Canada, in the general interest of the whole Dominion. This enactment is simply the complement—I was almost going to say the twin—of the Scott Act or the Temperance Act of 1878. Let us look at the preamble of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. That states:—

"It is very desirable, to promote temperance in the Dominion, that there should be uniform legislation in all the Provinces respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors."

These are the objects as declared by the two Acts, and I set a good deal of value on these two declarations for the reason that the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 has been declared to be constitutional; and if we find there is an affinity between the two Acts, we may conclude if the one is constitutional, the other must be constitutional, and therefore the proposition of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that the Hodge case determined the constitutionality of the Act now before the House, will completely fall to the ground. In the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, the object is to make uniform legislation in all the Provinces respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, in order to promote the cause of temperance. In the Canada License Act of 1883, the object is to make uniform legislation in all the Provinces throughout the Dominion—for what purpose? In order to preserve peace and good order throughout the whole of Canada. The objects are practically, therefore, the same. But I do not rest upon my own frail interpretation of what the significance of the Act of 1878 may be. The Privy Council, in the decision in which they found the Canada Temperance Act to be constitutional, declared as follows:—

"The preamble of the Act in question states that it is very desirable to promote temperance in the Dominion, and that there should be uniform legislation in all the Provinces in reference to the traffic in intoxicating liquors."

Then their Lordships go on, and state as follows:—

"The declared object of the said Act is to have uniform legislation in all the Provinces, in reference to the traffic in intoxicating liquors, with a view to promote temperance in the Dominion. Parliament does not treat the promotion of temperance as desirable in one Province more than another, but as desirable in every Province throughout the Dominion."

Then their Lordships say again:

"Parliament feels that the subject is one of general concern for the Dominion, and upon which uniformity of legislation is desirable, and the Parliament alone can so deal with it. There is no ground or pretence for saying that the evil or vice struck at by the Act in question is local, or exists only in one Province, and that Parliament, under colour of general legislation, is dealing with a Provincial matter only."

So, with regard to the Canada License Act of 1883, there is no ground or pretence for saying that it is local in its scope or in its objects. Its objects are Dominion in character. They are not of a provincial character. What it has in view is not to make uniform laws with regard to any one Province upon the subject of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, but its object is to make a uniform and general law applicable to the whole Dominion, upon the trade or traffic in intoxicating liquors. Now, it cannot be doubted that this is a subject within the purview of this Parliament. When we refer to the case of Parsons and the Citizens' Insurance Company—and here I am citing the opinions

expressed in cases that have passed under review; I am not citing the decision of cases in which the final decree of the court is yet to be made, but I am citing the final decisions of the highest court in the Empire. We find their Lordships said:

"Construing, therefore, the words 'regulation of trade and commerce' upon the various aids to their interpretation above suggested, they would include political arrangements in regard to trade requiring the sanction of Parliament, regulation of trade in matters of interprovincial concern, and it may be that they would include the general regulation of trade affecting the whole Dominion."

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the making of a uniform law upon the subject of the traffic in intoxicating liquors is not a regulation of trade affecting the whole Dominion. I do not see how the contrary can be for a moment successfully maintained. That the liquor traffic is a trade, that it is a trade existing throughout the Dominion, that it is an influential trade, an extensive trade, cannot be denied; and I believe that this Legislature has as much right to regulate that trade as it has to regulate any other trade in which the Parliament of this country has jurisdiction. When we see that the scope and objects of the Canada License Act of 1883 are practically co-extensive with those of the Scott Act, and that the constitutionality of the Scott Act has been affirmed by the Privy Council of England, it is easy to come to the conclusion that the Canada License Act of 1883, whether it be advisable or whether it be inadvisable, is constitutional within the meaning of the Constitution of this country. My hon. friend who, with so much ability, moved this resolution, did not contend that it was constitutional or that it was not. His argument was entirely addressed to the question as to whether it was advisable to put that Act in force, or rather to continue it in force. But he has been exceeded in the race. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), have far outstripped him, and have gone far beyond the constitutional position taken up by him, and have come to the conclusion that the Act of 1883 is unconstitutional, on the authority of the Hodge case recently decided in the Privy Council.

Now, I will address myself for a moment or two to the Hodge case. As I stated before, the decision there is not germane to the decision of the question which is now before the House. Their Lordships state what their decision is. These are their words:

"He (Hodge) did permit this billard table to be used as such within the period prohibited by the resolution of the License Commissioners, and it was for that infraction of their rules he was prosecuted and convicted."

These are the words of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Now, when we turn to their Lordships' remarks, what do we find? After setting out what the case is about, their Lordships do not proceed to lay down any general dictum upon the regulation of trade and commerce; they do not proceed to state that the Act that is now before the House or any Act equivalent in terms is unconstitutional; they proceed to discuss the contents of sections 4 and 5 of the License Act of Ontario, of 1877, in the following words:—

"Their Lordships proceed now to consider the subject matter and legislative character of sections 4 and 5 of the Liquor License Act of 1877, cap. 181, Revised Statutes of Ontario. That Act is so far confined in its operation to municipalities in the Province of Ontario, and is entirely local in its character and operation."

Now, these words may have a special signification when the constitutionality of this Act is brought into juxtaposition with that of an Act having reference to the whole Dominion:

"It authorizes the appointment of License Commissioners to act in each municipality, and empowers them to pass, under the name of resolutions, what we know as by-laws, or rules, to define the conditions and qualifications requisite for obtaining tavern or shop licenses for sale by retail of spirituous liquors within the municipality; for limiting the number of licenses; for declaring that a limited number of persons qualified to have tavern licenses may be exempted from having all the tavern accommodation required by law, and for regulating licensed taverns and shops; for defining the duties and powers of License Inspectors, and to impose penalties for infraction of their resolutions."

These words are descriptive of the contents of sections 4 and 5 of that License Act. Then their Lordships proceed:

"These seem to be all matters of a merely local nature in the Province and to be similar to, though not identical in all respects with, the powers then belonging to municipal institutions under the previously existing laws passed by the Local Parliaments. Their Lordships consider that the powers intended to be conferred by the Act in question, when properly understood, are to make regulations in the nature of police or municipal regulations, of a merely local character, for the good government of taverns, &c., licensed for the sale of liquors by retail, and such as are calculated to preserve, in the municipality, peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct.

"As such they cannot be said to interfere with the general regulation of trade and commerce which belong to the Dominion Parliament, and do not conflict with the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, which does not appear as yet to have been locally adopted."

Here we find that their Lordships have made an express reference to the powers of the Dominion Parliament to regulate trade and commerce. They say that these powers conferred by the Local Act do not interfere with our right to regulate trade and commerce, and that they "do not conflict with the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, which does not appear to have been locally adopted." Sir, have these words any signification? Is there any meaning to be attached to the fact that their Lordships, while adjudicating upon the Hodge case, with regard to playing a game of billiards after seven o'clock in the evening, have pointed out that the Canada Temperance Act did not appear to have been locally adopted? Now, I put it to you, and to every member of this House, whether their Lordships might not have meant to convey by these words that had the Canada Temperance Act, 1878 been "locally adopted," had it been in force in York County at that time, then the provisions of the License Commissioners, made in virtue of the Local Act of the Province of Ontario, would have been submerged and over-borne, and that the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act would have prevailed in their stead? Sir, if the Parliament of Canada has the power to enact the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, if it has power to provide that local prohibition may take place, if this Parliament has the power to enact a Dominion prohibitory liquor law—and no hon. member will doubt that it has that power—who can doubt that the greater power includes the less, and that if we have power to say that liquor shall not be sold at all, we have not also the power, as the supreme Legislature of the country, to say how that trade shall be regulated; to say that it shall be restricted; that it may be restricted to a certain number of licenses in each municipality. I do not say at this time that it may be so, because, as I stated at the outset, I wish to give a correct interpretation to the Constitution. That question has yet to be determined, and that is one reason why the Minister of Public Works has moved to refer this question beyond the whirlpool of partizanship and strife to which it is subjected here, and submit it to the cool judicial decision of the Supreme Court of this country, and, if necessary, to the highest court of the Empire. Now, Sir, if we refer to another portion of the Hodge case, we find a statement that in my humble view, is pregnant with meaning. When their Lordships referred to the misapprehension under which counsel seemed to have laboured, with regard to the true intent and meaning of the case of Russell and the Queen, they said:

"The principle which that case and the case of the Citizens' Insurance Company illustrates, is that subjects, which in one aspect, and for one purpose, fall within section 92, may, in another aspect, and for another purpose, fall within section 91."

Mr. Speaker, I think within these words we will find in time the true solution to the question of jurisdiction between the Local Legislatures and the Parliament of Can-

ada. As plain as words could convey it, they there intimate that subjects which, in one view and for one purpose, may fall within the jurisdiction of a Provincial Legislature, may, in another view and for another purpose, fall within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. And if there was a difficulty upon the matter which I have previously discussed, it enables us to come to a conclusion, and to see how, notwithstanding that the Privy Council found that sections 4 and 5 in the Hodge case, were within the jurisdiction of the Legislature of Ontario, the whole of the Canada License Act of 1883 may be, notwithstanding, within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. We are as yet, in the interpretation of our Constitution, only groping. During my practice at the Bar, and during my intercourse with gentlemen on both sides of politics belonging to the legal profession, I have heard many adverse criticisms upon the terms of our Constitutional Act. Sir, I have never shared in these adverse criticisms. The study I have been able to give to the distribution of legislative powers under the British North America Act, has convinced me that that distribution has been most skilfully made; that the sections 92 and 91 are pieces of the most skilful mechanism, and show the care that has been employed in framing these words so as to preserve our Constitution in such form as should be for the public interests of this country. The men who designed that Constitution were the leading men in this country at the time, and some of them are happily now surviving with us to give the aid of their skill and experience to interpret it. Some of them have passed away, but whether they have passed away or whether they remain with us, I think there is but one sentiment among the people of this country, and that is, that these men were the ablest men of our country at the time, and that they faithfully and patriotically gave their best exertions in order to frame for us, at a time when political rancour was quiet, a Constitution that would survive the attacks of partizanship, and that it would be our guide for many years, if not centuries, to come. Until a short time ago it was the view prevailing in the courts of this country that if the Legislature of a Province had power to do a certain thing, to pass a certain Act, as, for instance, the incorporation of building societies, the Dominion Legislature had not that power. An opinion to that effect was expressed quite recently, within a year or two, in the Court of Appeal in the Province of Quebec, and an appeal was taken from that decision. It was a case in which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was one of the counsel before the Privy Council in England, and in that case their Lordships decided explicitly that this Parliament could give to a corporation the lineaments or essentials necessary to its incorporation, to enable it to carry its operations as a building or construction society, even to the extent of acquiring land throughout the Dominion, in order to fulfil its purposes; but that when it went to the several Provinces, then it became subject to the laws of Mortmain in the several Provinces, and to such other laws as might prevail with regard to the tenure of land. Until quite recently, this view prevailed. In the case of Loranger and the Colonial Investment and Building Society, decided in the Privy Council on the 1st of December last, their Lordships said:

"Chief Justice Dorion appears to be of opinion that inasmuch as the Legislature of the Province had passed Acts relating to such societies defining and limiting their operations, the Dominion Parliament was incompetent to incorporate the present association, having for one of its objects the erection of buildings throughout the Dominion, their Lordships at present fail to see how the existence of these Provincial Acts, if competently passed for local objects, can interfere with the power of the Dominion Parliament to incorporate the association in question."

And by analogy of reasoning, perhaps we might, for the sake of argument, grant the premises laid down by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that the Legislature of a Province might pass an Act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors or providing for the licensing of taverns,

but it does not follow—the contrary is established by this decision—that a power may not be vested in the General Parliament whenever the object of the incorporation is matter of general concern. For a moment or two I desire to call attention to sections 91 and 92 of the British North America Act, under the provisions of which the constitutionality of this Act must be decided, and under which the constitutionality of the Crooks Act was decided in the case of Hodge. Section 91 is as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, in relation to matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated."

And twenty-eight subjects are enumerated, among which is "The regulation of Trade and Commerce." The section concludes:

"And any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section shall not be deemed to come within the class of matters of a local or private nature comprised in the enumeration of the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces."

Section 92 contains the subjects exclusively agreed to be legislated on by the Provinces, and the conclusion of subsection 16 says:

"Generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in the Province."

The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) addressed a plausible argument to this House and pressed it very strongly, that if the Local Legislatures had jurisdiction in the matter of the liquor traffic, they had it exclusively, because, under section 92, their powers are assigned to them exclusively. That was a very plausible argument; but the hon. gentleman must remember this, that though sub-section 16 of section 92 assigns all matters of a merely local or private nature in the Province to the jurisdiction of the Province exclusively; yet, notwithstanding that, when any of those matters come under any of the twenty-eight classes of subjects enumerated in Section 91, then the subject matter is taken out of the jurisdiction of the Province by the express terms of the British North America Act, and is placed under section 91 within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. That may be a conclusion which is fatal to the hon. gentleman's contention; that may be a view much more in keeping with the view of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde); but whether it may be in accordance with his view or not, such is the proper interpretation of the Act, as propounded in several decisions rendered by the Privy Council in England. I will read a few words from their Lordships' decision in the case of Russell *vs.* The Queen, with respect to sections 91 and 92. Their Lordships say in that case:

"The general question of the competency of the Dominion Parliament to pass the Act depends on the construction of the 91st and 92nd sections of the 'British North America Act, 1867,' which are found in Part VI. of the Statute, under the heading 'Distribution of Legislative Powers.' "The 91st section enacts (I have read the section.)

"The general scheme of the 'British North America Act,' with regard to the distribution of legislative powers, and the general scope and effect of sections 91 and 92, and their relation to each other, were fully considered and commented on by this Board in the case of the Citizens' Insurance Company *v.* Parsons (7 L. R Appeal Cases 96). According to the principle of construction there pointed out, and the first question to be determined is, whether the Act now in question falls within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in section 92, and assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces. If it does then the further question would arise, viz., whether the subject of the Act does not fall within one of the enumerated classes of subjects in section 91, and so does not still belong to the Dominion Parliament. But if the Act does not fall within any of the classes of subjects in section 92, no further question will remain, for it cannot be contended, and indeed was not contended at their Lordships' Bar, that if the Act does not come within one of the classes of subjects assigned to the Provincial Legislatures

the Parliament of Canada had not, by its general power 'to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada,' full legislative authority to pass it."

From that pronunciamento it is perfectly plain that in construing an Act the first question is: does the subject matter of it fall within the subjects of section 92? and if it does, that does not decide finally that it belongs to section 92. The further question then arises, whether or not, notwithstanding that it falls within section 92, it belongs to any of the enumerated classes of subjects in section 91, and so belongs to the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament? In the case of Parsons *vs.* The Queen, their Lordships said:

"The first question to be decided is, whether the Act impeached in the present appeals, falls within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in section 92, and assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the Provinces; for, if it does not, it can be of no validity, and no other question would then arise. It is only when an Act of the Provincial Legislature, *primâ facie* falls within one of these classes of subjects, that the further question arises, viz., whether notwithstanding that is so, the subject of the Act does not also fall within one of the classes of subjects in section 91, and whether the power of the Provincial Legislature is or is not thereby overcome."

According to the opinions expressed by their Lordships in these two cases, in regard to the distribution of power, under sections 91 and 92, there is first to be considered whether the subject matter of the Act falls within section 92; if so, the further question arises whether it does not fall within 91, and therefore comes under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament; and then there is a third question; if it does, does the legislation passed by virtue of it overbear the legislation passed on the same subject by a Provincial Legislature. So, Sir, I submit that this is a fair question to be considered here. I do not pretend to decide it; I only call attention to it. Does the legislation of the Dominion Parliament, with reference to a matter of personal concern, submerge the legislation upon the same subject passed in a Province as a local and private matter, *quoad* the Province? The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island did not suggest that we might even have concurrent legislation. He said the Hodge case decided the matter finally, that the jurisdiction was in the Provincial Legislature, and not here, and he did not go so far as to say that it might be concurrent. Now, their Lordships said in the Parsons case:

"It could not have been the intention that a conflict should exist; and in order to prevent such a result the language of the two sections must be read together, and that of one interpreted, and, where necessary, modified, by that of the other. In this way, in most cases, it will be found possible to arrive at a reasonable and practical construction of the language of the sections, so as to reconcile the respective powers they contain, and give effect to all of them. In performing this difficult duty, it will be a wise course for those on whom it is thrown to decide in each case which arises, as best they can, without entering more largely upon an interpretation of the Statute than is necessary for the decision of the particular question on hand."

So, we see, according to the declaration of their Lordships that it is not in the contemplation of the Act that there should be a conflict of jurisdiction. That would seem to suggest, and it is practically suggested in the case of Hodge *vs.* The Queen, that the lesser power of the Local Legislature must give way. I do not say so, but I simply say that it is a fair inference from the reasoning of their Lordships in these cases. Further, I say that the British North America Act seems to imply, by the use of the word exclusively, not merely with reference to local jurisdiction, but with reference to Federal jurisdiction, that there is not a concurrence of jurisdiction, on any subject contained in sections 91 and 92. That view is further strengthened by the fact that in section 95 we find the following. The marginal note is:

"Concurrent powers of legislation respecting agriculture, &c."

The section itself states:

"In each Province the Legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the Province, and to immigration into the Province; and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to agriculture in all or any of the Provinces, and to immigration into all or any of the Provinces; and any law of the Legislature of a Province relative to agriculture or to immigration shall have effect in and for the Province as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada."

Here, Sir, we find an expressed stipulation in our Constitution providing for concurrent jurisdiction. The marginal notes styles it concurrent jurisdiction. The provisions of the Statute declare it to be concurrent jurisdiction. It is provided in that clause that in the event of the legislation of the Local Legislature being repugnant to that of the Federal Legislature, the legislation of the Local must give way. This exception seems to support the view that, in the event of a conflict between the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures and the Federal Parliament, the pre-eminence is given in the matter of legislation to the Parliament of Canada. Now, there is a decision which seems to bear out that view. It is a decision rendered in a case about ten years ago in the Privy Council, and several times since has been referred to approvingly by their Lordships. It was an appeal in the case of "L'Union St. Jacques *vs.* Belisle," which arose in the district of Montreal, under these circumstances. This union was a benevolent or aid society. It provided that certain contributions should be sent in by workingmen to the society, and that certain provision should be made for the benefit of widows and children of deceased workmen. In the course of time the society became embarrassed, and it was necessary for it to obtain legislation in order to provide for the successful carrying out of its affairs. The society did not desire to go into insolvency, but to make such provisions as would enable them to pay less than the ordinary amount of their obligations, under the constitution and rules. They went to the Legislature of Quebec and obtained an Act authorizing the commutation of the claims against the society. Two of the widows having claims refused to accept these commuted amounts, and they brought action against the society, claiming that what the society had done was to go to the Legislature of Quebec for relief, and that the Legislature of Quebec had passed an Act practically dealing with the subject matter of insolvency, which is under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. The case went to the Privy Council, and Lord Selbourne, who rendered the decision of their Lordships, declared that the subject matter of the Act did not come within the purview of insolvency; that the object of the Act was to avoid those subjects; that it was legal to bring the matter to the Province of Quebec, and that the Dominion had nothing to do with it. They decided that the Act of the Province was constitutional because it dealt with a local and private matter. In delivering judgment their Lordships expressed the following opinion which, in my view, has a strong bearing on this case:—

"The hypothesis was suggested in argument by Mr. Benjamine, who certainly argued this case with his usual ingenuity and force, of a law having been previously passed by the Dominion Legislature, to the effect that any association of this particular kind, throughout the Dominion, on certain specified conditions, assumed to be exactly those which appear to be on the face of this Statute, should thereupon, *ipso facto*, fall under the legal administration in bankruptcy or insolvency. Their Lordships are by no means prepared to say that if any such law as that had been passed by the Dominion Legislature, it would have been beyond their competency; nor, that if it had been so passed, it would have been within the competency of the Provincial Legislatures afterwards to take a particular association out of the scope of a general law of that kind, so competently passed by the authority which had power to deal with bankruptcy and insolvency. But no such law ever has been passed; and to suggest the possibility of such a law, as a reason why the power of the Provincial Legislature, over this local and private association, should be in abeyance or altogether taken away, is to make a suggestion which, if followed up to its consequences, would go far to destroy that power in all cases."

Now, Sir, I understand the meaning of this to be that in their Lordships' opinion, if there had been a general

law for the whole Dominion, providing for the liquidation of insolvent companies, then in all probability it would not have been in the power of the Legislature of a Province to pass a measure relating to that paricular subject. I also understand its meaning to be, further, that the Local Legislatures may exercise certain powers in the absence of the exercise of the more general powers by the Dominion Parliament; and I go further, and taking that cause side by side with the expression of opinion in the Hodge case, that subjects which, in one aspect and for one purpose, may fall in section 92, may, in another aspect and for another purpose, fall in section 91, I think that the conclusion is not difficult to reach, that some powers competently exercised by a Local Legislature may be submerged in the event of a general legislation upon the same subject matter, in the interest of the whole Dominion.

Mr. HOUDE. That is encouraging.

Mr. MACMASTER. Why, Sir, it is no part of my duty to encourage the hon. gentleman; it is no part of my duty to intimidate or alarm the hon. gentleman; it is my duty, as I stated at the outset, as I conceive it is the duty of every hon. member who addresses himself to this subject, to expound the Constitution truly. If we do not expound it truly, we may be sure that in a very short time it will be expounded truly by the courts; and we may as well take time by the forelock, cast aside our prejudices and our predilections and our preferences, and address ourselves to the task of ascertaining, if possible, the true interpretation of our Constitution. A short time ago, when I was in England, I met Mr. Benjamin who practised so successfully on this continent and afterwards in England; and he said to me: "You appear to have great difficulty in intrepreting your Constitution, which has only been in existence for fifteen years; but I can tell you, after a practice of thirty odd years in the United States, and subsequently in England, where I often had to do with cases relating to the Constitutions of the colonies in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, that these cases are increasing year by year and day by day, and although we thought in the United States that the difficulties of our Constitution would be settled in the first fifteen or twenty years of its existence, the present day has developed difficulties that we never contemplated, and that are ten times as great as any that existed in the first half century of its existence." These are difficulties, let me say to my hon. friend from Maskinongé, that are found in every written Constitution, whether the Constitution of Canada, of the United States, of France, or of Switzerland."

Mr. HOUDE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make a remark? What is the custom in England—to ask the courts to define the meaning of the British Constitution; or is it for the Legislature to create precedents and to establish usages which form part of the Constitution itself?

Mr. MACMASTER. My hon. friend is a man of far too great ability and learning not to understand that the British Constitution is not a written Constitution; and what the Judges in England do is to interpret the common law and the Statutes of the land. But what are the Judges asked to do in this case? They are asked to interpret one of the Statutes passed in England relating to the Government of this great and important colony; and in the interpretation of our Constitution, which is an Imperial Act, they apply the same rules of interpretation as would be applied to the interpretation of a Statute relating to the humblest concern or subject in the United Kingdom.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he proposes to persist in this policy of submergement, to which he refers?

Mr. MACMASTER My hon. friend is evidently somewhat submerged by this consideration of the subject. He evidently sees the difficulty of grappling with that consideration. If my hon. friend were less disingenuous than his remark seems to indicate, he would have given me credit for saying that I regarded that as a possible view to be taken of the subject. I did not commit myself to that view; I simply said it was a possible view; and I very much doubt whether it is not the correct view, that the local power is over-borne by the Dominion power, under the terms of our Constitution in the circumstances I have mentioned. That may be right or it may be wrong. This document, the British North America Act, is not so sacramental that it cannot be changed by the same power that brought it into existence; but until the emergency arises, until it is clearly demonstrated that this Constitution works unfairly and unjustly to us, it would be premature and improper on our part, by suggesting possible difficulties, to go to the Imperial Legislature and ask for amendments to that Constitution. The hon. Minister of Public Works asks that it be referred to the Supreme Court and the Privy Council for determination. Hon. gentlemen object to that. We know that for years they objected to submit the great question of the boundary of Ontario to the Privy Council. They sang "Ontario, Ontario!" with that beautiful rhythm that characterizes their warbling throughout the country. They stated that by the refusal of this Government to ratify the award, Ontario was robbed of half its territory; but when the hon. leader of the Government proposed, in 1872, that the whole question should be relegated to the Privy Council, the highest Court in the Empire, and reiterated the proposition, in 1882, before the General Election, what did the hon. member for Bothwell say? He voted that it should not be so referred, in order that the question might be retained as a football to be played with before the electors of Ontario. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends at Toronto are also evidently determined that this question should be made a footfall. I have been discussing this question as a legal and constitutional question, entirely regardless of the political projectiles that may be thrown into it. My view may be right, or it may be wrong; I have no political ambition to serve in taking one view or the other. What I want, and what I take it every hon. gentleman in this House wants, is the correct interpretation of the Constitution. If it be found that the true interpretation is unsuitable to the progressive people that inhabit this country, if it be found necessary, in the interests of the Provinces and the whole Confederation, to modify our Constitution, then, I say, let us modify it. The men who were ready to bring this Constitution into action, would certainly be willing to see it modified, if necessary; but let it be clearly demonstrated that that modification is necessary before we risk experiments of that kind. I say further, if on a determination—and I say this not so much for myself as for my genial and intellectual friend from Maskinongé—if on a determination of this kind, it should appear that the jurisdiction of this question lies entirely with the Federal Parliament, and that it is for the best interests of the Provinces that it should be relegated to the Provinces, and that, in so doing, no injustice will occur to the public peace and order of the whole Dominion, I, for one, would be willing to consider whether it might not be better that this question should be so relegated. In the meantime, be it observed, I have only addressed myself to the constitutional question submitted to this House. Our duty is to give a true interpretation to the Constitution, and on this account, I am favourable to removing this question from the whirlpool of politics to a place where it can be calmly considered, the Supreme Court, and, if necessary, to the Privy Council, the highest Court in the Empire.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend entered into a lengthy discussion and quoted very largely from the cases bearing on this matter. He said he wished to approach the ques-

tion in a calm, judicial spirit, but I think, before he got through, he showed he was holding a brief for some one; he showed he was holding a brief for the Government in this case, in endeavouring to gloss over the legislation which is now the subject for discussion. In carrying out the views enunciated by the hon. member for Glengarry, it is clear that eventually the Dominion Government would absorb the whole legislative powers of the local Provinces, and instead of being a Federal union, we will become practically a legislative union. It is the duty of every hon. member to see that the autonomy of the Provinces, granted them under the British North America Act, should be observed; to see that the powers vested in the Provinces should remain intact, and to vigorously oppose any attempt to interfere with them, irrespective of party. The hon. member for Glengarry started with the theory that a conflict exists in the British North America Act, between sections 91 and 92, and that Local Legislatures are inferior to this Federal Legislature. Now, I say both those theories are fallacious. There is no conflict. In the 95th section, which he has quoted, there is a provision for concurrent jurisdiction, and there it is expressly provided that where a conflict does take place, the Federal legislation shall supersede the other; but with regard to the other proposition, I shall show, by the decision of the Privy Council, that that also is not tenable. The inclusion of one is the exclusion of the other. The 95th section shows the Legislature never intended any conflict should arise between the subjects granted to the Federal Parliament and those exclusively granted to the Local Legislatures; but, independent of that, I turn to the decision of the Privy Council in the case of Parsons *vs.* The Citizens' Insurance Company, and I will first call attention to the proposition laid down in this case. The Privy Council decided in that case, that the powers of the Dominion Parliament for the regulation of trade and commerce include the regulation of trade even in matters of interprovincial concern.

"And it may be that they would include general regulation of trade affecting the whole Dominion, but * * * * but its authority to legislate for the regulation of trade and commerce does not comprehend the power to regulate by legislation the contracts of a particular business or trade, such as the business of fire insurance, in a single Province."

Their Lordships, in the course of that case, used the following language:—

"An endeavour appears to have been made to provide for cases of apparent conflict; and it would seem, that with this object, it was declared in the second branch of the 91st section, for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of the section, that (notwithstanding any thing in the Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada should extend to all matters coming within the classes of subjects enumerated in that section With the same object, apparently, the paragraph at the end of section 91 was introduced, though it may be observed that this paragraph applies, in its grammatical construction, only to No. 16 of section 92. Notwithstanding this endeavour to give pre-eminence to the Dominion Parliament in cases of a conflict of powers, it is obvious that in some cases where this apparent conflict exists, the Legislature could not have intended that the powers exclusively assigned to the Provincial Legislature should be absorbed in those given to the Dominion Parliament."

The proposition was there laid down that the powers exclusive to the Local Legislature should not be absorbed in those given to the Dominion Parliament. Their Lordships assumed there was no real conflict; but even where there was apparent conflict, the two ought to be distinct, and where the powers were exclusively assigned to the Provincial Legislatures, they should not be absorbed by the Dominion Parliament. The hon. member for Glengarry put forward the proposition that if the Local Legislatures had the power and if the Dominion Parliament eventually should assume that power by legislating for the whole Dominion, in contradistinction to the Local legislation of a particular Province, the action of the Dominion Parliament would over-ride the inferior Legislature; and he puts forward, though not in express terms, but it is to be found in his argument, the proposition that a Local Legislature is of inferior jurisdiction to the Dominion Parliament. Now, I will quote from the very case of Hodge *vs.* The Queen in which, though my hon. friend endeavours to file it down simply to a case as to whether a man had the right to use a billiard room or not, principles of the greatest constitutional importance to the Provinces and the Dominion were laid down:

"It appears to their Lordships, however, that the objection thus raised by the appellants is grounded upon an entire misconception of the true character and position of the Provincial Legislatures. They are in no sense delegates or acting under any mandate of the Imperial Parliament. When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a Legislature for Ontario, and that its Legislative Assembly should have exclusive authority to make laws for the Province and for Provincial purposes, in relation to the matters enumerated in section 92, it conferred powers not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial Parliament, but authority as plenary and as ample within the limits prescribed by section 92 as the Imperial Parliament, in the plenitude of its power, possessed and could bestow. Within those limits of subjects and area, the Local Legislature is supreme, and has the same authority as the Imperial Parliament or the Parliament of the Dominion would have had under like circumstances to confide to a municipal institution or body of its own creation authority to make by-laws or resolutions as to subjects specified in the enactment, and with the object of carrying the enactment into operation and effect."

I say that the two decisions I have quoted, the decision in the case of Parsons, and that in the case of Hodge, entirely contradict the two propositions of my hon. friend with regard to the conflict between the two Legislatures, and also with regard to the inferior position which he claims the Local Parliaments hold in regard to this Federal Parliament. Then it becomes a question of construction, with regard to the point whether this power is in this Dominion Parliament or not, and it is a point which it is important to discuss, under the other aspect of the case, which has been presented to the House, because it has been argued in two points of view: first, with regard to the constitutionality of the Liquor License Act of 1883; and secondly, as to its expediency or necessity, because we must bear in mind that the strong argument put forward for the interference of Federal legislation in this matter was the necessity which it was contended was forced upon this Parliament by the decision in the case of Russell against the Queen. First, as to the constitutional question. Laying down, as I said, the proposition that there is and there should be no conflict, we have a right to see what is the decision of the highest tribunal. It was admitted by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), and also by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), that in the technical and literal sense there was no decision on the Licensing Act of 1883; but, if, in arguing cases before the courts, we could bring forward identical cases, there is an end of all argument, because there is a decision; but, when we go into court, as members belonging to my profession know, we have to argue cases by analogy, by deducing principles from the cases before us and the Statute upon which to decide its legality or illegality, its *vires* or its *ultra vires*. In arguing this case, I take the first point, that the case of Hodge against the Queen decidedly puts the power of licensing within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. My hon. friend from Glengarry said the principle which their Lordships referred to as laid down in the cases of Russell and the Queen and the Citizens' Insurance Company was that "subjects which, in one aspect and for one purpose, fall within Section 92, may, in another aspect and for another purpose, fall within section 91." Assuming that to be a proper principle, it may be that subjects of that kind may in another aspect and for another purpose fall within the other section, but not in the same aspect and for the same purpose. In dealing with bankruptcy and insolvency, it is necessary that this Parliament, in order to carry out the power given to it, should trench upon property and civil rights, but they deal with it in another aspect and for another purpose than the Local Legislatures deal with it under section 92, and it would not be argued that this Praliament would be entitled to exercise plenary powers over property

and civil rights all over the Dominion; because my hon. friend's argument might be carried to this extent, because this Legislature had the right by virtue of its power to regulate bankruptcy and insolvency, to interfere with property and civil rights, that, while Local Legislatures could exercise within their jurisdictions the power over property and civil rights granted to them in section 92, yet, if this Parliament chose to exercise its power over property and civil rights over the whole Dominion, at once the powers of the Local Legislatures would be absorbed in the powers of the Dominion. I contend that the proposition that, in another aspect and for another purpose, this may be, shows that their Lordships never contemplated that, for the same purpose and the same objects, subjects should come under the jurisdiction both of the local and Federal legislation. The case of Hodge against the Queen clearly lays down the principle that the power to regulate belongs to the Ontario Parliament. My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., has already called attention to the 4th and 5th sections of the Ontario License Act. It is not, as put forward by the hon. member for Glengarry, merely the subject of a billiard room, but it is a question as to the powers granted by those 4th and 5th sections of the Ontario Act, whether, in the first instance, the Ontario Legislature had the power to make those regulations, and secondly, whether they had the power to delegate that power to Commissioners. What are these powers:

"For defining the condition and qualifications requisite to obtain tavern licenses for the retail, within the municipality, of spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors, and also shop licenses for the sale by retail, within the municipality, of such liquors in shops or places other than taverns, inns, ale-houses, beer-houses or places of public entertainment; for limiting the number of taverns and shop licenses respectively, and for defining the respective time and localities within which, and the persons to whom such limited number may be issued; for declaring that in cities a number not exceeding ten persons, and in towns a number not exceeding four persons, qualified to have a tavern license, may be exempted from the necessity of having all the tavern accommodation required by law; for regulating the taverns and shops to be licensed; for fixing and defining the duties, powers and privileges of the inspector of licenses of their district."

Then Section 5 is as follows:—

"In and by any such resolution of a Board of License Commissioners the said Board may impose penalties for the infraction thereof."

Now, there are, in section 4, five different powers claimed to be exercised by the Ontario Legislature, which also, by that, they transfer to the License Commissioners, and the 5th section gives them the power to inflict penalties. Now, my hon. friend from Glengarry puts forward that the question of the right to regulate these licenses arose from subsection 9 of section 92, "shop, saloon, and other licenses for the purposes of raising a revenue," and if their Lordships had decided upon that sub-section and that these powers referred to that, there might be some force in the argument put forward. He said: what was their decision, what was the question they decided? That Mr. Hodge permitted a "billiard table to be used as such within the period prohibited by the resolution of the License Commissioners, and it was for that infraction of their rules he was prosecuted and convicted." My hon. and learned friend put it forward that that was the decision of their Lordships. Why, if he looked, he would see that that is a conclusion of the fact set forward as admitted and proved upon the trial of the case, and not the decision or the conclusion which their Lordships came to. We find that followed by the remark:

"The preceding statement of the facts is sufficient to enable their Lordships to determine the questions raised on the appeal."

Then, they say they are requested by the counsel to ascertain as to the Act being *ultra vires* of the Ontario Legislature, and then what do we find they decide:

"The subjects of legislation in the Ontario Act of 1877, sections 4 and 5, seem to come within the heads Nos. 8, 15 and 16 of sections 92 of British North America Statute, 1867. Their Lordships are, therefore, of opinion that, in relation to sections 4 and 5 of the Act in question, the Legislature of Ontario acted within the powers conferred on it by the Imperial Act of 1867, and that in this respect there is no conflict with the powers of the Dominion Parliament."

Now, I want to see under what sections they say this power is granted to the Ontario Legislature. Sub-section 8 is "municipal institutions;" sub section 15 provides for "the imposition of punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section;" and sub-section 16 is "generally all matter of a merely local or private nature in the Province." Then, sub-section 9 is excluded, for they decided, under sub sections 8, 15 and 16, that that power remains in the Provincial Legislature, and, if that power is vested in them, how can concurrent power remain, or even come under section 91, within the Federal Legislature. Now, in this case, the Prime Minister last year said, in referring to Russell against the Queen:

"It is quite clear to every lawyer; and any man who is not a lawyer who reads that judgment, will see that the very reasons on which the Privy Council decided that this Parliament had the right to deal with the Scott Act are the reasons showing that the Provincial Legislature of Ontario had not a right to deal with that subject, except as a matter of revenue for municipal or provincial purposes."

That was the statement made by the First Minister in discussing this Act last year. That was the ground upon which he put it that Regina and Russell simply decided, and the only ground on which it could be held that the Provinces had any right to deal with the subject was for the purposes of a revenue for municipal or provincial purposes. And yet we find, since then, that it is not under that section at all, but by virtue of municipal institutions, by virtue of being of a local nature, and by the power to impose penalties, that sections 4 and 5 are within the competency of the Ontario Legislature. Then I see by the principle laid down in the Parsons case and that of the Citizens' Insurance Company, that that power is vested for that purpose in the Provincial Legislatures, and therefore cannot be in this. There can be no conflict of jurisdiction. If once it is found to be with that 92 section, it is taken entirely out of 91 section. Now, the case of the Queen against Russell my hon. friend from Glengarry referred to, but he did not follow up the observations made by their Lordships upon that case, and I wish that the language used by the First Minister in the debate last year should be borne in mind when I read the language of their Lordships in the case. The argument put forward then is dealt with by their Lordships and showed to be untenable. They say:

"The appellants contended that the Legislature of Ontario had no power to pass any Act to regulate the liquor traffic; that the whole power to pass such an Act was conferred on the Dominion Parliament, and consequently taken from the Provincial Legislature by section 91 of the British North America Act, 1867; and that it did not come within any of the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures by section 92. The clause in section 91, which the Liquor License Act, 1877, was said to infringe, was No. 2, 'the regulation of trade and commerce,' and it was urged that the decision of this board in Russell *vs.* Regina was conclusive—that the whole subject of the liquor traffic was given to the Dominion Parliament, and consequently taken away from the Provincial Legislature. It appears to their Lordships, however, that the decision of this tribunal in that case was not the effect supposed, and that when properly considered, it should be taken rather as an authority in support of the judgment of the Court of Appeal."

The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Davies) has referred to that judgment, and he has also cited the language of Chief Justice Spragge and Justice Burton, whose judgment was confirmed by the Privy Council. But they have pointed out that the decision in Russell and the Queen is authority for that decision, and they follow that up and reiterate it to show clearly their opinion on that point:

"It appears to their Lordships that Russell *vs.* The Queen, when properly understood, is not an authority in support of the appellant's contention, and their Lordships do not intend to vary or depart from the reasons expressed for their judgments in that case."

Their decision in Russell *vs.* The Queen has not had the effect contended for by those who support this License Act of 1883. The questions their Lordships decided were not, as the hon. member for Glengarry has said, the mere use of a billiard table after a certain hour, but they were questions of a constitutional nature. The real question was as to the power of the Ontario Legislature, and having found that power to reside within the Ontario Legislature with regard to licenses and the regulation of this traffic, independent of the general regulations of trade and commerce, they state that this power belongs to the Provincial Parliament, and therefore it does not belong to the Dominion Parliament. With regard to the Scott Act, it has been pointed out that their Lordships put forward that it was a regulation of trade and commerce applying to the whole Dominion, not for the internal carrying on of trade. The hon. member for Glengarry cited the case of the Union St. Jacques against Belisle, which was one of the earliest cases brought before the Privy Council. In all these cases they considered the point before them and did not go into any theoretical discussion or argument as to matters that were not before them, but confined themselves strictly to the propositions necessary for the purpose of the case before them. That makes the case in Hodge still stronger, because their Lordships felt it their duty in that case, in order to get at the right construction of the Statute with regard to the License Act of Ontario, to discuss these important questions with regard to the power of the Provincial Legislature, with regard to the construction put upon Russell against the Queen, and with regard to the full and plenary powers of Provincial Legislatures. They have so decided that. In the debate on the Address, the First Minister put forward that decision himself differently from the manner in which my hon. friends opposite have put it forward. He said the Ontario Government, first, could make by-laws and regulations for the liquor traffic. That means, they could pass Acts for the regulation of licenses; and secondly, if they could do that for themselves they could give that power to municipalities. That is the proposition put down by the First Minister himself, as the effect of that decision. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in putting that down, the First Minister undertook to say that it was not a decision of any weight in the Privy Council. He said:

"Well, the Hodge case, I have no hesitation in saying, is not the last word of the question. I have no hesitation in saying that the Privy Council, for some reasons known to those behind the scenes, from the absence of those members of it who usually take up questions under the British North America Act, avoided a decision."

He thus says that the Privy Council gave a judgment which is not to be relied upon, because some members of it were absent. Now let us see who were the Judges present on that occasion. We find that the decision was given by Lord Fitzgerald, late Irish Lord Chancellor, and there were present besides, Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir Robert P. Collier, Sir Richard Couch and Sir Arthur Hobhouse. I find that, with one exception, which was an appeal from the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, the court was constituted of the same Judges, in hearing the different cases under the British North America Act. The following is a list of the cases, with the Judges sitting in each:

Case.	No. of Judges.	Remarks.
L'Union St. Jacques *vs.* Belisle.	5	Sir Barnes Peacock and Sir Robert P. Collier, two of them.
Attorney-General *vs.* Queen Insurance Company.	5	do
Valin *vs.* Langlois	5	do
Cusway *vs.* Dupry	4	do
Bourgoin *vs.* Railway	4	do
Parson *vs.* Citizen Insurance Company.	5	Sir B. Peacock, Sir Montague E. Smith, Sir R. P. Collier, Sir Richard Couch, and Sir Arthur Hobhouse.
Western Railway Company *vs.* Windsor Railway Company.	5	Lord Blackburn, Lord Watson, Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir R. P. Collier, and Sir Arthur Hobhouse.
Russell *vs.* The Queen ...	5	Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir Montagne E. Smith, Sir R. P. Collier, Sir R. Couch, and Sir Jas. Hannen.
Dobie *vs.* Temporalities Board.	....	Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir R. P. Collier, Sir R. Couch, Sir Arthur Hobhouse.
Hodge *vs.* The Queen.....	....	Lord Fitzgerald, Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir R. P. Collier, Sir R. Couch, and Sir Arthur Hobhouse.

When the First Minister says that the Privy Council, for some cause or other, behind the scenes, avoided its decision, I say that the cases show that the very men who have construed, since 1874, the British North America Act, are the very Judges who decided the principle on which the case of Hodge was decided. Instead of giving a decision on the billiard table question, they did not shrink from laying down the principles on which provincial rights should be maintained, and by which the autonomy of the Provinces should be preserved from Federal interference and control. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) cited the preamble of the Liquor License Act, 1883, and contended that because it was put forward for the purpose of having uniform legislation that therefore the object of the Federal Parliament in passing the Act was to have uniform legislation over the whole Dominion, and he inferred that to a certain extent it would draw the power into the hands of the Federal Parliament. But the first point to ascertain is, whether the Federal Parliament has power over the subject for which to secure uniform laws over the whole Dominion. The Dominion Parliament is just as restricted and confined within the limits of section 91 as Provincial Legislatures are confined within the limits of section 92, and the Federal Parliament has no more right to transcend and encroach on the powers of section 92, than the Provincial Legislatures have to encroach on the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. Then we find that, according to the propositions put forward, the consideration of this subject was forced on this Parliament by the decision in the case of Russell, because it was contended that that judgment placed the whole liquor traffic within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. That difficulty was swept away by the contrary decision given in the case of Hodge. I therefore argue, as I would argue before a court of law or as a Judge, that if I find the principles laid down in different judgments are analogous, I have a right to apply those principles and draw conclusions, and I maintain that by the cases cited, more particularly the case of Hodge, the principle is laid down that the regulation of taverns, the mode in which they shall be governed, &c., are matters entirely within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature, by virtue of the section respecting municipal institutions and the other two sub-sections to which I have referred. If that is the correct, and as I maintain, the only conclusion to be drawn from the decision in the Hodge case, then the power must remain with the Provincial Legislatures and this Parliament has nothing to do with the matter. But, besides the constitutional question, it was said that if the law of 1883 had not been passed, there would have been unrestrained liquor selling throughout the Dominion. When the Privy Council has decided that the laws in force in the several Provinces are constitutional laws, of what use is this Federal law, except to cause a conflict of jurisdiction? As has been suggested by the hon.

member for Queen's, P. E. I, (Mr. Davies), under which law is a man to act and be licensed? With those two laws in force, standing side by side, and with the matter still unsettled, grave conflicts would arise, which even the submission of the proposed case to the Privy Council would not overcome. But if the necessity has ceased to exist, let us place the matter in the position which it occupied before, and strengthen, if we can, the hands of the Provincial Legislatures to keep the trade within proper bounds, and in so doing we willbe guarding provincial rights, which, I fear, there is too much disposition to assail. In that event, no conflict can occur. Under present circumstances, the Act of 1883 is unnecessary, and the ground is covered by the Crooks Act of Ontario, and legislation already passed by the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. We will do more. The city of St. John, in the district I have the honour to represent, founded by Royal charter, has itself possessed for nearly a hundred years, the right to regulate licenses, and the Act of 1883 would sweep away that right. That Act, therefore, was not only an interference with provincial rights, but with rights and privileges granted to that city by its charter. It is for that reason, and because I believe the power is vested in the Provincial Legislatures, and that the necessity for the Act has been shown to have passed away, I support the motion. The only argument put forward last year was, that in order to prevent the traffic running riot through the country, a Dominion Act was necessary. Now, we find by the solemn decision of the highest tribunal of the Empire such is not the case, but that the laws of the Province are sufficient. Then, let us avert the conflict which is otherwise inevitable, and let the licensing question remain within provincial jurisdiction, and by doing so we will preserve to every Province its independence and its Provincial rights.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Up to this hour, this discussion has been carried on, I believe, exclusively by gentlemen learned in the law. It may not be amiss, even at this late hour, to devote a few moments to considering how this question presents itself to one not learned in the law—to a layman. The proposition to repeal the Dominion License Act naturally raises the question of the circumstances under which that law was enacted, what evil was to be remedied by it, what good was to be accomplished by it, on what ground did it rest? Fortunately, Sir, we are not left in any doubt upon this matter. The reasons for the law and the necessity for it were recorded, officially recorded, and we have them where they may be referred to at all times. Not to go back to the unofficial records of what occurred near Toronto, as recorded in the *Mail* newspaper, on the 2nd June, 1882, but relying on the records which no man can dispute, which no man can claim to be unfair, we come down, Sir, to a period, not of ancient history, to nothing that is contained in the old books, but a period of only one year ago, and we find a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne claiming that this law was necessary in order to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. At a very little later period, we are given further information upon this subject; and here, Sir, I am compelled, somewhat reluctantly, to repeat what has been read in parts several times during the debate, but it perhaps is something which will stand repeating two or three times. It occurs to me that some hon. gentlemen do not understand yet. I refer to the statement made by the Prime Minister a year ago, as to the ground upon which this legislation was based. He said:

"That subject was not willingly undertaken by the present Government They were quite satisfied that the law, as it obtains in the different Provinces, should be continued They were quite satisfied that each Province should, so far as the law would allow it to enact such Statutes, deal with the subject of shop, tavern and saloon licenses. Neither the Government nor the Parliament of Canada, I take it, wish to interfere; and it was only when the decision which was given in June last on the Scott Act, a Dominion Act, and when the subject was forced upon them, that they thought it their duty to bring it before Parliament. I never had any doubt that when the question was brought before the courts, it would be decided that the Provincial Legislatures had no right whatever to deal with that subject, except for revenue purposes, for the purpose of imposing taxation for provincial or municipal purposes. * * * Now it is quite clear that if the Dominion Parliament had the right to pass the Scott Act, it had the exclusive right, because there is no current jurisdiction in the British North America Act on that subject; and when the constitutionality of that Act was decided against by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, the Dominion Government—I being a member of that Government—in order that the question might be settled, in order that we might get the highest final decision on that point, we came to Parliament to get a vote of money for the purpose of paying counsel on both sides * * * It is quite clear to every lawyer, and any man who is not a lawyer who reads the judgment will see that the very reasons on which the Privy Council decided that this Parliament had the right to deal with the Scott Act are the reasons showing that the Provincial Legislature of Ontario had not a right to deal with that subject under the Crooks Act, except as a matter of revenue for municipal or provincial purposes. The hon. gentleman says that we should have allowed the matter to stand over until it was finally decided. Sir, if there be any value in that decision, and there is every value in it, because it is the law of the land, there is no check at this moment in the Province of Ontario against the unlimited, unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. This is not a matter we can play with. It is not a matter of policy; it is a matter of necessity. If we wish to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors we must legislate immediately; for I take it that any man in this city or in any other part of Ontario can open his saloon and sell liquors, and there is not a court in the world can prevent his doing it."

Here, Sir, we have the ground of the entire legislation and the necessity for it. Now, was that the true ground or was it not? Is there any hon. gentleman on the opposite side prepared to say it was not truth? If it was the true ground thirteen months ago what is the basis to-day? Are they not forced into the position of either acknowledging that the representations made then were not true, or the representations made to-day are not true? From the date of Confederation until that time during a period of sixteen years, the Provinces have exercised this power, and it therefore required strong reasons for changing it. It was contended that the decision did not affect this power, but the Dominion Act which was passed. Before it went into effect another decision was given by the same highest tribunal in the Empire—a decision clear and distinct—that the Provinces have the power to regulate and control the traffic. Therefore, the entire ground was swept from under the Dominion Act. Its entire foundation was destroyed, and I fancy that to-day it might not be improperly designated the balloon Act, because the ground work is all gone. The Crooks Act has been described as not being worth the paper it is written on. Is this true? Is it not decided to be of the same value as the English law, and who can estimate the value of England's laws to the entire Empire, to the world. The question then arises, is there concurrent jurisdiction. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) said it was the duty of every member to expound constitutional law. I will not do it, I am not a lawyer, but I will quote a high constitutional lawyer, the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. He states that there is no concurrent jurisdiction under the British North America Act on this subject, and I hope hon. gentlemen will accept the authority. The Government of the Dominion and the Provinces have not the same power, he states, and I notice that this view was entertained by a gentleman in Ontario who holds the same political views as hon. gentlemen opposite. Recently the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature moved an amendment in which he stated that the Provinces had the exclusive jurisdiction and his followers all supported it. Under these circumstances, Sir, should not the Dominion Act be considered as dead? May the present motion be not considered as one to give it a decent burial? The authority of the Province has been thoroughly established; is it wise to press the matter further? When the alleged foundation and necessity of the Act is all gone, ought this to be pressed, in the mere hope of creating confusion by establishing a double power? Is there any pride in this matter? Is there any pride in having given an opinion

on constitutional law? If there is, what is proposed by the present course? It has been decided that the Provinces have the power; it has been declared that there is no concurrent jurisdiction; therefore, if hon. gentlemen opposite succeed in establishing concurrent jurisdiction, have they not proved two wrong opinions instead of one? Under the circumstances, is it wise, is it prudent, to attempt to force Dominion authority over the Provinces to the utmost extent? Is it wise to strain the Constitution for this purpose? Is this House prepared to maintain the doctrine that this Parliament is the fountain of all authority? Have the Provinces no authority, no rights? Would it not be well, Sir, to seriously heed the voice of warning that is being raised in the different Provinces? Would it not be well to listen to the notes of discontent that come up from the people down by the sea? Would it not be well to listen to those notes of discontent that come with still stronger force from the far west? Would it not be well to heed the determined opposition to encroachments of this kind that comes from the Province of Ontario? Would it not be well to heed the equally strong though less demonstrative opposition that comes from Quebec? Sir, are there not sufficient difficulties surrounding the Government of this Dominion, owing to its peculiar geographical position, without adding to them a conflict of jurisdiction? We often hear of the friction between the Dominion and the Provinces deplored. What is the easiest way of removing that friction? Let the Central Government cease to rub the Provinces, and the friction will cease. Is it a sound principle that by weakening the parts you can strengthen the whole? Is this Dominion going to be strengthened by weakening the various Provinces? Sir, I believe there is no solid, abiding foundation for the union of these Provinces except in the contentment and happiness of the people in the various Provinces. It is now many years since Junius wrote, that "While the national honour is firmly maintained abroad, and while justice is impartially administered at home, the submission of the subject will be voluntary, cheerful, and I might almost say, unlimited." That is quite as true to-day as it was one hundred years ago. Is this question one confined to any particular section of the Dominion; is it not of equal interest to all of the Provinces? Is it not of equal interest to the far east and the far west, and is there any section with a higher interest in it than the great Province of Quebec? Sir, under our system, it is well known it is exceedingly difficult for men in the open House to oppose the party to which they belong; but there are means still remaining by which, without breaking party lines, members can bring to bear upon their party that pressure to which they are bound to yield. Let us not deceive ourselves, Sir, upon this question of provincial rights. It is a question that cannot be put down by this Parliament; it is impossible to put it down. The people are jealous of their provincial rights, and they will protect them. Party lines may be so sharply drawn as for a time to conceal them, but they exist, and they will assert themselves. Though this Dominion were bound together by bands of iron, it would not resist the constant encroachments which are made upon it and are tending to its injury. It is well known that when iron is subjected to a constant jar, its texture becomes changed; and if this constant jar is brought upon the Provinces, the texture which binds them together will change. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim to have rocked the cradle of this Dominion; let them take care that they dig not its grave. If it is considered indispensable that the smoke of sacrifice shall constantly ascend to political ambition, let something be selected for the sacrifice that the people value less than their Provincial rights, lest they may arise and quench the fire and throw down the altars. It is stated that, in the beginning of this era, the early Christians were frequently given over to wild beasts, because they refused to burn incense to Jove. Is the Province of Ontario being similarly treated? The indications are that the beasts are given to the Government and not the Government to the beasts. Some of these beasts I know, for I have met and fought them, not at Ephesus, but at other places.

Mr. OUIMET. It may be very satisfactory to the House to hear me announce that I do not intend to make a speech. I only wish to propose a sub-amendment to the amendment. I base it upon the decisions which we have already, and which I take to be correct decisions. I will not discuss them; but I will take them as they might be interpreted by any hon. member of this House, even if he is not a lawyer. The decision in Russell *vs.* The Queen says *en resumé* that the power of totally prohibiting the liquor traffic belongs to this Parliament. The power of prohibiting this traffic, as well as any other traffic or trade, belongs to this Parliament; but when it comes to making regulations, in order to ensure the maintenance of order and peace in the different municipalities, the matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. Being convinced that such is the true law, and that it would be useless to go to the Privy Council to have another discussion of five or six hours on the same point, and to hear every one propound a different interpretation of the *considerants* and the *exposé* of the learned Judges, I believe it would be more simple to define what would be the legislation in this matter. I think there will be no objection to the words of the sub amendment I propose to move, since they are the very words of the resolutions which were declared, in the case of Hodge *vs.* The Queen, to to be perfectly constitutional. I beg to move, in amendment to the said proposed amendment:

"That all the words after 'thereof' in the said amendment be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—'it is expedient to amend the Canada License Act of 1883, so as to strike out from said Act all provisions which do not relate to total prohibition of the liquor trade, and leave to the Provincial Legislature, in passing laws for the raising of a revenue for provincial, local, or municipal purposes, to make enactments regulating and determining the matters following, that is to say:—

"'(1.) For defining the conditions and qualifications requisite to obtain tavern licenses for the retail, within the municipality, of spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors, and also shop licenses for the sale by retail, within the municipality, of such liquors in shops, or places other than taverns, inns, ale-houses, beer-houses, or places of public entertainment.

"'(2.) For limiting the number of tavern and shop licenses respectively, and for defining the respective times and localities within which and the person to whom, such limited number may be issued, within the year, from the first day of May of one year, till the thirtieth day of April, inclusive, of the next year.

"'(3.) For regulating the taverns and shops to be licensed.

"'(4.) For fixing and defining the duties, powers and privileges of the Inspectors of Licenses of their district.'"

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Ouimet) negatived on a division.

Amendment (Sir Hector Langevin) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dugas,	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dundas,	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	Massue,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	Méthot,
Bell,	Foster,	Moffat,
Belleau,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gault,	O'Brien,
Benson,	Gigault,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Billy,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bourbeau,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hall,	Royal,
Brecken,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Smyth,

Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Carling,	Ives,	Tassé,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Chaplean,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tupper (Pictou),
Colby,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vanasse,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Coursol,	Macdonald (*King*),	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	Macmaster,	Wigle,
Desaulniers,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams,
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dodd,	McDougald,	Woodworth.—117.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dupont,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox),	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Amyot,	Fisher,	Mills,
Armstrong,	*Fleming*,	Mulock,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Ouimet,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Houde,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	King,	*Springer*,
Casey,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Vail,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Daoust,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Davies,	McCraney,	Wells,
De St. Georges,	McIntyre,	Wilson.—63.

On the main motion, as amended, being put,

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the First Minister, in case this motion is carried, as no doubt it will be, what steps the Government propose to take with a view to giving effect to it? Is it proposed to suspend the Act until the matter is decided, as proposed in the motion of the Minister of Public Works?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. According to the announcement of my hon. friend who moved the amendment, the Government will bring down a measure, which the hon. gentleman will see, showing what course the Government intend to take.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on a division.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:05 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 19th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SCRIVER, in moving the adoption of the First Report of the Joint Committee on the Library, said: Perhaps I had better explain that the only important matter contained in this report is a recommendation which was made last year by the Committee, and which was not adopted by this House, that the law books, except those needed for consultation, be transferred from the Library of Parliament to the Library of the Supreme Court. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read that portion of the report. It is as follows:—

"Last Session the Committee recommended that the bulk of the law books be permanently transferred to the Supreme Court Building, where the series of English and American Law Reports, formerly in the Library, have been sent by order of this House; that the Department of Justice be henceforth responsible for the maintenance and management of this Law Library, that it be no longer regarded as forming part of the Library of Parliament; subject, however, to a right of preferential access by members of both Houses to these books, whenever and wherever they may require to consult them. Such text-books only to be retained in the Library of Parliament, or, hereafter added thereto, as may be necessary for purposes of legislation The Committee beg leave to renew their recommendation—their report of last year, not having been concurred in by Parliament.

"A Sub-Committee has been appointed to determine, along with the Assistant Librarian, what law books should be retained it the Library."

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there anything in the report respecting increase of salaries?

Mr. SCRIVER. Not in this report.

Mr. SPEAKER. The object of this report is to allow the Library Committee more money to expend on the general library.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope that beside the text books and books on law, all Privy Council reports and all digests of reports, be kept in the Library here, because these are of continual use to us.

Mr. SCRIVER. The Sub-Committee charged with the duty of superintending the transference is composed of members, some of whom are perhaps as well prepared as any members of this House to judge what books it will be proper and judicious to retain in the Library here.

Mr. AMYOT. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this motion be allowed to stand over until hon. members are acquainted with the contents of the report. Our time is very much occupied, and it would be very awkward to have to go to the Supreme Court to consult law books. The rights and privileges of Parliament are affected by the motion, and it should be allowed to stand over for a day or two.

Mr. SPEAKER. The report was printed nearly a month ago in our Proceedings.

Mr. LAURIER. The Committee recommend that certain books be selected from the Library of Parliament and transferred to the Supreme Court Library; the Sub-Committee will have to judge what those books shall be, and report to the Library Committee, and that Committee will report to the House.

Mr. MILLS. This subject is a matter of very considerable importance. Take, for instance, the discussion we had in the House yesterday respecting the question of competent jurisdiction. It might be necessary, as it was in that case, not merely to consult text books, which have very little bearing on such a subject, but a number of decisions of the courts. I understand that if these law books are removed from the Library they will be placed in the Supreme Court building, and as that Court rises at four o'clock in the afternoon it would be impossible during the sitting of the House to consult those reports. This might be very inconvenient, and it is a question whether the country would not be better served by adding something to the Library appropriation and allowing us to retain the law books here and provide other books for the Supreme Court, and the use of the Bar, when they require them at the Supreme Court, rather than denude the Library of all the law publications. In my opinion there are reports such as those of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Federal reports of the United States, and others, which under our Federal organization are always important to have here, and are as necessary to consult as the ordinary text books on Parliamentary law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think as several hon. gentlemen have asked this report to stand over, and as attention has been called to the matter, it might be allowed to stand for another day, although it has been on the Votes and Proceedings for some time.

Mr. DAVIES. The object of the Committee was, as I understood, to remove from our Library to the Law Library those books relating to commercial law, common law, real estate, &c., which are now in this Library; but, as the matter stands now the text books are to be found here, and the reports at the other building, so that it is almost impossible for lawyers attending the Supreme Court to work up a case at all. It was understood that the works on constitutional law should remain here, and a Sub-Committee carefully selected was appointed and instructed not to remove to the lower library any works on constitutional law, or other works which might be used by members of the House. But lawyers find that as matters are now arranged they are required to work up part of their case in this Library and then go down to the other building for their reports, and that for that reason it was almost impossible to work at all. I have consulted a good many lawyers from the different Provinces and several have told me that they would prefer working up their cases at home in their own libraries. The suggestion of the Committee should be carried out, but I think the wishes of hon. gentlemen should also be carried out, by allowing those books which are necessary for us to use here to remain in this Library.

Mr. WELDON. I think the law reports of the Provinces, the digest of cases, and all works on constitutional or criminal law should be kept here, while text books which are more used for the purpose of litigation, and commercial text books, &c., should be kept where the reports are to be found. The intention of the Committee was that the English reports, the reports published by the Council of the Law Society, and the reports of the various Provinces should remain here, together with the works on constitutional and criminal law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think perhaps that the matter had better stand over until we have an opportunity of considering it. The hon. gentleman can bring it up again at an early day, and now that attention has been called to to it I hope hon. gentlemen who are interested in the matter will consider it carefully and be prepared to express their opinions when the report is again brought up.

Motion allowed to stand.

FORTIFICATIONS AND MILITARY BUILDINGS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) respecting fortifications and military buildings and their maintenance and repair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill embraces but one clause, which explains its object. It provides that after the 1st of July, 1884, the management of fortifications and military buildings, &c., and their maintenance and repair, should be in the hands of the Militia Department.

Bill read the first time.

CLAIM OF JOSEPH CHARLES LISLOIS.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to refer to the Dominion Board of Arbitrators the case of Joseph Charles Lislois, in the matter of his claim for the loss of his buildings burnt by the fire from a Government locomotive, and to place that gentleman on the same footing of equality with Mr. Fraser, of the county of Pictou?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not the present intention of the Government to refer this case to the Dominion Board of Arbitrators, as Mr. Lislois is not on the same footing as Mr. Fraser, there being a material difference in the two cases.

PAYMENT OF LABOURERS ON THE P. E. I. RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES, in the absence of Mr. YEO enquired, Whether, under the contract entered into by Messrs. Gray and Whirtar with the Minister of Railways for the construction of the Cape Traverse Branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway, any provision exists by which the Government can secure the labourers and workmen upon that road, payment for their work and labour actually performed by them in the construction of the road-bed, and whether it is the intention of the Government to take steps to secure those workmen their wages?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a clause in the contract as follows:—

"If the Contractors fail at any time in paying the salaries or wages of any person employed by them upon or in respect of the said works, or any of them, and any part of such salary be one month in arrear, or if there be due to any such person one month's wages or salary, the Engineer may notify the Contractors to pay such salary or wages, and if two days elapse and the same be not paid in full up to the date of payment or to such other date as may be in accordance with the terms of employment of such person, then Her Majesty may pay to such person salary or wages from any date to any date, and to any amount which may be payable, and may charge the same to the Contractors, and the Contractors covenant with Her Majesty to repay at once and any every sum so paid."

It is the intention of the Government to do anything in their power under this clause to protect the labourers.

REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS.

Mr. TASSÉ enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to afford to Canadians who, having emigrated to the United States, desire to return to their native country, proportionate facilities with those to be extended for the transport of European immigrants, from Quebec or New York to Winnipeg?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government already afford facilities to Canadians who have emigrated to the United States and desire to return, proportionate with those extended for the transport of European immigrants.

LAND OR TIMBER SALES ON HUNTER'S ISLAND.

Mr. COCKBURN enquired, Whether any lands or timber have been sold or granted, by license or permits, upon Hunter's Island; and if so, when granted and to whom?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No lands or timber have been sold or granted, by license or permits, upon Hunter's Island as yet.

MARITIME COURT FOR CANADA.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) enquired, Whether there has been any reply to the Address of both Houses passed in the Session of 1882, on the subject of the establishment of a Maritime Court for Canada? If a reply has been received, what is the nature of that reply?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Notwithstanding several applications no answer has yet been received.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALFRED OGDEN.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), in the absence of Mr. KIRK, enquired, Is Alfred Ogden, or has he within the last two years, been in the receipt of any salary, allowance or payment of any kind from the Government of Canada, or

from any officer of the Government? If so, what is the amount thereof, and what services did he perform therefor? What service is he now performing?

Mr. McLELAN. Alfred Ogden was in the employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department for a time collecting specimens for the Fisheries Exhibition and preparing, verifying, and paying bounty claims at a remuneration of $150 a month. He is not now performing any work for the Department.

CARLETON POST OFFICE.

Mr. WELDON enquired, From whom was the land upon which the post office in Carleton, city of St. John, N.B., is being erected, purchased, and for what price? What is the amount of contract for building, and who is the contractor? Is the cost of building the foundation included in the contract? If not, what will be the extra cost of foundation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site of that post office was purchased from the mayor and aldermen of the city of St. John for $900. The amount of the contract was $8,951. The contractors are Messrs. Causey, Bond & Milden. The cost of the foundation is included in the contract price. Further information can be found on page 22 of the Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works for 1883.

EMPLOYMENT OF J. A. WILKINSON.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) enquired, Has J. A. Wilkinson been in the employment of the Government during the past three years, or during any portion of that time; if so, during what time; what was his salary or compensation; how much has he received from the Government during the said three years past for services or otherwise? Is he now in the employment of the Government; if so, in what capacity and what salary? If not now employed, when did he cease to be so employed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the 17th of October, 1882, by Order in Council, Mr. J. A. Wilkinson and Mr. A. F. Wood were appointed land valuators on the Murray Canal, to value land to be required at Burleigh, Buckhorn, and Fenelon Falls, at a remuneration of $10 per day each, and travelling and hotel expenses during the time of their employment. Mr. Wilkinson has received as valuator $1,580 as salary, and $1,301.56 for expenses. Mr. Wilkinson is now employed only when his services may be required by the Department, and as occasion may require.

EMPLOYMENT OF A. H. BLACKEBY.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant) enquired, Is A. H. Blackeby, of Galt, Ontario, in the employ of the Government in any capacity? If not, when did he cease to be so employed? What amount has he received up to date for services as Commissioner in connection with the inspection of factories?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Blackeby is not in the employ of the Government, and has not been for a year, I think. The sums that have been paid to him for the services referred to appear in the Public Accounts now before the House.

MR. ACHILLE TALBOT.

Mr. RINFRET enquired, Is Mr. Achille Talbot an employé of the Government? What is his salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Yes; Mr. Talbot is an employé of the Branch of Correspondence, with a salary of $2 per day.

POST OFFICE AT ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. BERNIER enquired, Whether the Government or any of its members has received a petition signed by the inhabitants of the city of St. Hyacinthe, praying for the erection of a post office in that city? If so, whether the Government proposes to grant this request, and place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient for the building of such post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Certain documents have been received: a letter, bearing date the 8th of October, 1833, from the ex-member, Mr. Tellier, praying that a building be erected; later on, on the 3rd of November, 1883, extracts from the *Courrier de St. Hyacinthe*, calling attention to the wants of the locality in that respect; then, on the 17th of November, 1883, a letter from the hon. member himself, stating that a petition to that effect was being signed; and on the 14th of November, 1833, another letter from Mr. Tellier, accompanying a petition of the inhabitants of St. Hyacinthe, praying that such a building be erected. I cannot answer the last part of the question, because the Supplementary Estimates are not yet passed. When they are brought down the hon. gentleman will see whether there is anything for him or not, and if there is not anything, he must do like others—he will have to wait.

MONTREAL DRILL SHED.

Mr. BERNIER enquired, What are the names of the contractors who have been given the contract for the rebuilding of the drill hall at Montreal? What is the name of the architect entrusted by the Government with the preparation of the plans and the superintendence of the work while being executed? And what is the name of the inspecting officer of works for the rebuilding of this hall?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The names of the contractors are Messrs. J. B. St. Louis Bros., of Montreal. The name of the contractors for the iron roof is that of a company called "The Hamilton Bridge and Tool Company," from Hamilton. The specifications have been prepared by the Department of Public Works. The name of the architect is Mr. Alphonse Raza, of Montreal. The name of the inspector is Mr. Alphonse Lapierre, also of Montreal.

DOMINION LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government—if the Dominion Liquor License Act is not repealed—to furnish to the Boards of License Commissioners in the Province of Quebec, the petitions, certificates, and other blank forms in relation to the said licenses, in the French language, especially for use in those counties exclusively French?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Blank forms have been prepared and are being distributed.

WORKS AT ISLE-AUX-NOIX.

Mr. BOURASSA enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete the works for improving access to Ile-aux-Noix? If so, whether they propose to place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient to perfect the said works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) There has been no demand to that effect made to the Department of Public Works. The Department does not know that there is any need of improvement there. Nevertheless I shall enquire.

WYANDOTTE INDIANS.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) enquired, Whether the moneys payable upon their enfranchisement to the Wyandotte Band of Indians of the township of Anderdon in the county of Essex, have yet been distributed? If not, when the distribution may be expected to be made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The money has not yet been distributed, but the order is now before Council and I hope the distribution will be made in a few days.

CHETICAMP HARBOUR.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to dredge the entrance into Cheticamp Harbour, Inverness, during the ensuing summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give a positive answer to-day. This matter is still under the consideration of the Department.

POSTAL ORDERS—FRANCE AND CANADA.

Mr. HOUDE enquired, Whether the Government intend taking any proceedings towards the establishment of a system of interchange of postal orders between France and Canada?

Mr. CARLING. Arrangements have been entered into for the interchange of money orders between Canada and France.

THE COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Notices of Motions are called I would beg to state that the hon. member for Elgin has moved several times for papers connected with the petitions for the removal of Judge Hughes. I ascertain from the House that one of the objects of the return was to get copies of papers under the impeachment. The papers were dated as far back as 1862 and diligent search has been made in the Department of Justice and in the Secretary of State's office everywhere but they cannot be found.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Look in the Minister of Interior's pigeon hole.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Secretary of State has written to Toronto to try and get copies of the papers connected with that impeachment. In the *Globe* of the 18th March, it was stated that the Dominion Government has shown signs of intending to do nothing in the matter of the petition for the removal of Judge Hughes, that the petition has been returned with several small objections, the return being an insult to the people of Elgin, that Judge Hughes is a man after Sir John's own heart who wants the matter to be allowed to drop. The small objections against the petition amounts to this: that there was a paper sent down professing to be a petition, but no signature was attached to it, and it was sent back for the purpose of getting one man at least in Elgin to sign it. It was sent back with the request, first, to get the signatures of the petitioners; secondly, to get the dates when the acts complained of were done, and thirdly and generally, for a more orderly arrangement of the ground, which spread over twenty-five years.

Mr. WILSON. I might ask the hon. First Minister when this supposed petition was returned to Mr. Stanton.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The petition was received in the Department on the 21st January, and the Address was moved on the 28th January, so the hon. gentleman had full notice that that petition was coming down, and he moved immediately after he heard it was sent down. The petition was unsigned, and complained of acts happening a great many years ago. I cannot exactly tell the hon. gentleman, because I do not know, the information was not supplied to me, but I will ascertain when the letter was written back from the Department of Justice asking that a petition might be sent, if it was to be sent.

Mr. WILSON. I might state here that I think the hon. gentleman will find, if he examines the record, that not only this winter but a year ago there were petitions sent down with signatures. I am credibly informed by the County Crown Attorney, who is making the charges, that he did so send the petition; and, therefore, I think very likely they will find that, prior to this short date mentioned by my hon. friend, there were petitions, and the matter has been placed before the Minister of Justice for over a year's time. As far as any remarks that were made in the *Globe*, I am not responsible for them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not say you are.

Mr. WILSON. And the hon. the First Minister need not feel so heated over it. The people of Elgin do feel, and feel very strongly in the matter. They feel that there is a gross injustice being done to that county, and that the matter has been some time before the Government. I think there are petitions and that they have been presented here. Not only that, but, having those petitions, the hon. gentleman thought it was right and proper that Judge Hughes should be appointed as the chairman of his License Board. Those charges are preferred by the very man appointed to see that justice be done in the prosecution of offenders in the county of Elgin, the County Crown Attorney. He is no friend of mine, but is a warm political friend of the hon. gentleman, and he is the man who is bringing the charges against Judge Hughes, so that, whether Judge Hughes be a Reformer or a Tory, the charges are being preferred against him not by any of my friends, but by the hon. gentleman's own friends.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not a question of friends at all. If Mr. Stanton had sent the petition down, if he wished to make it, he should have taken the responsibility of signing it. But he did not sign it. He merely says, I beg to send down a petition from a number of the inhabitants of Elgin, but it so happened that no inhabitants of Elgin signed it. The last papers found were some which had come to the present Chief Justice Wilson when he was a member of the Government, and there is no entry in the Department of Justice of any action by him, and there is no entry of any other petition until this blank paper was sent down the other day.

Mr. WILSON. I might ask whether the petition has come yet signed by Mr. Stanton.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it has not; it had not five minutes ago, because I saw the Deputy Minister of Justice and asked him the question.

Mr. WILSON. He said he had the return some time ago and he sent it back to get the additional return in reference to the count of impeachment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not say that. I said the petition, or what professed to be the petition, was sent back with a request to get some signatures and to have the date specified, and there has been no return to that. As to the other branch, the hon. gentleman wanted a return of the proceedings on the impeachment matter; those were searched for, and, as there were none found, there is an enquiry being being made in the Courts upon it.

REGION NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR.

Mr. DAWSON, in moving for a return of all reports not hitherto published, relating to the character and probable resources in agricultural lands, forests, minerals and otherwise of the country through which the Canadian Pacific Railway is being constructed to the north of Lakes Huron and Superior, embracing all information in possession of the Government in respect to the whole of the region intervening between the Great Lakes and the southern coast of Hudson's Bay, said. In making this motion, it is not my intention to press

for a very voluminous return of papers. Last year I made a motion for certain papers, and explained that what I wanted was a synopsis of the information. Well, that synopsis came down, it was not at all voluminous, and it contained all the actual information required and all in the possession of the Government; whereas, if they had sent down all the papers, they would have filled a volume. I want something of the same kind now. I do not wish to have a voluminous return brought down, but the pith and substance of the reports that have been sent in. The country to which this motion relates embraces a third part of the entire distance across the continent. It has been represented very often as a sterile and barren country, and, if such is the case, if all this is true, then the Pacific Railway would be a most unfortunate undertaking; but I have information, and I am satisfied from what I have seen myself and from the reports of others, that that country is very far from being a barren country, that throughout its entire extent of 1,000 miles, from the Ottawa through to Rat Portage, to the verge of the prairies, there are immense tracts of very good land, that the whole country is covered with forests and nutritious grasses, cattle that range through it get fat in summer, and the forests of lumber are practically inexhaustible.

An hon. MEMBER. Timber limits.

Mr. DAWSON. For my part, I possess no limits, but there is room for the lumber trade to be carried on there in regions which have not yet been touched by the lumbermen. There are many parts of that country more especially in the valleys among the hills, where the soil is exceptionally rich, and to form an idea of that country I would only ask hon. members to look across the Ottawa, to look to the valley of the Gatineau. The Gatineau runs through a country of the same kind. A country entirely composed, or nearly so, of different forms of Laurentian rock, and the hon. member for Ottawa tells me that he has a population in his constituency of over 50,000, 30,000 of whom are in the valley of the Gatineau. The county of Pontiac is precisely the same, the same sort of rock, the same sort of country as that north of Lakes Huron and Superior, and in that county there is a very large and thriving population. With regard to the country immediately north of Lakes Huron and Superior and extending back to the Pacific Railway, as a proof that it is not unfit for settlement, I may say that we have now 20,000 settlers along the Georgian Bay and up to Sault Ste Marie, all living comfortably, cultivating the soil to the north, and they grow most beautiful wheat. It is an admirable country for growing wheat where the land is good. I do not mean to describe it as a paradise, but I do say there are large tracts of excellent land in it, and the settlements now extend along the Thessalon and back of the Bruce Mines—which, looking from the shore, seems to be the most dreary part of the whole country—40 miles already, and the settlers all express themselves highly pleased with the land. In the valleys of the Mississagua and Thessalon to the east and Goulais River to the west of Sault St. Marie there are also large tracts of good land, tens of thousands of acres, in many places, room for a dozen townships, with sufficiently level land equal to that of the prairies of the west, and with a climate far milder in winter, and I think, just as good in summer. Now, Sir, as you proceed west of Lake Superior you find an equally good country in the valleys of the rivers. Along the coast of the lakes the country is very rough and broken, but when you get inland to these river valleys you find excellent soil. Then as regards the Pays Plat River which flows into Nipigon Bay a gentleman connected with the Pacific Railway, and a most intelligent man, told me he had been through it and that there was room enough for at least half-a-dozen townships, of the most magnificent land, all level, or nearly so, between the ranges of mountain on each side. The same may be said of the Black Sturgeon River which flows into Black Bay, a large river with very extensive flats at the mouth where there is room for several townships. In the valley of the Kaministiquia, again there is quite a large extent of good land. A thriving settlement has already sprung up there where they grow wheat and cereals of all kinds, and the people are highly pleased and satisfied with their lands. Going further back, away from the immediate coast of the lake, and westward from Lake Nipissing there is a considerable tract of fair land between Lake Nipissing and the west branch of the Great French River. There is some very good land in that section. In the valley of the Spanish River again, according to the surveyors reports, from the point where the line crosses that river to Lake Huron, there is a considerable tract of good land; and to show that people appreciate the land there I am told that a company is now being organized to form an extensive cattle ranch on the Spanish River where they think the conditions are as favourable as in the North-West. Large sections of the land have been burned over and are almost like prairies. In the valleys of the rivers the soil is very rich and produces all that is required for the support of cattle ranches. As you proceed still further west and still further to the north, the country becomes more level; as to that country not being valuable there never was a greater mistake. Mr. Dymond, who was formerly a member of this House, a highly accomplished gentleman, and whose statement would not be called in question, a gentleman well qualified to describe the country, visited that region and collected a large amount of information for the Government of Ontario; and I may say that that Government values the timber in that country as worth $150,000,000. Now, Sir, if I may be permitted, I wish to read a few extracts describing the country between the height of land which runs from the neighbourhood of Lake Temiscamingue and the Ottawa River westward, all the way to the vicinity of Thunder Bay and beyond that. Now, in that country, after you pass the height of land, according to the description I have of it, there is an immense tract of level country where the soil is good. It extends westward from Abittibi along the slopes of the Moose for 350 miles, and then on the slopes of the Albany River and along nearly its whole extent, the country is very little broken by hilly ground. Last year Dr. Bell, describing this country before the Emigration Committee, said:

"Referring to the mineral deposits, Dr. Bell said that iron ore in inexhaustible quantities was found on the east coast of the Bay, and on the islands northward from Cape Jones, the ore being of a very valuable kind, from the great amount of carbonate of manganese it contains, making it available for the manufacture of Bessemer steel. But there appears to be a serious question as to the adequacy of the fuel supply for its manufacture on the spot. Dr. Bell said that he had seen specimens of authracite coal, supposed to exist on Long Island; but, he added, the quantity is not known to be great."

Then with regard to the land north of the waters of the Moose, he says:

"To the southward of James' Bay, the southern prolongation of Hudson's Bay, and to the south-westward, there is a long tract of land which, sooner or later, will be, I believe, of value for agricultural purposes. It extends for a distance of nearly 200 miles in a southerly and south-westerly direction. The immediate shore of James' Bay, towards the south end, is very low and level, and the country for some distance back is covered with sphagnum moss, but this does not exist far inland. The greatest extent is between the lower parts of the Albany and Moose Rivers, but beyond that, there is a level tract of excellent land, well wooded; and southward and south-westward of that again, the country rises pretty rapidly for a short distance and we come upon a plateau which extends inland for another 100 miles, and over the greater part of that the land is excellent as far as I could judge. I have surveyed all the principal rivers and lakes and canoe routes of that country, and made excursions inland to see the rocks and the soil, and it would be what we should consider, in Western Canada, good land. On the eastern side of James' Bay, there is a narrow strip extending about 100 miles from the southern extremity, which would be useful for cattle

raising. It is already used by the Hudson's Bay Company for that purpose, and they have shown that sheep and cattle can be reared there successfully."

Again he says in respect to the timber:

"On the head waters of the Moose River, white pine is abundant and of good size. Red pine also exists and extends rather further north than the white. Then there is 'Jack pine' or 'cypress,' or more properly the Banksian pine, which, though not a timber tree in its southern extension, becomes so in the northern region, which is its home. In the Albany region I have seen large groves of this tree, quite different from the ordinary scrubby variety."

As to climate he says:

"In regard to the climate for agriculture, the country that I have spoken of, south and south-west of James' Bay, lies in the latitude of Cornwall and Devonshire, in England, and southward of that, it is in the same latitude as the northerly parts of France; and while these countries enjoy exceptionally favourable conditions, there is no peculiarity of climate that would make the district I have referred to, worse than the average of the face of the earth in those latitudes, and, therefore, I think it is likely to be of value for agriculture, as far as climate is concerned."

As to the dates of the opening of the river he remarks as follows:—

"When I was at Martin's Falls, on the Albany, I collected the dates of the opening and closing of the Albany River for about forty years preceding my visit, and since that I have obtained the dates for over ten years, so I have an exact record of the opening and closing of the Albany for fifty years, and the average time that it is open is fully six months."

In respect to the fishery resources of the Hudson's Bay he says:

"In regard to the whale fishery, the large whales are confined principally to the north-west part of the Bay. The Americans from New Bedford and New London have resorted to the north-west part of the Bay to fish whales for twenty years or upwards, and have generally been very successful. From one to three or four or five vessels go every year, and according to the Report of the United States Commissioner of Fisheries, the returns have been very large."

Then, in answer to the question. "What is the liability to summer frosts in the country around Hudson's Bay?" he says:

"In the larger area of agricultural land south and south-west of James' Bay, I think not very great. In 1877, on my homeward journey, I left Moose Factory on the 1st October, and at that time all the tender plants—the tobacco plant, castor oil, bean, common beans, cucumbers, balsams and other tender plants, were perfectly green, standing in the open air, and probably remained so for some time after I left, as we had no frost. And at the posts of the Hudson Bay Company, inland, they are not often troubled with early autumn frosts. I think the sowing is done on an average at the same time as in corresponding latitudes in Lower Canada."

Again, speaking of iron ore, he says:

"Iron ore is very abundant on the east coast of Hudson's Bay and on the islands northward from Cape Jones. At the commencement of Hudson's Bay proper, there is an inexhaustible quantity of rich and valuable ore—valuable from the fact, that it contains a great amount of carbonate of manganese, making it available for the manufacture of Bessemer steel."

A country with all these resources, with forests and iron ore and lying alongside a great highway, easy of access, surely cannot be called a barren country; and yet not many years ago, not a hundred years ago, an hon. member of this House said:

"That railway north of Lake Superior runs for 700 or 800 or 1,000 miles through the most inhospitable country on the face of the globe—I do not speak now of Manitoba, but north of Lake Superior, from Callander even to Winnipeg. It is questionable in my mind whether there are 10,000 acres adapted for settlement along the whole line of the route, and, if you carry on a railway through a country not adapted for settlement, it strikes me forcibly it will be carried on with a very large expense to the country, and will not be remunerative to the contractors. Unless there is some way-freight for a railway, it is utterly impossible for it to be a paying concern."

This wholesale denunciation of an immense region like that described, has a every bad effect when it comes from such a high authority as this did. Sometimes hon. gentlemen in their argument, to carry out a particular view, express themselves without reflection as to the character of a country. I do not know whether that hon. gentleman did so or not, but he spoke as if he did, because I believe he is very much better informed. It is a great pity that such reports should go abroad about a very extensive portion of the country. From the ascertained sources of the Moose at Lake Abittibi to the source of its westerly branch north of Lake Superior, the distance is 350 miles, giving over 30,000 square miles of territory on the waters of the Moose where the soil is in great part very good—that is a country as large as Scotland or Ireland—and containing, according to the estimate which I have obtained, upwards of 20,000,000 acres of very fair land. I may be permitted to read from a paper which I have obtained from an officer of the Government appointed to explore that country—some information furnished by Professor Bell. He says:

"As to the position and extent of this basin (of the Moose) which is one of the largest and most important drainage areas in the Dominion. It lies between the parallels of 47° and 51° north latitude and 78° and 85½° west longitude. Its outline is approximately circular, measuring 330 miles from east to west, or as far as from Toronto to Montreal, by 300 miles from north to south. As much misapprehension exists in regard to its climate, etc., I may here compare its general position as to latitude with European countries with which we are more familiar. Its most northern parts correspond with the extreme south of England, while the bulk of it is in the latitudes of the northern parts of France, the southern parts of Germany, the central parts of Austria and the great wheat districts of Southern Russia. It is far removed from the cooling influence of the Arctic current of the Atlantic coast and may be considered to enjoy an average climate for its latitude as compared with the rest of the world. As might have been expected, wheat ripens well in this district as we know from the testimony of those who have tried it, while Indian corn comes to maturity in the southern parts of it. Timothy and all other kinds of hay as well as root crops and vegetables thrive remarkably well. The region seems to be admirably adapted for stock raising and dairy produce. The abundance of wood and the purest of water are important considerations.

"As to soil, elevation, etc., the greater part of the region may be described as a tolerably level plateau with an elevation of less than 1,000 feet above the sea. The southern part is more broken than the northern, and the whole area has a gentle slope towards the north.

"The Moose River has upwards of a dozen principal branches, rising near the height of land, flowing often for long distances parallel to each other, but gradually converging towards the head of James' Bay. The western branches unite to form the Moose River proper, which is only about 40 miles in length, and this receives the eastern branches on its way to the sea."

Dr. Bell goes on to say:

"The late Walter McDuat—a thoroughly reliable authority—in speaking of the south-eastern part of the region in question, says in his Geological Report for 1872: 'The whole region, extending northward from the mouth of the Montreal River, which is about 30 miles south of the head of Lake Temiscamingue, may be pretty correctly described as a level clay plain, with a great number of rocky hills and ridges protruding through it. * * The height of the clay appears to be pretty uniform throughout the whole region. * * Taking the mean of all the heights * * we find that the height of the clay plain above the sea level is about 900 feet. * * Lake Abittibi is surrounded on all sides by level clay land. * * To the north and especially the north-westward, the clay level seems almost unbroken and it is well known that it extends in this direction to the shores of Hudson Bay. Several acres of this clay soil are cultivated at the Hudson's Bay Company's post at Abittibi and with satisfactory results. The only crop grown at present is potatoes; but I was informed by the man who has charge of the farming operations (a French Canadian, who has been more than thirty years in Abittibi, but was brought up as a farmer near Sorel, in the Province of Quebec), that several other crops, including wheat, had been tried in former years, and with such results that he is inclined to insist that all the ordinary cereals can be cultivated as successfully at Abittibi as on the St. Lawrence. Such an opinion from a man who has been for so many years practically engaged in the cultivation of the soil, is worth recording and ought to be reliable. Indian corn is grown at more than one locality near the head of Lake Temiscamingue, and is said to ripen well. I am able, personally, to testify to this, as I was shown some good ripe ears which had been grown during the summer of 1872, on the farm of Mr. Angus McBride, at the head of the lake.' Similar testimony might be quoted from the reports of Mr. E. B. Borrow, who has travelled much through the country drained by the various branches of the Moose River.

"In various parts of the district there is a prospect for the discovery of several of the more valuable metals. It is especially the case towards the south-east side; while in the northern part, I have found large deposits of iron ore, gypsum and lignite. So little intelligent exploration for mines has yet been done in the vast region northward of the great lakes, that we can hardly form any idea of the rich mineral resources which lie dormant in this part of the Dominion. I am convinced from what I have seen, that there is nothing in the climate of this region which would prevent it being successfully farmed."

A country with all these resources cannot be called a barren country. In the forests at Lake Abittibi there are pines

3 feet in diameter, and towards the head of the Albany River, and near Lake St. Joseph, there are forests of pitch pine, which is a valuable wood in that country, with trees averaging nearly 2 feet in diameter, according to the authority of Prof. Bell, who has explored that region. I believe the value of the country is equal to that of any part of the North-West. I believe that the vast region north of the height of land and along the waters of the Moose and Albany is in a great measure valuable for agriculture, and will yet sustain a very large population. It is not alone this great country which will give traffic to railways, but through that country this Parliament has already granted four charters to railways leading down to Hudson's Bay. I believe that great inland sea, with which the Canadian Pacific Railway will be connected, and with which this country will be connected, possesses resources which are not yet dreamt of. I believe the region to be opened will prove very rich in fisheries of every description, and in minerals. I believe we will have a great traffic arising from that bay, and I should not be at all surprised if it were found before long that the section of the line north of Lakes Huron and Superior was the best paying portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, considering the mineral wealth and the resources of that immense region. We know that in a country farther westward, 200 miles north of Lake Superior, wheat grows well; we know that there are rivers there which are navigable for miles, with magnificent forests and excellent land on their banks; we know that cattle thrive throughout that whole region, and why then should it be called a barren country? With regard to its mineral wealth, I should think that the testimony of such a man as Professor Agassiz should have very great weight, and he declared long ago that one of the most important regions of the world—and he had travelled over the whole world, and was considered one of the first scientists of his day—was that country north of Lake Superior, and that it would eventually prove to be one of the richest mineral regions on the face of the earth. The results so far obtained have demonstrated the accuracy of that statement. A few days ago there were no less than $400,000 paid in New York for a mine, covering a few acres in Thunder Bay, within 15 miles of Prince Arthur's Landing. That gives some idea of the resources of this country, and as it is opened up, no doubt its mineral interests will be of very great importance.

Mr. TROW. I have only a few words to say, and I would not have risen but for a remark which has been made by the hon. member for Algoma. Whether inadvertently or not, but certainly not intentionally, in my remarks the other day on the Canadian Pacific Railway Resolutions, I stated that I had travelled over a portion of the intended route of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that I considered that the portion which came under my observation was inhospitable and not adapted to successful settlement. Furthermore, during my travels I fell in with parties whom I presumed were familiar with that portion of the country, and the information which I gathered from them was that the land was not adapted to cultivation; that the climate was not suitable, and from the inaccessible mountains and ravines which were described as abounding in that country, I naturally came to the conclusion that that information was correct, and I wrote to a local paper in my riding at the time to that effect. However, since I made that statement I have taken the precaution to read some reports on the subject, and more particularly the reports of Mr. Borron, a former member of this House, who is employed by the Ontario Government. In that gentleman I have very great confidence, and believing every word he states to be correct, to the best of his knowledge, I have come to a different conclusion with reference to the adaptability of many portions of that section of the country to settlement. He has made observations on the country, from Lake Superior to James' Bay, and also to Hudson Bay, and down the various rivers and ravines, and he has travelled there very extensively for several summers. I yield to his judgment, and I believe there are large tracts of land upon and adjoining these rivers which are adapted to settlement. There are very large limits of excellent timber, and there is no doubt there are very valuable minerals. I merely make this statement because the hon. gentleman mentioned my name, and in order to contradict the statement I made the other day. I have no desire to misrepresent or decry the country and would not do it under any circumstances. My object is to see the country settled and aid in its settlement and progress to the best of my ability.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am glad the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has drawn the attention of the House to the question now under consideration, and I think after the speech which has been delivered by my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) the House must admit the value of the motion which has been submitted by the hon. member for Algoma. I was, I confess, considerably surprised on reading the statement made by the hon. member for South Perth in the discussion which took place on the Canadian Pacific Railway Resolutions. I was greatly surprised to learn that that hon. gentleman had stated that there were not, in his opinion, 10,000 acres of cultivable land, between Callander and Winnipeg; because I had known, of my own knowledge, long previous to that time, that in the immediate vicinity of Callander, and between that place and Sudbury Junction, a larger portion of land than the quantity mentioned by the hon. member for Perth was cultivable and was actually in occupation by settlers at the present moment. I think it is to be regretted that statements such as those which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Perth, in the discussion to which I referred, should have been sent to the world on the authority which statements made by hon. members in this House must naturally have in the country, and I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman has to-day admitted that the information on which he made that statement was incorrect. I have a statement made by a gentleman on whose opinion, I think I can thoroughly rely, that large portions of the country between Callander and Winnipeg are cultivable and are admirably adapted to settlement. I hold in my hand a letter which was written to me some years ago by Mr. Wm. Bell, D.L.S., who was occupied for some years in surveying limits under the authority of the Ontario Government, on the north shore of Lake Huron, and between that section of country and the Ottawa River. He said:

"Along the Amable Dufond River and several miles west of it, there are extensive flats of rich, loamy soil, thence westward a beautiful undulating country extends to Lake Nipissing and South River and a considerable distance west of that river. The soil is generally a sandy loam on the higher lands and clay loam on the flats. In some parts the timber is pine, mixed with hardwood, and in many places, hemlock, hardwood and balsam. From Lake Nipissing, the country ascends gradually to the south, and at a distance of 15 miles from the Lake in that direction extensive ridges of maple, birch and beech, occur, mixed occasionally with hemlock and balsam, pine being seldom met with. The soil is a sandy loam. The whole country described above is fit for settlement.

"On the north side of Lake Nipissing and Mattawa River a large tract of country extending northerly to Lake Temiscamingue is covered chiefly with hard balsam and spruce. Pine is most abundant near the Ottawa, but a few miles west of that river it becomes scarce. Over a large proportion of this tract, the soil is a clay loam of good quality and nearly all of it is suitable for settlement."

He concludes his letter in these words:

"In my opinion, there is no part of the unoccupied land of the Crown which affords so large an unbroken tract of country suitable for settlement as the territory described therein."

I know, as a matter of fact, that on the shores of Lake Temiscamingue, both in the Province of Ontario and the

Province of Quebec, wheat of the very best quality has been grown; and there is at present a grist mill in the vicinity of that lake which is used for the grinding of wheat grown by the settlers. It is also a well known fact that at the head of Lake Temiscamingue there are great clay flats covered with splendid oak timber. I might go on reading extracts at great length to show the fertility of the soil in the section of country referred to; but I will content myself with reading one statement made by a gentleman who is now a member of this House; I refer to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Sutherland). In 1878 he appeared before the Committee on Immigration and Colonization, and in the course of an examination as to the character of the country lying between the head of Lake Superior and Rat Portage, he was asked the following question:—

"By Mr. McNab—I wish to ask the character of the land along Rainy River, and whether it is likely to be settled? Is that outlay of money likely to be of benefit to the country, assuming our all-rail route is completed?"

The outlay of money here referred to was for the construction of a system of tramways proposed to connect the waters of Lake Superior with those of the Lake of the Woods. The answer was as follows:—

"I contend that if the railway is not built for four or five years—and I don't think it is possible to build it in less time than four years—if this route is not opened up, there is no chance of settling the fertile belt here on Rainy River, as there would be no opportunity of settlers seeing the country, and they would not go. There are seventeen townships surveyed there, with about 23,000 acres in each township. I have talked the matter over with Col. Dennis, and from the field notes of the surveyors he estimates that there are at least 150,000 or 200,000 acres of excellent land there. There are about 400,000 acres altogether. I am satisfied he is under the mark, and I have seen a good part of the territory along Rainy River, and have heard a good deal about it from others."

In view of all the statements which have been made as to the fertility of a large portion of that country lying between the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at Callander and Winnipeg, and in view of the great mineral and timber resources in that large extent of territory, I think that my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) must admit that the Government were wise in deciding to push through the road north of Lake Superior as rapidly as possible; and I think it is an advantage to this House and to the country that the hon. member for Algoma has submitted this motion, which I have very much pleasure in seconding.

Mr. COCKBURN. I have been very much interested in the discussion which has taken place on this subject. Some of my remarks have been anticipated by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Haggart). I cannot speak from personal experience, in such glowing terms as the hon. member for Algoma has done, of that portion of country north of Lake Huron and Lake Superior; but I have some personal knowledge of a portion of the country, within 200 or 300 miles of where we now stand, and I know from personal observation that considerable belts of land fit for settlement do exist in the northern part of Ontario, and I suppose the same thing is true of Quebec, though I cannot speak of that from personal knowledge. The great North-West has received so much attention during the last few years that the settlement of the newer portions of the older Provinces is entirely neglected. I cannot claim that the soil in our free grant districts will compare in fertility with the soil of the North-West; but there are other advantages in favour of these free grant districts. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) has already described the country around Lake Temiscamingue better than I can; and hon. gentlemen from Ontario have recently received from the Provincial Commissioner of Crown Lands reports of the country around Lake Nipissing. I hold in my hand a report lately issued, which shows that, though some of the lands surveyed are almost valueless, others are very good indeed. Mr. Niven, a surveyor, who was sent out by the Ontario Government to explore that district, reports regarding one section, as follows:—

"Township No. 17 north of Lake Nipissing is nearly all good hardwood land, and is by far the best township in the entire area explored. I never saw finer hardwood bush than many parts of it—a few basswood here and there, ironwood in many places, and a grove of beech on the east boundary, a few miles north of Trout Lake."

Mr. Niven also speaks of the township of Widdifield, in which I have been myself. It is in the very next division from here. Mr. Niven says of it:

"Township of Widdifield is immediately on the north shore of Lake Nipissing and traversed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. About two-thirds of the entire township is fit for settlement."

With a railway running through that township, and a round-house there to accommodate sixteen engines, I should think it would offer very good inducements to people who cannot go to the North-West, because there they would find fuel and fencing, as well as the land, for nothing. I cannot say that this is a land flowing with milk and honey, but there are belts of good land, with the advantage of being within easy access, and the expense of reaching there being small, I therefore think it is very important that this discussion should have taken place to-day, in order to call the attention of intending settlers to this part of the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway has already been built along the entire length of Lake Nipissing, and with the construction of the proposed railway from Lake Nipissing to Lake Temiscamingue, there is no doubt that a very rich country will be opened up. It is a matter of very great satisfaction to find, on closer examination, that the northern portions of the Province of Ontario are proving to be so valuable.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Algoma ought to be congratulated on taking this opportunity of bringing such an important subject before this House and the country. When we remember the statements made from time to time in reference to that country and the impressions created upon the public mind, I think we must acknowledge that a great deal of information regarding it that would be profitable to the public is yet hidden from our observation. If we consider the extent of country, a distance of nearly 1,000 miles long in one direction and from 200 to 500 miles wide in another, and if we remember that in Ontario, were there is not perhaps one-third as large a territory settled, we have to-day a contented population of 2,000,000, I think we must admit the importance of this question. Again, if we compare the geographical position of the country with other parts of the world, with reference to its latitude and longitude and its altitude from the sea, we find that it compares favourably with other parts of the world that are thickly populated to-day, that sustain a contented and happy people ranging from three to forty people to every square mile. If we think again of its rivers, the length and the number of which are, comparatively speaking, equal to those found in any other part of British North America, if we remember the clearness and pureness of the waters that flow down its fields, we cannot fail to properly estimate its importance. If we look at its mineral resources, we find the deposits there are similar to those found in other parts of the country that have been partially explored and are yielding, as a return for those explorations, some of the greatest sources of wealth to be found in the Dominion, we may, from that direction, too, estimate its importance. If we look at its soils, we find they also compare very favourably with the soils in the richest parts of Ontario, which have been cultivated for years. If we look at its timber, the want of which is being felt very largely at present, both in this part of the country and the North-West—if we look along its navigable streams, extending hundreds of miles, useful for navigation and transportation, and see the large forests of valuable

timber that extend along those streams, which must be very useful at no distant date to this country, we cannot fail to be impressed with its importance. If we remember its lakes, teeming with as fine fish as can be found in any part of the country, from that point of view also we must be struck with its importance. Then look at its climate. Hon. gentlemen have been pleased to say in this House that it has a very inhospitable climate, but measuring its climate from the depth of snow, from the length of the summer and the length of the fall, or from the number of months during which its rivers are navigable, we find that it compares very favourably with the climate of many other parts of the country largely populated and wealthy to-day. If we look at its grasses and its plants and vegetables, we find that they are the same as those found in other parts of the country about which we know a great deal more to-day. I saw only a year ago a single potato that was brought down from Port York which lacked only one ounce of two pounds weight, and which being cut through, appeared to be of the very best quality; and the carrots brought down from there, both as regards size and the quality of the root itself, are decidedly much superior to what we find in the best parts of Ontario and Quebec. I say, considering the importance of the subject, no matter in what light you view it, it must be a matter of considerable interest to the people of the Dominion, and the people of Ontario especially, because a large extent of this territory belongs to Ontario, and when we remember that in a short time we will have opened up a large portion of the country, some 400 or 500 miles in length, with a railway, we will see the necessity of bringing in some way prominently before the eyes of the world the resources of the territory that will be opened up for settlement there. The hon. member for Muskoka said, that, from his knowledge of the country, he was inclined to believe there was a great deal of broken land in it, but only a few years ago I heard a gentleman, who apparently had opportunities of being conversant with the country, say there was not 10,000 good acres in the Manitoulin Island; that it was a place that could not be settled; that no large number could reside there and support themselves on its products; yet, in travelling through that country, although we must confess there is a large amount of broken soil, that is not an unmixed evil; because it cannot be used directly in the raising of grain, it is very useful for the purpose of grazing, and some of the finest cattle of this country that cost the smallest amount of money has been raised in Manitoulin. From the meagre information that we have, we learn that in every part of it there is found some of the best arable land known in the Dominion. If the soil and climate, if its waters, if its altitude from the sea, if its depth of snow, the length of its winters, the mildness of its summers, are the same as in other parts of the world, well known and amply tested, and found suitable for agricultural purposes, we must admit that it compares favourably with other known parts of this country. It is important that the information asked for should be laid before the country through this House, because any information we have had heretofore has been extremely meagre. I was pleased to find that the hon. member for South Perth was ready to accept the information, coming from a source which he would, perhaps, look upon as more valuable than that coming from any other source—the information given by a representative from the Ontario Government. I am pleased to find that there seems to be every chance of our receiving information which will satisfy those that are skeptical, as the investigation proceeds, as pioneers reach different parts of the country and send back reports, which will only be found to corroborate the reports we have as to the richness of the country. I am glad the hon. member for Algoma has put this notice on the paper. I hope it is only the opening up of a great question which will be ventilated year by year and be brought home prominently before the attention of the people of this and other countries, and I doubt not that at no distant time this region will be found to be one of the richest sources of wealth to Ontario and the Dominon.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not propose to add anything to what has already been said, in regard to the value of this country for the purposes of settlement, but what I wish to say is, that that value is, so far, merely theoretical, and will be of no avail to the wealth of the Dominion until more extended railway communication is given to it. Not a day passes on which I do not receive letters from those I represent, asking, in almost despairing terms, when are they to have the benefit of railway communication. There are settlers in some parts of that country who are raising large crops of grain, who are entirely dependent upon the lumber interest for their market, who are 50 miles away from any source of obtaining supplies, and who are every day looking most anxiously to see whether the long promised railway is likely to reach them. If ever there was a case in which the interests of the poorer class of settlers deserve consideration, it is the case of those men who, at a time when the North-West was not entering into competition with it and under circumstances of the greatest possible hardship, made homes for themselves in what was then almost an unknown wilderness. I do trust that the Government will, at the very earliest possible moment, take the claims of these people into consideration and carry out the promises made long ago—promises made only, I might almost say, to be broken—to give them the means of obtaining what has become to them a matter of necessity. I only say this, not that I have any fear but that the expectations held out will ere long be realized; but, on their behalf, I would take this one opportunity, the last that will probably occur, of impressing upon the Government the great necessity there is, not for action, but for speedy action; and I venture to say that next summer, if the opening of next season does not show that steps have actually been taken for the completion of this work, my place in this House will be a very useless one, for there will be such an emigration from that country that I shall have very few people left to represent. Some have already gone. In many townships there are less people now than when the Census was taken in 1881, and if speedy steps are not taken for the construction of the railway, the population will diminish in a still greater ratio; and I think it is hardly worth while for us, when we are building up Provinces so far from ourselves, to do it at the expense of depopulating a country which will, in many respects, compare favourably with the most fertile portions of the North-West.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICAL ARBITRATORS.

Mr. BLONDEAU moved for a statement giving the names of the Official Arbitrators and Secretaries to Arbitrators, appointed to office since 1st July, 1867, up to the present time, the statement to show the date of appointment, the salary allowed, the duration of tenure of office, and the salary actually paid yearly in each case. In case of appointment having been made by Order in Council, or the salaries having been increased by Order in Council, copies of such Orders in Council in each case to be annexed to the statement.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity, now offered to me by this motion, to draw the attention of the Government to the appointment of these different Official Arbitrators. I think that in appointing these officers the character of the work they have to perform and the surroundings in which they are called upon to discharge the duties of their office should be borne in mind. Quite recently the Arbitrators have had to hear evidence and to decide several cases connected with the construction of the branch railway to St. Charles. On that

occasion it has been found that that the greater number of these Arbitrators do not understand a single word of French, and are called upon to hold investigations in cases where the witnesses who are summoned and the parties themselves do not understand English. This has given rise to great inconveniences; interpreters are needed to translate to the witnesses the questions put by the Arbitrators, and to translate also the answers given by the witnesses; this doubles the cost and the length of the inquests. It seems to me that from a purely economical point of view, and also to do justice to the population of a whole Province, the Government ought to require that those officials should speak, or at least understand French. I think that the Government ought to require this knowledge in this branch of the Service as well as in the others; for at the present time, with Confederation as it is now constituted, with the exigencies of Civil Service, a perfect knowledge of the English language is required from an employé, who wishes to obtain a position here at Ottawa, and still in several places on lines of railway, on the Intercolonial Railway, and in the organization of the office which is now contemplated, persons who do not know a single word of French, who do not even understand it, are appointed, and our countrymen are obliged to appear before these courts. It is easy to understand, Mr. Speaker, in what a disagreeable and inferior position we are placed in that respect. I call the attention of the Government on this point, and I do hope that they will remedy the evil which I have pointed out. Again, very recently, at a sitting of this court, the President or one of the Arbitrators has had the impudence to tell one of the lawyers that if he did not know how to plead in English he had no business to plead before the Board, and that was said in the city of Quebec, in the capital of the Province of Quebec. I think the least that can be required of these officials, is that, if they do not understand French, at least they should have some idea of good breeding; and that in a country like ours, they should refrain from putting on the overbearing airs of a conqueror: they will not pass in our time. I take this opportunity to call the attention of the Government to a case which came before the Dominion Arbitrators, and for which I have, for the last two or three years, used my best endeavours, but without success, although the cause is perfectly just. The Government owns a railway which is called the Intercolonial Railway. One day, a locomotive which had left River du Loup for Quebec, set fire to a building belonging to one of the electors of my county. The building being burned down, the proprietor naturally asks the Government to make good his loss. The Government sends an Arbitrator; the Arbitrator hears evidence, finds that the fire was set to the building by one of the engines belonging to the Government, finds that the plaintiff's claim is not too high, and comes to the conclusion that in equity the Government is bound to refund to this man the money which he has lost by this fire. But it seems that when the engine left River du Loup for Quebec, the metallic screen placed on top of the chimney of the locomotive, and which is destined to prevent the sparks from flying out, was in good order. Now, the Government have refused on that ground to give this man the amount of money to which he his entitled for the damage they have caused to him. Well, I fail to see by virtue of what law a Government is not bound to make good the damage caused by them. I fail to see by virtue of what law, either natural or positive, the Government is exempt from paying the amount of the damage they have caused to a party by setting fire to his building. The position taken by the Government in the present case is very strange, inasmuch as we now have two precedents. In the county of Pictou, two individuals were in the same position; their fences—not their barns—but their fences and a few cords of wood were burned down by one of the locomotives of the Intercolonial Railway. In that case, as in the other, a kind of inquest was held by Official Arbitrators, and the Arbitrator declared that in equity the Government were bound to pay, but that in law they were not, because the metallic screen covering the chimney of the locomotive was in perfect good order. The member for the county, or somebody else, for all I know, at all events, somebody having more influence than I have, approached the Government and obtained from them the decision that this cause on which an Arbitrator had made a report should be referred to the whole body of Arbitrators. The Court of Arbitrators, with a full attendance, decided that this individual, not only in equity, but also in justice, had a right to be paid, and he was paid. The case to which I now refer is that of Mr. Fraser. Another individual has also been paid under the same circumstances. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour, to day, of putting a question to the Government on this subject, and I was told that the two men were not at all in the same circumstances. I know very well that they are not in the same circumstances, for one of them has been paid and the other has not; but when they are both paid they will be on the same footing, and it is for that reason I ask the Government to pay this man. If the Government allow themselves the sport of burning down a man's buildings, let them bear the consequences, and let them make good the losses of which they have been the cause. I think that if the case was referred to the whole Board of Arbitrators, as the Pictou case has been, the result would be the same as that which took place in the case of Mr. Fraser, and that justice, which has not been refused to a person who does not belong to our nationality, will not be refused to a person who speaks our language.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my hon. friend made a mistake or misunderstood the question which is now before the House, because the last part of his speech has reference to a matter altogether different.

Mr. LANDRY. It has reference to the Arbitrators.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I am afraid my hon. friend has forgotten the facts which took place during the interval which elapsed between the time when his question was put and the time when the present motion was made. At all events, I did not wish to interrupt him, because I thought the occasion was favourable for him to press the claims of the individual whose name he has mentioned in this House; but he will have to excuse me if I am not able to answer him as the hon. Minister of Railways, whom it concerns specially, would do. I shall speak to him on this question, and I am convinced that if there is any possibility of doing what the hon. member asks, the hon. Minister of Railways will certainly do it. As to the arbitrators to whom he has referred, there is no doubt it would be desirable that all of them should understand both languages. It would be desirable that all public officials in the Civil Service should understand and even speak both languages. But the hon. member knows that it is an impossibility, under the present circumstances. In the Province of Quebec it is altogether different; nearly all of those who speak the English language, at least most of our educated men, know French as well, and can understand and speak it; but, unfortunately, it is not so in other Provinces, although there are very remarkable exceptions in that respect. As to the facts concerning the St. Charles Branch Railway, I do not think that those who appeared before the Arbitrators have had any reason to complain a great deal, for I think that, taking it all in all, their cause has been well pleaded, since the amount which has been grated by the arbitrators has been quite large, and must have satisfied most of those who had reason to complain, and who had submitted their cause to them. The hon. member has spoken, I believe, of the President of the Arbitrators who, it is said, forgot himself in reference to an

advocate, who was pleading before him. If that is the case, the official has not acted as he should have; he should have remembered that the French language had a perfect right to be used before the court, as before any of the other courts in the Province of Quebec, and before the Federal courts. But I am satisfied that, in his desire to do justice, this Arbitrator has tried to impress on the mind of the advocate that if he pleaded in the language which was the most familiar, and, perhaps, the only language familiar to the President, he would run a better chance of obtaining justice. At any rate, I hope that the advocate who pleaded there will understand it so, and will not believe that the President had any intention of showing any disregard for him, or for the French population of Canada, for I am acquainted with the President of the Board of Arbitrators, and in spite of his exterior, which may be somewhat rough, I know that he is kind hearted, and he is a man who would not deliberately act as he must have acted or else the hon. member would not have said so. Neither is there any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in the future choice of the Arbitrators, the remarks just made by the hon. member must be borne in mind. When an appointment is made, if it should be possible for us to find a man who understands and can speak both languages, it will be a great deal better than to have men who can speak only one language, especially for a court whose services are required in the Province of Quebec as well as in the other Provinces. During recess it may be deemed expedient to enquire into the composition of this Board and to see if means could not be devised to improve the present system, so as to make it more effective and less expensive. My attention has been called by one of the hon. members of this House to the delays and cost, and I think that there will be a possibility of improving the composition of this Board during our next Session. The question will be taken into consideration, and although I am not prepared to promise a measure on this subject, we will see whether or not there is any means of making improvements.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways on a case which is similar to that which has just been stated by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr Landry). I refer to the case of a man named Narcisse Pelletier, whose fences were burned down by sparks from a locomotive on the Intercolonial Railway. A report was made to the Department, but on a point of law, the question of the responsibility of the Government was suspended—that is to say, the entire responsibility of the Government was not admitted, because the chimney of the locomotive was covered with this metallic screen, which is used as a protection against fire. I make this remark because it is a matter of civil law and of property in the Province of Quebec. Now, according to law, in the Province of Quebec, the Government ought to see that an article of our Civil Code provides that damages caused to others in any way whatever must be paid. All damages must be paid. It may be that in other Provinces, civil law is applied differently, but in the Province of Quebec—and I call particular attention from the hon. Minister on this point—the law is as I have said before. I submit these facts so that the hon. Minister of Public Works may bring them to the knowledge of the Minister of Railways, that he may take them into serious consideration. I believe these individuals have a right to be indemnified, for it is known in fact that the fire was caused by the fire of a locomotive. Only in law the responsibility of the Government has been denied. This question ought to be decided once for all, as decisions have been given for and against this point.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if the House will allow me to answer immediately to the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), I shall tell him that the rule followed by the Railway Department, and consequently by the Government, with respect to damages caused by the Intercolonial Railway, is exactly that followed by all railway companies throughout the country. When a fire is caused by sparks from a locomotive, the investigation must show whether or not the chimney was covered with the metallic screen referred to by the hon. member, and if it is proved that this metallic screen was fixed on as required by law, the responsibility of the railway company does not exist and the damage is not paid. That is the policy carried out on the Intercolonial Railway with respect to damages caused by fire. Because a railway is operated by the Government that is no reason why the responsibility should be different from what it is when the railway is under the management of a company. And the hon. member may be sure that, although a Government is not more anxious to pay out money than an individual is, it is always more agreeable to them to make up for damages or to show that they are making up for them, than to be obliged to refuse. If in certain cases the Government has paid damages, it must be that it had been proved that the cover had not been properly fixed on the chimney of the locomotive, or that there was other defects and that the railway was at fault. At all events, the Minister of Railways is perfectly willing to examine each case and to decide it according to the evidence made out. If in the case pointed out by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), the case of one Fraser, in one of the Maritime Provinces, the damages were paid, it is because it must have been proved that the Intercolonial Railway was at fault, or that whoever had charge of the locomotive was at fault, and that consequently the Government ought to pay. If the hon. member who has brought this matter before the Minister of Railways has new proofs to give in favour of the man he wishes to protect, he may be sure that the hon. Minister will take the matter into consideration.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) If the House will allow me, I shall state that in the case I have referred to the chimney was in perfect good order; but it must be borne in mind that the fire was not communicated by the chimney; the fireman was building his fire and he threw some on this man's building. The chimney was in perfect order, but the fire came out of the other end.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In that case, the hon. member will have to bring the matter again before the Minister of Railways, in order to see by which end the fire came out.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) But I see no end to the delay of the Government in paying my elector.

Motion agreed to.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION TO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE, in moving that in the opinion of this House it is expedient to enact a law prohibiting the incoming of Chinese to that portion of Canada known as British Columbia, said: This is a question which has been before this House on several occasions, which has been thoroughly discussed, and hence, I intend, for my part, on this occasion, to be brief. No one regrets more than I do myself that the condition of things in British Columbia makes it necessary to enact a law prohibiting any further immigration of Chinese to that Province; but, Sir, it is necessary that such a law should be passed—not only necessary, but, it is, in my opinion, imperative. The people of that Province have been aware of this fact for years past. They have repeatedly petitioned the Federal Government on this point, asking for some restrictive measure to be passed to restrict the immigration of Chinese to that Province. Orders in Council have been passed by the Provincial Government there to the Federal Government here, asking relief. The people themselves have peti-

tioned this honourable House on one occasion, but so far their prayers have been fruitless. Various reasons might be given why such a law should be enacted. One is because the Chinese labour is brought into competition with the labour of the white man. The Chinese work for wages that will not support a white labourer's family. They bring with them none of the responsibilities of our civilization. They have no wives or children to support, and hence they come stripped, as it were, to do battle with white labour. The white man has his family to feed, to clothe, to educate, churches and other public institutions to maintain; and in a thousand other ways he is called upon to contribute. The Chinaman, his rival in the labour market, has none of these responsibilities. He has only himself to provide for, and hence he is prepared for the combat; and, however much the Chinaman may desire to get for his labour, he will work for what he can just get. He will not be put on one side on account of the price. The white man, handicapped with the responsibilities of his civilization, the Chinaman prepared to struggle for his solitary existence—the result is inevitable; free white labour gives place to the slaves of the companies, who are prepared to work at a rate for which the white man cannot subsist, with their cheap and dirty mode of living and their capacity for living in swarms, in wretched dens where a white man would drop, if he did not suffocate. The experience on this phase of the question in California and Australia is very significant. It matters not how low a white man may offer his services, a Chinaman is always prepared to offer his at a lower rate; consequently, thousands of white families have been compelled to leave the State of California, because they found it impossible to compete with Chinese labour. In the Province of British Columbia, white men have had to leave on account of the Chinese monopolizing the labour market. It is impossible for white labour to compete with men who work sixteen hours a day, who sleep on shelves in the shop, and who live on a little rice, flavoured with a chunk of pork. Wherever a Chinaman gets a foothold he never lets go, and in whatever branch of labour he comes into competition with the white man, the latter goes to the wall every time. Is it right, then, that we should allow these people to swarm in upon us by thousands and to deprive our people of the labour which this country affords? Certainly not. We require all the labour of this country for our own people. We must remember, also, that China is the great slave market from whence labourers are being drawn to this country. Myriads of them are waiting, myriads of the lowest type of humanity, to come to this country to labour at a rate of wage upon which a white man would starve. We have in that Province at the present time, upwards of 18,000 Chinese. Just imagine for one moment that number of slaves in a Province so thinly populated as British Columbia is at the present time. I know it is argued by some hon. gentlemen that they are a necessity, that their labour is required to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Speaker, I differ entirely from that view. They are not a necessity. I received a letter to-day, the contents of which I was very sorry to learn; it is from one of the largest employers of labour in that Province, and he says that there are a great many men there who cannot get employment. Now, that is a very serious fact, and yet we are told, from year to year, that it is necessary to allow these people to swarm in upon us by thousands while our own people there cannot get employment. It is quite time that some action on the part of this House should be taken to prevent such large numbers of Chinese coming into that Province, thus depriving our own people of the employment which they are entitled to in their own country. It is no new thing that we are asking. What we are asking for has been adopted by Australia, in three of the colonies, which have passed restrictive measures The State of California has passed a restrictive or a prohibitory measure. Our own Province, during the last year, passed two restrictive measures, and, in addition, we memorialized this Government, asking that this Parliament also should pass some restrictive measure respecting Chinese immigration; but, so far, no action has been taken on the part of this Government or this House. These people, while they offer their services at a low rate, only wait for the opportunity to demand from their employers as high a rate of wages as the white man gets. We have had experience of their doings in this respect in the Province of British Columbia, where, on one occasion, the whole Chinese population of the city of Victoria struck for a higher rate of wage, and they never went to work until their request was granted. Large numbers of these people in any civilized community invariably demoralize and impoverish that community. They do not come amongst us, as other people do, to settle and make for themselves decent homes. Whilst they are amongst us, they live as meanly as it is possible for human beings to live, and after making a certain amount of money they return to China and their places are filled by another batch of slaves from the Flowery Kingdom. And this has been carried on to such an extent that we have found that fully one half of the total earnings on the railway, in the mines, and in some other branches of labour, has been carried out of the Province by these people, never to be brought back. Hence, they are coming and going and drawing the very life blood out of that Province, and at the same time are depriving our people of their just rights. It is no wonder that the people of that Province have raised their voices against such a monstrous imposition. I am satisfied that if such a state of things existed in the Province of Ontario, or in the Province of Quebec, there would be such a rallying of the forces demanding and insisting upon a remedy, as would be irresistible. I am certain that the hon. members of this House would not allow such a state of things in their midst to exist for forty-eight hours; and those of us who come from that Province, who feel the evils of the influx of these people by thousands, come here and ask the assistance of the members of this House from the other Provinces, so that we may get rid of the imposition to which we are now subjected. Sir, we object to these people also, on account of their slavery. They come to us as slaves, and they are treated as such while they are here. I desire to read a statement made by Mr. Consul Bailey, of Hong Kong, on this point:

"The emigration from China to all parts of the world is an organized business, in which men with large capital engage, in which men are bought and sold at so much per head, precisely as a piece of merchandise is handled at its market value. The Coolie of China is bought by the rich trader to serve his purchaser at a low rate of wages for a series of years in a foreign country, under a contract for the full performance of which, in many instances, he gives a mortgage on his wife and children."

Sir, I can vouch for the truth of that statement. They do come here and are treated as slaves. They come to our Province consigned as so much merchandise to the Chinese companies, and afterwards they are sold to the highest bidder. And yet we are told that white men should be in a position to compete with those individuals. Such a statement is an insult to the workingmen and the white people of this country. Let us hear what one of the papers of the Province of British Columbia said, in a leading article, with respect to this question:

"In this Province, in this very city, Chinese slaves, male and female, are constantly arriving; in some cases obtaining their freedom after years of labour; in other cases—those of females, especially—never. Cargoes of Chinese are shipped here at a nominal cost to the Chinese merchant or combination of merchants, and the individuals comprising the living freight become part and parcel of their importers, until enough has been retained from their earnings to enable them to purchase their liberty, which generally requires four or five years' servitude And so widespread and complete is this system, and so powerful the organizations, that the slaves become, perforce, voluntary ones, in a country where everyone is nominally free, simply because they dare not assert their freedom, knowing full well that should they do so,

speedy vengeance would be visited upon them—a dead body be discovered and be called a 'Chinese mystery;' or a corpse picked up floating in the river and a coroner's verdict of 'found drowned,' and in a few days all would be forgotten. There remains, however, a yet worse phase of Chinese slavery, viz., the introduction from China of young female natives who are brought here and sold for the most base and degraded purposes—purposes with regard to which it were best to be silent, if such silence would not be worse than folly—it would be even criminal."

That is the statement made by the leading paper of that Province, and I am satisfied the only remedy for the evil is to pass a law for the exclusion or restriction, at least of the Chinese from that Province. They are a dangerous class of people. I desire to refer to an incident which occurred last fall. When the labourers had been discharged from the railway work on the main line, the Chinese gathered at a certain place on Fraser River, where a white man, who had had charge of a gang of Chinese, lived in a cabin by the road side, and during the night this man was shot and left with his throat cut. It was supposed he had money in the cabin. No white man was there, and of course suspicion fell on the Chinese. About the same time a similar occurrence happened lower down the Fraser, where another white man was murdered at a place where there were only Chinese in the vicinity. It appears that this man had tendered for a piece of work which the Chinese wanted to get, and in fact the white man secured it, but lost his life; and, by the way, I wish to inform the hon. members from Quebec that he was a native of that Province. These two men, there can be no doubt, were murdered by the Chinese; but those people are so crafty and clever that it is almost impossible for the authorities to secure their conviction. In nine cases out of ten they avoid the law. They have laws and tribunals of their own, and if it is necessary to put one of their own people out of existence, they select the man, the hour, and the place, and the deed is committed. All that is known is that some man is dead; but as to the individual who committed the deed, that is never known to the authorities. The Chinese are, as I have said, a dangerous class, and of course the more numerous they become, the greater the danger to the white people, especially to those on the mainland, many of whom are farmers residing in isolated places. They are a dangerous class to be present in the Province in crowds and gangs of thousands. Not only are the Chinese injuring the white people, but they are demoralizing the Indians of the Province. I ask the House to support the motion and I am sure that such action will be supported, if not unanimously, by a majority of the people, who, if they possessed the knowledge of hon. members on this question, would certainly favour a restrictive measure.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion of my hon. friend from Victoria, I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible. The question of restricting Chinese immigration has been before this House at various times and ably dealt with by different members from British Columbia. I can, therefore, only reaffirm the statements I had the honour to make last year, and confirm the position taken in hostility to Chinese as a class by members from that Province in the preceding Parliaments. I will not again trouble the House with a description of their habits and modes of life nor why I deem them an undesirable class with which to colonize our own country. It ought to be sufficient for hon. gentlemen to know that the Legislature and people of British Columbia have been protesting against their unlimited admission to our territory, not only by unanimous resolutions of our House of Assembly but by Minutes of Council, and petitions from the people. It is not like a question involving the alienation of our public lands, which might cause a division amongst members from that Province. It is a question that affects every portion of the province prejudicially and must ultimately extend its evils to other Provinces. Sir, when reading those resolutions of our Legislative Assembly last Saturday afternoon, my eye fell upon a telegraphic despatch in the Montreal *Herald*, that for a moment inspired me with hope for the success of our efforts this season. The despatch was as follows:—

"London, March 14.—The Canadian Government has objected to some emigrants recently sent out by Tuke's Committee, and has notified the English Government that many of them are unsuited for colonial life."

Sir, the first thought that occurred to me was whether Mr. Tuke, which has the sound of a celestial name, might not be Ah Tuke or Kiwong Tuke, or some other Chinese dignitary who had been acting as immigration agent for Mr. Onderdonk, and I thought perhaps the Government were beginning to repent them of the sympathy they had been extending to that disinterested gentleman in his laudable efforts to flood our country with Mongolians. But, Sir, my hopes were soon dispelled when I observed that the telegram was dated, London instead of Hong Kong. It then occurred to me, Sir, that Mr. Tuke must be an Englishman and that our Government had objected to some particular class of immigrants from the United Kingdom. Can it be possible that there are to be found anywhere in Great Britain any class of people equal in degradation to the slaves and criminals of China that are now and have been permitted free entry into our Province. Sir, while permitting one and protesting against the other is casting a slur on our kindred that should not be passed over. Mr. Speaker, there is also another phase of the question which has not before been referred to in this House. As you are aware, our international boundary extends from the Strait of Canso, in the east, to the Strait of Georgia, in the west—along that extended frontier we are on terms of most cordial friendship with our great neighbours to the south of us. Our sympathies are the same, our objects, the development of our respective countries are the same, and we reciprocally recognize our respective Constitutions and our political autonomies built upon them. Along this extended border, Sir, there is peace and good will which I hope may never be disturbed. This Chinese question alone on our western border may cause ill-feeling. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the United States passed a law prohibiting the immigration of Chinese into any part of their States or Territories, and the fact of Chinese having free admission to British Columbia, and their being smuggled across our boundary into their territory, did cause some friction among their people last summer, and will continue to do so until we adopt a law similar to theirs. It, Sir, would be impossible for any territorial Government to keep a sufficient police force to guard our international boundary to exclude that class of people, more especially if we continue to admit them. I most earnestly call the attention of the Government to this phase of the question, in the hope that they will not permit the continuance of a system that will assuredly engender bitterness where friendship now so happily exists. It being now nearly six o'clock, I will only say, in conclusion, that I hope the Government will allow this question to come to a vote by allowing it to come up on Monday next. We wish to hear this Parliament of Canada speak on a matter of the first importance to British Columbia, and as the right hon. the Premier said last year, of subsequent importance to the other Provinces.

Mr. BAKER. As it is close to six o'clock, and as I desire to make a few remarks on this question, which is of so much interest to our Province, and as I will occupy at least fifteen or twenty minutes, I beg, with the permission of the House, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

After Recess.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BAKER. I rise to a question of privilege, for the purpose of enabling me to set right a little matter which occurred before you left the Chair, at six o'clock. When I moved the adjournment of the debate, my intention was to have it come on after six o'clock, and it was my ignorance of Parliamentary proceedings which led me into the guiltiness, if I may so call it, of a *lapsus linguae*. I really intended the debate to go on when I made that motion, and inasmuch as I am supporting the motion brought in by my colleague, I think it is due to him and to my constituency that I should make this explanation. I trust to the generosity of the House on this occasion, to correct the error which I made, by allowing the order to remain where it should have appeared on the Orders of the Day as if I had not made the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only way, I think, in which the hon. gentleman can do that, is with the consent of the House, to move to rescind the order that the debate be adjourned; and the only difference it would make is this, that when a debate is in progress when six o'clock arrives, and I leave the Chair, the question is then put at the top of the Public Bills and Orders, and is no longer a notice of motion. But if the debate is adjourned, it goes to the bottom of Public Bills and Orders. By moving that the order be rescinded, it will go to the head of the Public Bills and Orders, and would come on next Wednesday evening.

Mr. BAKER. With the permission of the House, I would then move that it be rescinded.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be better that the hon. gentleman should make his motion at some other time. What will happen, if the motion be rescinded now? How will the debate stand adjourned?

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be the same as at six o'clock.

Mr. BLAKE. But it is past six o'clock; it is eight o'clock

Mr. BAKER. I have no doubt that it makes very little difference in the result, but it makes a good deal of difference to me. I wish to explain to the House that I have committed an error through want of knowledge of Parliamentary practice.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think any person desires to prevent the hon. gentleman having his error rectified—at any rate, I shall be glad to help him, if possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the debate had droped at six o'clock, I suppose the order would have kept its place.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would have been higher on the paper.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest as a more regular way—and I do not think that the House would object, for it is an important question, which I agree should be fully debated—that the Government should give notice to have this order stand at the head of this class of orders. For my part, I would be willing to assent to such a motion, and then the hon. gentleman's error would be remedied.

HAMILTON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

On the order being called for the House to resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company being read,

Mr. MULOCK. Before the motion is adopted, I wish to call the attention of the House to an amendment which I have placed on the paper, and which I intend to move.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member should move it in Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware that we are to go into Committee; but before we do so, I think it is regular for me to make some observations to which I wish to direct the attention of the Government especially. I think there has been an oversight in the manner in which this Bill has been dealt with by the Committee, and it should either go back to the Railway Committee, to be corrected, or it should be corrected here; and I think the Government must take the responsibility, in the end, of seeing that this Bill issues in a manner to the public interest. I do not say that the Government is in the slightest degree to blame, but I wish to fully acquaint the Government and the House with the interests involved.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that if he is going to raise important questions on this Bill, it would be better, and I would ask my hon. friend in charge of the Bill to consent, that it should be referred back to the Railway Committee, where it can be examined and considered. It is not usual, after a Bill has passed that Committee by consent, to raise important questions here, and I think it would be more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would move that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways and Canals, for the further consideration of those points which have been overlooked.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite agreeable to the course suggested but, inasmuch as the remarks I wish to make apply both: to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway and to the Northern Railway, perhaps the mover of the Northern Railway Bill will agree to the same course.

Mr. SMALL. I have no objection.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I move that the Bill be referred back.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways. When an important Bill, such as this is, likely to involve an important debate upon the effect of certain clauses, I think it is very desirable that it should be relegated back to the Committee to have the matter discussed there. I only regret that the same course was not pursued with regard to the Grand Trunk Bill. However, circumstances alter cases, a little, it appears. I do not object to the motion of the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to, and order discharged.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Curran's proposed motion: That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 21) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will be in the recollection of the House that a question was raised by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron) in regard to the legality of the amalgamation which had taken place between the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways; and my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) intimated that it was upon the assurance I had given to the Committee, that the Minister of Justice had very carefully considered that point, that the Bill had passed through Committee without very much investigation in that regard; and he suggested that the Bill should stand over, a suggestion to which weight was given by the objections raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The Bill was consequently allowed to stand over. Now, I desire to say to the House that I have called the attention of the Minister of Justice again to that point, and he has given a very careful and thorough re-examination of the question; and, in the light of the act which my hon.

friend from North Victoria thought bore upon the question, he has stated that no doubt exists as to the entire legality of the amalgamation; that there was perfect statutory power on the part of the Great Western and Grand Trunk Railways to amalgamate; that the amalgamation has taken place under that power, and that the Act to which the hon. member for North Victoria referred does not at all affect the previous legislation, as that Act has reference to traffic arrangements and running powers, but not to the question of amalgamation. I may say while I am on my feet that my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) pressed also the importance of having it provided more specifically in this Act that the first expenditure under this Act should be for the purpose that we all have in view, that of laying a double track between Toronto and Montreal. I have accordingly asked the Minister of Justice to prepare an amendment, which I propose to move when we go into Committee, and which provides specifically for the first application of the funds to that work. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, also drew my attention to a pledge which I had given to the House a year ago, when I introduced the Act amending the Consolidated Railways Act, touching the power of railway companies to deal in the stocks, bonds, and securities of other railway companies in Canada. Certain companies, such as the Grand Trunk Railway Company, were exempt from the operation of the law as we introduced it, because we made an exception in the case of those companies which had specific legislative powers enabling them to act in that manner; and my hon. friend drew my attention to the fact that I had suggested that we would regard that discussion as giving a year's notice, and that this year we would introduce an amendment in the Act to make it apply to all railways. I may say that I remember distinctly having given that pledge to the House, and in conformity with it the Government will introduce an amendment to the Consolidated Railway Act to apply it to the Grand Trunk Railway as well as others.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And other railway companies incorporated during this Session?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Act of last Session will cover all the companies of this Session.

Mr. BLAKE. An Act passed this Session, has expressly given the power.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Only in the way the Committee decided the power should be given.

Mr. BLAKE. And that is by specifically naming the lines that may be amalgamated.

Mr. MITCHELL. It affords me great pleasure to find that the Government has decided upon those two very important points. With regard to the first, the power of amalgamation, I do not intend to offer an opinion. It is true, some of the most important lawyers of the House and the hon. Minister of Justice have expressed an opinion adverse to that, but I shall not take up the time of the House in discussing it. It affords me much satisfaction to know that this discussion, which has been raised in the Committee of Railways, and subsequently continued in this House, has had the result of bringing about this security demanded by the country, that the money to be raised on the amalgamated stocks for the purpose of doubling the track will be applied to that purpose. I do think it would be more satisfactory if that Bill was included in this one, but I am not disposed to suggest to the Government the action they should take to protect the public interest, as they seem to think this is the best way. I accept the conclusion with great satisfaction, knowing that if this agitation has been created, it has led to results profitable to the country. One word more in reference to the fact stated by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs),

the other day. He impugned my figures. I am prepared to justify the figures I stated. I will not raise the discussion now, but I will be prepared to defend my figures whenever an opportunity for a discussion comes up, which opportunity may occur, if the hon. gentleman who impugns my figures, desires, on the third reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to ask the Committee to amend that clause by adding the following words:—

"After 'rails,' in the 35th line, the words: 'first upon the portion of the line between Montreal and Toronto and then;' after the words, in the 38th line, 'purchase of,' the words 'the necessary;' and after, in the 39th line, the words 'rolling stock and,' the words 'lastly to the.'

The clause as amended, will read as follows:—

"And the remainder of the said consolidated debenture stock by this Act authorized to be created and issued, and any sums remaining out of the sums mentioned in the preceding paragraphs (*a* and *b*) after the said existing charges and debenture stock mentioned therein have been purchased or exchanged for consolidated debenture stock, shall be applied to the putting down of a double track, or second line of rails, first upon the portion of the line between Montreal and Toronto, and then upon such portions of the company's railways as the Directors may, from time to time, determine, with all necessary works, machinery and appliances connected therewith, and also to the purchase of the necessary additional rolling stock; and lastly, to the other general purposes of the Company; and the Company shall render to the Government statements of the application of the proceeds of the additional debenture stock by this Act authorized."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 19,

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), moved to add the following words:—

"And nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to confirm or make valid any agreement, fusion, amalgamation, or consolidation heretofore made between the said The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and the said Great Western Railway Company, except in so far as the same shall have been heretofore authorized by law; nor shall anything herein contained affect any suits now pending."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend will not press that motion. It has not been considered in Committee.

Amendment negatived, and, Bill as amended, reported, and read the third time.

Mr. CURRAN moved that the Bill do pass.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I wish to move the amendment to the third reading of this Bill, of which I have given notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill has been read the third time. I waited some time for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to have an opportunity to move this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The third reading is passed. I leave it to the House whether I did not wait for some time.

Mr. PATTERSON. I appeal to you to give me an opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is that the Bill do pass.

Mr. PATTERSON. I move in amendment that the Bill do not now pass, but that it be——

Mr. SPEAKER. An amendment cannot be moved to this motion. I am afraid you will have to get it in the Senate.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest to the hon. First Minister that he ought to send the hon. member for Essex up to the Senate with the Bill.

Bill passed.

SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RAILWAY.

Mr. WOODWORTH moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 81) further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to The Battleford and Peace River Railway Company.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ORTON moved that all the words after "Melbourne," in the 26th line of the first clause of the Bill be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "and thence by way of Rapid City, along the line of railway as now graded."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to the amendment moved by my hon. friend, that point was considered in the Committee very fully, and after full consideration it was decided to leave it as it stands in the Bill. I think it is not necessary for my hon. friend to press his motion, because the point of departure and the route of the railway are left subject to the approval of the Governor-General in Council. If my hon. friend, or any person, shows a good reason why a particular point should be the point of departure, and makes a strong case for it, taking a particular direction, the Governor in Council will have power to insist on that being carried out. I do not think, the matter having been considered in the Committee, and adopted in the present form, that the Committee here will be disposed to change it.

Mr. ORTON. I think there are very important reasons why that amendment should be considered by this House. This railway passes through a section of country that will be rapidly settled up, and if that road now laid down is carried out, it will give a nearer market by at least 12 miles to all farmers who settle along that line for all time to come. There is another very important reason. In the neighbourhood of Rapid City there are water powers which are very important to the whole of that district, and it is of the utmost importance that they should have easy railway access in order to utilize those water privileges for the benefit of the farmers in the neighbourhood. I understand the railway company desire to start from Brandon. There are many difficulties in the way there. They will have to construct another bridge across the Assiniboine River, and there is an immense hill to overcome, and the expenses of constructing the road will be very much increased. The road has already been graded to Rapid City, a distance of 45 miles; and it will be nearer for the market east and for Winnipeg, by about 12 miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it should hardly be expected that this Committee should alter a Bill in regard to the point of departure of this road, upon motion of any member of this Committee, after the question has been carefully considered and a conclusion arrived at in the Railway Committee. I have nothing whatever to do with the Bill. But I may say this to my hon. friend, that if, under the power which this Bill gives to the Governor in Council to control the route of the railway, to a certain extent, a good case is made out for one particular line much more advantageous than another, it will receive due consideration from the Government.

Mr. WATSON. I think it is very important that this clause should be amended. It is true it was considered in the Railway Committee, but it was rushed through with some haste, and we expected we would have another opportunity of considering it in the House. The people of Rapid City want the road, and it is very important that the starting point and route should be definitely located. The people in that section of country have made investments in the belief that the road would start from Melbourne, and run through Rapid City, and it has been graded from that point to Rapid City. I think, when it is built, it will probably receive some assistance from the Dominion Government. If the road takes this route it will strike the old line laid down by the Government, before reaching Rapid City.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the argument advanced by the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson) why the road should start from Melbourne is rather in favour of keeping to the present route, and that is the fact that they have the road already graded for a distance of 45 miles. I apprehend no company will be willing to give up the right of way that is already purchased, and when the road is already graded, without good and substantial reasons for doing so. I think, also, it would be unreasonable to bind them to start at any particular place, because it virtually handicaps the company, and they are endeavouring to secure a line which will be valuable to the people for the smallest possible amount of money. One of the great difficulties to contend with by any railway company is buying the right of way after people know just where the road is going to be located. Speculators always go in advance of the railway surveyors, and, after getting possession of the land, they oblige the railway companies to pay much more for it than they otherwise would if they had the option between two different lines. All the guarantee that is necessary, in the interests of the people, is that the road shall start from any point that will satisfy the Governor in Council. Besides, this route was adopted in the Committee, and after careful consideration, it was decided this was the best route, and I believe it would be unwise to make any change.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Bossé.)

Bill (No. 85) respecting the Erie and Huron Railway.—(Mr. Smyth.)

JOHN GRAHAM RELIEF BILL.

Mr. JAMIESON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 107) for the relief of John Graham—(from the Senate.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would advise hon. members opposed to this Bill to allow this motion to be passed on a division, and to take a division and record the names on the third reading.

Motion agreed to on a division; and Bill considered in Committee, and reported.

Mr. JAMIESON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS;

Messieurs

Abbott,	Haggart,	O'Brien,
Allen,	Hall,	Orton,
Allison (Hants),	Hay,	Paint,
Armstrong,	Hesson,	Patterson (Essex),
Baker (Victoria),	Hickey,	Reid,
Barnard,	Hilliard,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bell,	Homer,	Robertson (Hastings),
Benson,	Innes,	Scriver,
Blake,	Irvine,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Jackson,	Small,
Bryson,	Jamieson,	Sproule,

Burnham, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Victoria), Campbell (Renfrew), Campbell (Victoria), Carling, Cartwright, Cochrane, Cockburn, Dickinson, Farrow, Fisher, Fleming, Foster, Gault, Gillmor, Guillet, Kilvert, King, Kinney, Kirk, Kranz, Lister, Livingstone, Mackintosh, Macmaster, Macmillan (Middlesex), MacCallum, McDougald, McLelan, McMullen, McNeill, Mitchell, Mulock, Stairs, Taylor, Tilley, Tyrwhitt, Vail, Wallace (Albert), Wallace (York), Watson, Weldon, White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Wigle, Williams, Wood (Brockville) Wood (Westmoreland), Woodworth.—84.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Lennox), Amyot, Auger, Bain (Soulanges), Bain (Wentworth), Béchard, Belleau, Benoit, Bergeron, Bergin, Bernier, Billy, Blondeau, Bossé, Bourassa, Bourbeau, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Caron, Catudal, Chapleau, Costigan, Coursol, Curran, De St. Georges, Dupont, Fairbank, Fortin, Geoffrion, Gigault, Girouard, Grandbois, Guilbault, Gunn, Harley, Holton, Hurteau, Landerkin, Landry (Montmagny), Langevin, Lesage, McMillan (Vaudreuil), McCraney, Massue, Méthot, Pinsonneault, Platt, Rinfret, Riopel, Robertson (Shelburne), Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Thompson, Trow, Wilson, Yeo.—56.

Bill passed on a division.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Charlton's proposed motion, that Bill (No. 6) to provide for the punishment of seduction and like offences, be read the third time; and the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Mr. BOSSÉ moved in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after "that," be struck out and be replaced by the following: This Bill be read the third time this day six months.

Amendment to the amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Abbott, Amyot, Bain (Soulanges), Barnard, Bell, Belleau, Benoit, Benson, Bergeron, Bergin, Billy, Blondeau, Bolduc, Bossé, Bourbeau, Bryson, Burnham, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Victoria), Campbell (Victoria), Carling, Caron, Chapleau, Costigan, Curran, Daly, Dawson, Dupont, Fortin, Gault, Gigault, Grandbois, Guilbault Hackett, Hickey, Hurteau, Kilvert, Kranz, Landry (Montmagny), Langevin, Lesage, Macdonald (King's), McDonald (Cape Breton), Mackintosh, Macmaster, Macmillan (Middlesex), McMillan (Vaudreuil), McCallum, McDougald, McGreevy, Massue, Méthot, Mitchell, Montplaisir, Orton, Paint, Pinsonneault, Riopel, Robertson (Hamilton), Small, Smyth, Sproule, Tyrwhitt, Wallace (York), White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Wigle, Williams, Wood (Westm'l'nd)—69.

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Allen, Allison (Haute), Allison (Lennox), Armstrong, Auger, Bain (Wentworth), Fisher, Fleming, Foster, Geoffrion, Gillmor, Girouard, McIntyre, McMullen, Mulock, O'Brien, Paterson (Brant), Patterson (Essex), Platt, Reid, Rinfret, Robertson (Hastings), Robertson (Shelburne), Scriver, Shakespeare, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Stairs, Temple, Thompson, Trow, Vail, Wallace (Albert), Watson, Weldon, Wilson.—74.

Baker (Missisquoi), Baker (Victoria), Béchard, Bernier, Blake, Bourassa, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Campbell (Renfrew), Cartwright, Casey, Catudal, Charlton, Cockburn, Coursol, De St. Georges, Fairbank, Farrow, Gunn, Hall, Harley, Hay, Hesson, Hilliard, Holton, Homer, Innes, Irvine, Ives, Jamieson, King, Kinney, Kirk, Landerkin, Lister, Livingstone, McCraney,

Mr. FOSTER. In advising with some of the friends and promoters of the Bill, it is thought best that I should ask for leave to withdraw the amendment. That is not my opinion, as I believe the amendment is a just one, which should be as much a part of the Bill as any clause in it, but in deference to those who take a great interest in the Bill, I ask leave to withdraw it.

Motion for leave to withdraw amendment negatived.

Amendment negatived on a division; and Bill read the third time and passed on a division.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FOSTER. When six o'clock came on the day upon which I moved a Resolution, respecting the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, I had not finished the remarks which I had intended to address to the House. However, as the time of this House is valuable, and as there are quite a number of hon. gentlemen who are disposed to take some part in this debate, I shall with your permission, Sir, waive any remarks which I had intended to make, until the close of the debate, when I believe I shall have the opportunity of making a reply.

Mr. FISHER. In seconding the resolution moved by my hon. friend, I wish to say a few words, especially as the standpoint from which I view this question is a little different from that of my hon. friend, although we arrive at the same conclusion in regard to the principle at issue. Notwithstanding the able and exhaustive argument of the hon. gentleman who made this motion, I find that there are a considerable number of points which have not yet been touched upon; and it is for this reason that I ask the attention of the House for a few minutes, after which any hon. gentleman who wishes to speak in opposition to the principle before us, may have an opportunity to address you. First, Sir, I would like to have it clearly understood that, in treating of this question, I do not consider that the ordinary use of liquor is at all a crime or a sin. I say this because I know that a large number of people who think as I do, that the use, the manufacture and the traffic of intoxicating liquors in this country should be prohibited, do hold that opinion. But, notwithstanding that I differ from them on this premise, I am happy to say that the conclusions which we draw from different premises arrive at the same end. When I say that, I do not in any way wish to endorse the use of liquor, because I believe that is inadvisable, that it is contrary to the public good, and that it is contrary to the physical advantage of those who indulge in that use. Unfortunately, however, we invariably find that the use is attended with abuse; and it is because of this invariable fact in the world's history, that I am opposed even to the use of intoxicating liquors. In saying this, I do not wish to be understood as saying that I believe that no individual can use intoxicating liquors without abusing them; but I be-

lieve that if the opportunities are given for using intoxicating liquors, the necessary consequence will be the abuse of them by a very large proportion of those who attempt the use of them. In dealing with this question, I find that the community may be fairly divided into three classes—those who are already temperance people, those who use liquor without abusing it, and those who, unfortunately for themselves and for the community in which they live, abuse it. The first class it is not necessary for me to appeal to, because I believe all temperance people are thoroughly in accord with us in regard to the principle of this resolution, and will gladly and heartily endorse any legislation which it may involve. The last class, those who abuse the liquor, I think we have a perfect right, for the good of the country, to restrain from that abuse. I find, then, that it is necessary for me simply to appeal to those who use liquor without abusing it. In doing so, I shall not only appeal to their generosity and their kindliness towards their fellow beings in this Dominion, in asking them to assist in bringing about what I believe to be a great good to the country, but I think I can appeal to them fairly and justly, as well as successfully, on the ground that it is also to their pecuniary and material advantage that such a resolution as this should pass this House, and that a law should be founded upon it. A great statesman has announced as a principle that it is the duty of a Government to make everything that is right easy for its citizens, and to make everything that is wrong difficult. This perhaps may be considered a self-evident proposition; but I think that we must necessarily include in it the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I would go further and say that not only is it the duty of a Government, but it is the duty of the citizens of a country, to assist in making everything that is right easy, and everything that is wrong difficult. This proposition may be stated in another form: that we should oppose national duty to national selfishness. If the community believe that what I have stated is a duty, they must sacrifice to a certain extent what I acknowledge to be their use of intoxicating liquors to the necessity of restraining the abuse of them by a large number of their fellow-citizens. And I believe, Sir, that this appeal will not be in vain; because we know, as a matter of fact, that a large number of people among those who to-day are total abstainers have not found it necessary, from their fears of the consequences of using liquor in themselves to become total abstainers, but that they have become so owing to what they believe to be the necessary effect that their continuance of the use of liquor would have by way of example upon their fellow citizens. I have seen it stated in some papers, in which the mover of this resolution has been criticised, that he did not touch a vital point in the argument—the abstract right of Parliament or of the country to prohibit the use of intoxicating liquors. I wish to discuss this contention for a few moments. Some might say that it is now too late to attempt to make any such argument as that prohibition is abstractly wrong, because we already have parliamentary prohibition; but I find that, even without agreeing in this argument at once, I can quote the opinion of one or two well known statesmen in support of my contention that this Parliament has the abstract right to enforce total prohibition. First, I will quote a short extract from Mr. Mill, a great English writer on political economy. He says:

"Even in the best state society has yet reached, it is lamentable to think how a great a proportion of all the efforts and talents in the world are employed in merely neutralizing one another. It is the proper end of Government to reduce this wretched waste to the smallest possible amount, by taking such measure as shall cause the energies now spent by mankind in injuring one another, or in protecting themselves against injury, to be turned to the legitimate employment of the human faculties, that of compelling the powers of nature to be more and more subservient to physical and moral good."

Surely, in limiting or restricting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, we can fairly say we are compelling the powers of nature to be more and more subservient to physical and moral good. I find also that an able writer, a short pamphlet of whose I have in my hand, Mr. Wm. Hoyle, a well known authority in England on political economy and other economical subjects, says:

"True civilization consists, not in the mere amassing of wealth, but in promoting such social and national arrangements as will ensure the physical health, the national development, the social happiness, and the industrial and moral progress of nations."

If, Sir, as was shown very clearly by my hon. friend who proposed this resolution, the physical and moral health of the nation will be promoted by its abstention from the use of intoxicating liquors, we are justified, on this ground alone, in endeavouring to bring to pass the prohibition of the use of these liquors. I will cite also a quotation from Mr. Gladstone, who may, I think, be fairly called one of the greatest statesmen who has ever taken into consideration the internal economy of the greatest nation in the world. He said, in the case of Ireland:

"It was agreed that if the sentiment of the public was in sympathy with the proposal with regard to the Sunday-closing Bill, it ought to be assented to. If people were desirous to set aside this temptation, would it not be a cruel thing to refuse their desire."

From these quotations, I argue that it is a mere question of whether the country is really desirous that the law for total prohibition should be enacted. But I will go further. We have other things in which the liberty of the citizen is just as much interfered with as it would be in such a law as this. I believe that on our Statute Books there is an Act against the carrying of concealed firearms. Nobody can pretend that, in itself, the carrying of firearms in one's pocket or in any other way concealed on the person is necessarily wrong; but for the public good it has been found necessary, in consequence of the frequency of these firearms being carried for evil purposes, that the carrying of them should be declared wrong, and there is a law against it. We have in our municipal regulations the prohibition of certain trades and certain usages in large communities; we have also, and this is, perhaps, more akin to the present prohibitory law we are advocating, stringent laws against prostitution, against the circulation and the reading of immoral literature, and also against gambling. I think that these are really fair examples of such prohibitory legislation as this for which we are asking, and that since we have in this way interfered with the liberty of the citizen, we have the right to go further and interfere with it also in the question which is now before us. But even more than this; if we examine the present law we will find that in this and other Acts in regard to the liquor traffic, we have already adopted the principle of prohibition. We find that in England and in Scotland and in Ireland there are laws against the selling of liquor on Sunday; and if it is allowable to prohibit the selling of liquor on Sunday, it is equally allowable to prohibit the selling of it on other days of the week. If it is not interfering with a man's liberty to say he shall not, on a certain day or during certain hours, go into a liquor saloon or shop to obtain liquor, it is perfectly right that we should say that on other days and during other hours, he shall not have that privilege or liberty. In our own Statute Books, there is a series of laws acknowledging the prohibitory principle. We find the Scott Act and the Dunkin Act, both of which make local prohibition right in this country. If it is right for the Parliament of this country to prohibit the traffic in liquor in certain localities it must be perfectly legitimate and right that that traffic should be prohibited over the whole country. More than this, we find there are clauses in all these Acts, even in the License Acts we have in the different Provinces, which prohibit the sale of liquor in certain times and seasons and places, and if we are not at all to interfere with the right of the individual to obtain liquor where and when he likes, we should not have passed those laws; and the passing of those laws is, I contend, a suffi-

cient argument to show that we have the moral as well as the legislative right to pass these enactments we are now asking you to pass. Last year, Sir, this Parliament passed a License Act. By one of the clauses of that Act the people of the municipalities were allowed to prohibit the sale of liquor within their limits, which is giving to the people the right to legislate according to their desire in this matter; but that Act went further. Not only did it give to the people the right to prohibit the sale of liquor within their own limits, but it went so far, in the Province of Quebec, as to give to the representatives of the people in their municipal councils the right to prohibit the traffic in liquor within their municipal limits. If it is allowable to give a small body of men, such as a municipal council, the right to interfere with the liberty of the people to obtain liquor when and where they like, surely it is the right of this Parliament to decide that the people shall not obtain liquor when and where they choose. We also have in this country, in the North-West Territories, an absolutely prohibitory law. That was passed by this Parliament. That was not passed by the representatives of the people who were to be affected by it, but it was passed by the arbitrary power of the Parliament which ruled that country, as it was thought, at the time, for its own good, and as Parliament still, I think, considers it was done for its good, and it has been productive of good. Then, also, on Government works connected with our railroads, the Parliament of this country passed a law prohibiting the selling of intoxicating liquors, so that these works might be the better prosecuted. If I asked for any argument, I could not ask for a better than this very Act, to show that it is the opinion of this Parliament, and the opinion of the people of this country, that the liquor traffic in itself is obstructive of good; that it has a tendency to deteriorate the work the people do, and a tendency to interfere with that work. I think that, from these things to which I have alluded, these various laws which already hold in this country, and are already in force in regard to the restraint of the liquor traffic, I may fairly conclude that this Parliament has not only the legislative right, but the moral right, to interfere in this way with the liberty of the individual to obtain the liquor whenever he may desire it. There is another question which has agitated the minds of a good many, and is looked upon as a very serious objection to the passage of a prohibitory law. I allude to the loss of revenue to the country in consequence of this. I will not go into the moral question as to whether this revenue is obtained in a legitimate manner, as to whether it is right or wise for this country to batten upon the proceeds of this traffic, but I will simply quote the authority of a gentleman whom I am glad to see sitting in his seat opposite to me to-night, a gentleman whom a large majority of this House consider to be a very high authority upon financial matters—I allude to the hon. the Finance Minister, who last summer, on August 9th, at the Westminster Palace Hotel, in London, made a speech upon Canadian liquor legislation, and in that speech he said:

"It has been my misfortune, or fortune, having been a great many years in the Government of my native Province of New Brunswick, and in the Government of the Dominion, to hold the post of Finance Minister in all these Governments, and I have never heard but one opinion about the revenue question, namely, that it is of quite secondary importance, though it is, I admit, a more difficult matter with you. The revenue we obtain in the Dominion of Canada is probably five or six million of dollars a year, and it costs the people $20,000,000 in providing it for us. No Finance Minister would remain long in office who would, in this day, propose a scheme for raising a revenue of $5,000,000 that would cost $20,000,000 to collect."

Mr. Speaker, I think that coming from such an authority as this, this House will accept the view I have propounded; and I do not believe that there are great many people in this country who would not be prepared for the statement that the hon. Finance Minister there made. There are not a very great many people, I think, who would not fully understand, that although direct receipts from this traffic would certainly be expunged from our revenue, still, the improvement in the general commerce of the country, the improvement in the general welfare and well-being of our community would be so great, that the receipts in all other branches of our revenue would be increased correspondingly, and there would, practically, after the first year or so, not be any diminution whatever in our revenue from our tax payers. There is another point which I now come to, and that is when we ought to prohibit. It is generally said that we should not prohibit until the country is quite prepared for that action; until there is not only an evident desire on the part of the country for prohibition, but also that the country should be prepared to sustain the prohibitory measure and to assist in carrying it out. I believe this is, to a certain extent, true; but I believe also that one of the very best means of obtaining that happy period in the country's history is to commence by prohibiting. I believe that the very fact that a prohibitory law is in existence is one of the very best educating powers in the community. I believe that, by the legislative action of Parliament, we may have a better influence upon the people of the country to bring them to that opinion than we can in any other way whatever. It is true that in years past moral suasion has been tried, and moral suasion has accomplished a great deal. Far be it from me in any way to detract from the noble efforts of those who have spent their time and labour in trying to improve the principles of the community upon this question, but I believe that, in conjunction with moral suasion, as an assistant and a help to moral suasion, it is absolutely necessary that the Government of the country should propose a law and should assist those who are trying this moral suasion to carry out that law and to enforce it. What has been the result in those countries where we have had a prohibitory law? We find universal testimony to the fact that, in those States and countries where the prohibitory law has been in existence, the people have found the education which it exerted upon the community was the very greatest possible to be imagined. I find that, in the State of Vermont, where for some twenty years past there has been absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic, and the use of liquor as much as was possible, Governor Peck, who was an ex-Governor of the State, and Judge of the Supreme Court, says:

"In some parts of the State there has been a laxity in enforcing it; but in other parts of the State it has been thoroughly enforced, and there it has driven the traffic out. I think the influence of the law has been salutary in diminishing drunkenness and disorders arising therefrom, and also crimes generally. You cannot change the habits of a people momentarily. The law has had an effect upon our customs, and has done away with that of treating and promiscuous drinking. The law has been aided by moral means, but moral means have also been wonderfully strengthened by the law. I think the law is educating the people, and that a much larger number now support it than when it was adopted; in fact, the opposition is dying out. All the changes in the law have been in the direction of greater stringency. In attending a court for ten years, I do not remember to have seen a drunken man."

This testimony, I think, is very strong in the direction of the argument that the law is the best educator of the people. I also have the testimony of Governor Convers, in the same State. He says:

"The prohibitory law has been in force about twenty-two years, the enforcement has been uniform in the State since its enactment, and I consider it a very desirable law. I think the law itself educates and advances public sentiment in favour of temperance. There is no question about the decrease in the consumption of liquor. I speak from personal knowledge, having always lived in the State. I live in Woodstock, 60 miles from here, and there is no man having the least regard for himself would admit selling rum, even though no penalty attached to it."

I have here in my hand another testimony to the educating effects of the law. That is the Convention of the State Temperance Union in Rhode Island. Governor Howard, Governor of that State, said:

"I stopped short without recommending particularly the prohibitory law. I did so because I was not fully convinced that it was the best remedy to be found; but the law was adopted. After a long time we succeeded in selecting such a force of men as was needed to execute those laws; and now, ladies and gentlemen, I am here to-night especially for the purpose of saying, not from the standpoint of a temperance man, but as a public man, with a full sense of the responsibility which attaches to me from my representative position, that to-day the prohibitory laws of this State, if not a complete success, are a success beyond the fondest anticipation of any friend of temperance. In my opinion, prohibition in Rhode Island is a success, a marvellous success. I felt it incumbent upon me to make that declaration and I desire that it shall go abroad as my sober assertion."

I have here shown you briefly what has been the educating influence of this law in those States where it has been enforced. But there are other instances just as significant though not, perhaps, so well known to the people of this country. I find in a very interesting letter from a certain Mr. Balfour to the right hon. W. E. Gladstone, in which he describes the operation of liquor legislation in Sweden, that many years ago in that country there was absolute free trade in liquors, and that, at the period at which he writes, no less than 175,000 stills were in existence, manufacturing intoxicating liquor of the most ardent description in that country. The letter gives evidence that for a long time the crime, the destitution, the immorality in that country were simply enormous and almost inconceivable. Not long afterwards the Government of that country introduced restrictive measures against the liquor traffic, and we have evidence that almost immediately afterwards not only did the traffic itself diminish, but the crime, and the poverty, and the destitution among the people also decreased. This was not absolute prohibition, but it tended in that direction, and I think the argument is quite clear that, since the people in other respects were just the same during the two periods, that their moral, religious, and secular education was just the same during the two periods, the decrease in the amount of crime was attributable to the decrease in the amount of liquor consumed. I find, in looking over the history of liquor legislation in England, during a great many years indeed, that just in proportion as the traffic was restrained, just in the same proportion did the people benefit by such restrictive legislation; that when the laws were rendered more strict against the traffic in liquor the effects among the people were immediately evident by a decrease in the number of commitments to jail, in the number of crimes of all sorts, and also by a greatly augmented prosperity. I need not say that at no time was this legislation absolutely prohibitive, but my argument is, that just in proportion as the liquor traffic was restricted was there a decrease in its attendant evils. It has often been said that moral suasion in England has accomplished a great deal towards producing a sentiment in favour of prohibition. Sir, I believe moral suasion has done a great deal in that respect, but it is to be noted that it has been constantly attended with increasing legislative restrictions, and I believe that the increased temperance sentiment in England is as much due to the educating influence of this restrictive legislation as it is to moral suasion. But there is another argument which we may fairly adduce. It is very inconsistent for the Government of any country to license people to sell intoxicants and thereby encourage intemperance, while at the same time they pretend to be educating people in favour of temperance. Certainly it is a very ineffectual mode of educating people in favour of temperance by precept, when by practice the Government educate people in favour of intemperance. So long as we may be told that the liquor traffic is perfectly respectable, that it is acknowledged and fostered by the Government, that traffic cannot possibly be considered disreputable, or immoral, or wrong. It it very difficult for us to preach when we do not practise, and I think, Sir, that it is the duty of the representatives of the people to take the first step in practising that which they are endeavouring to preach to the people. Now there is another objection very often urged against prohibition, and that is that prohibitory legislation cannot succeed, and must necessarily be ineffective, and conducive rather to evil than to good. I believe we have not to go outside the limits of our own country to see the fallacy of this argument. I come from a county in which a prohibitory liquor law has been in existence for a long time, and I can emphatically say that while it has not accomplished all that we desire it should accomplish, while it has not been absolutely and entirely enforced, still it has accomplished so much good that the vast mass of the people in that county would regret exceedingly to see it repealed—nay more, they would strenuously resist and forbid the repeal of that law, and any agitation in favour of such repeal would meet with a most determined opposition. I think I am justified in saying this when I recall the fact that the other day I presented to this House a petition signed by 1,200 or 1,500 of the electors of my county, asking that this resolution, in favour of which I am now speaking, should be passed by this House. If the Dunkin Act, which has been for many years in existence in my county, had been inoperative, if it had produced more evil than good, if it had not, at all events, accomplished some of the good which was expected of it, it would have been quite impossible that so large a number of the most intelligent electors in my county should have asked for the passage of a resolution in favour of prohibition. Instead of that, they would have sent petitions here asking that this resolution be rejected, pointing out how prohibition had failed in its effect. We know that in a large number of counties in this Dominion the Scott Act also has been in force, and although, no doubt, there are conflicting opinions in regard to its action, still the simple fact remains that in every district I know of where this law is in force, the liquor sellers, and those who wish to obtain liquor, together with the manufacturers of such liquor, are opposed to such law, is to me a convincing argument that that law has done harm to the traffic. I believe if we could obtain evidence from those counties where prohibitory laws are in force, the evidence would be overwhelmingly in favour of prohibition. But, Sir, we have, as I said, a little while ago, prohibitory legislation in the North-West Territories, and I will quote again from the Ministerial benches, a witness in regard to its effective operation. I allude to a speech delivered by Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways, last summer, on the same occasion as that on which the speech was delivered by the Finance Minister, to which a few moments ago, I alluded. Sir Charles Tupper was reviewing the Act which he had the honour of proposing and carrying through Parliament. He said:

"I may say, in reference to that other Act which I had the honour of proposing and carrying through Parliament when occupying the position of Minister of Customs, in 1872, an Act that, as he says, excluded the sale, manufacture and use of intoxicating liquors from a territory nearly as large as that of all Europe, the difficulty to be encountered was comparatively simple.

"Mr. RAPER. Do you say 'use' is in the Act?

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say use, because the manufacture and sale being prohibited, it followed that the use was prohibited. The authorities appointed Mounted Police to have the law observed. Whenever the smallest portion of intoxicating liquors was discovered in the Territory, they had authority to destroy it then and there, and thus the use was completely and entirely prohibited throughout the extent of 250,000,000 acres of fertile land. Throughout that extent, intoxicating liquors are so completely prohibited, that when the distinguished Lord Dufferin was entertained in that Territory on the occasion of his visit, they were compelled to drink His Lordship's health with a mixture of Perry Davis' Pain Killer."

This evidence, Sir, is, I think, conclusive that at all events a prohibitory law can be enforced by the Government, that a Government wishing to enforce it can practically and effectually carry it out. But, Sir, I have here another witness in respect to this same matter—the enforcement of a prohibitory law, which I think is one of the most conclusive proofs that can possibly be quoted. I allude to what, no doubt, most

members will very well remember, the fact that the *Globe* newspaper, in 1881, sent two correspondents into the State of Main, that State which has always been quoted as the best example of a total prohibition of the liquor traffic. Those two gentlemen were, one in favour of total prohibition, the other in favour of the liquor traffic; and I will quote to the House, not the evidence of that gentleman who was in favour of total prohibition, but that of the other one who was against it, and I think the evidence which he sums up, is conclusive as to the fact that, although certainly liquor is sold in Maine, liquor no doubt can be obtained there and is drank there, still, on the whole, the Act is really and practically enforced. This gentleman wrote:

"Our work in Maine is now published, and before commencing enquiries in other States it may be well to sum up my conclusions, while the impressions left by our two weeks sojourn are yet fresh and distinct. I realized perfectly well that the results at which I have arrived will not be apt to please either party I do not write with the object of doing so, but simply to tell the plain truth as arrived at from personal observation, interviews with those whose opinions were likely to be of value, and consideration of the question in all its bearings. I shall not attempt a review or recapitulation of details, but present my conclusions in the form of a series of brief propositions, as follows:—

"That in the cities the law has been a partial failure so far as uprooting the traffic, or even the suppression of open bars is concerned.

"That this failure has been greatly exaggerated by quoting exceptional places or periods as typical of the whole State, and by the ingenious perversion of statistics.

"That in the rural portions of the State of Maine, law has suppressed open drinking and reduced secret drinking to a minimum and may therefore be considered as effective as any other measure on the Statue Book.

"That after thirty years, the opinion of the State is so strongly in favour of the law that no political party is willing to risk its future by advocating a reversion to license, and that on the contrary the Legislature is continually strengthening the law by more stringent amendments.

"That the class of liquor sellers who defy the law are the same class of men who, under a license system, would sell liquor without license."

I will not weary the House by reading the whole of his summing up, but I have taken out the salient features, and in omitting the rest I have not left the weaker or poorer paragraphs. I think, Sir, that this evidence is such as will successfully refute the assertion of so many people, that it is obviously futile to try and interfere successfully with the liquor traffic. I have here another quotation which I will not, however, read to the House, a quotation from a book by Hepworth Dixon, on America, in which he alludes to the State of Vermont, and especially to the little town of St. Johnsbury, with which I am myself familiar, and which he there describes as a workingman's paradise. In that little town is the Fairbank's great scale manufactory, and a large portion of the inhabitants are working people, 500 operatives having employment in that factory alone. Mr. Dixon says that those working men who are thus employed appear to consider total prohibition as their best friend; that they themselves will be among the last to aid any attempt to have the law repealed. He describes the town as being absolutely and totally a prohibitory one, going so far as to say that when he desired to obtain a glass of beer he had to get a pint bottle from a druggist and secure a medical certificate in order to obtain it. Here is evidence not only that prohibition does prohibit, but also that people are benefited by that prohibition, and that even the working classes, those who are supposed to be the last to approve such a change, are really those who do appear the most decided that the law shall not be changed. Mr. Fairbank, manager of those large works, attributed to a great extent, the efficiency of his men to the fact that they could not obtain liquor in the town, and were compelled to abstain. I have also here another quotation, which I will read to the House; it is also in regard to the State of Vermont and the State of Maine. I allude to the report of an English gentleman, who went out to the United States, Hon. William Fox, an ex-Prime Minister of the Colony of New Zealand, who was travelling through the United States, and visited Maine and Vermont for the express purpose of finding out how the prohibitory law worked there. He was, he says, against the principle. He did not believe that such a law could be satisfactorily carried out. But he here says:

"To sum up the whole, and admitting all the facts I could get from Mr. Murray, I believe the conditions of the States of Maine and Vermont to be much a follows:—If the House of Lords, and the House of Commons, and all the country justices, mayors, and aldermen of Great Britain, and a small number of the lower classes, perhaps 200,000 out of the population of 28,000,000, drank, and all the rest did not, you would have a state of things analogous here to what they are in Maine and Vermont—you would have a very small fraction who would get and use liquor, furnishing those shocking examples which some persons are in the habit of parading before us as existing in those States, but the whole of the rest of the population would be sober. The effect on their general condition is something marvellous—a total absence, externally, at all events, of all those vices and crimes which we meet with amongst drinking populations, which is very agreeable and very surprising. The impression left on my mind by my visit to these States was a full confirmation of the statements made to you by the hon. Gen. Neal Dow, and the documents which have been put forth—that in Maine and Vermont, on the whole, the prohibitory law has been a great success; notwithstanding that it has been more difficult to carry out, because of its non-permissive character."

Here, Sir, I think, is an accumulation of evidence which is quite sufficient to show that in those places where there is total prohibition it has been successfully carried out. But I find, too, that where partial prohibition has been carried out, it has had an extraordinary effect in decreasing the amount of drinking. One of the most curious, and, at the same time, one of the most convincing, evidences of this fact, was found in Scotland in 1854, at the time that what was called the Sunday-closing Bill was passed. We have the evidence of the Provost of Edinburgh to show that at that time, in consequence of the operation of that Bill, which stopped the people from drinking for just one seventh of the time, just one-seventh of the liquor drinking was stopped. We find that in that time about six-sevenths of the liquor was drunk which was drunk before, showing that by stopping the sale of liquor one day out of seven you stop the use of liquor in about the same proportion. I think it is not an illogical inference to draw that if you stop it for the succeeding six days, it would almost, eventually and absolutely stop the drinking of liquor entirely. There is one more argument which I have to bring before you to-night, Sir, and that is, why we should prohibit. I am not going into the argument which the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) so elaborately discussed the other night, as to the physical evils of intemperance. I am fully and firmly convinced that even the ordinary use of intoxicating liquors is bad, physically, for the individual who indulges in it. We were shown the other night a large mass of evidence, which tended to prove that the medical fraternity, throughout the whole country, endorse this view, and that they go further, and say that it is absolutely injurious to the public health that liquor should be allowed to be consumed. There is, it is true, on the other side, a large amount of evidence from medical men, to the effect that the moderate and ordinary use of liquor is not injurious, and however much I believe with the former, and not with the latter, still I am not going to make use of this argument, in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining absolute proof in regard to it; but I wish to view it, as nearly as possible, from a practical, business standpoint. If we can show to the community at large that by reason of this traffic, from day to day, from week to week, and from year to year we are losing an enormous amount of material prosperity, I think we have the most convincing argument to the people of the country that this traffic should be done away with. In a new country like this, we should do everything we can to assist in building up and developing it; and if it can be shown that a large amount of energy is wasted in this traffic, that it contributes to the waste of an enormous amount of our material and vital energy, I think we have the strongest and most convincing argument that the traffic should be done away with. In trying

to show you that this is the case, I will only read one or two quotations. The most important, and I think the most conclusive, is that which I shall read from an article written in *Fraser's Magazine*, in 1875, by the gentleman who founded, and has controlled the extraordinary settlement in the State of New Jersey, called the Vineland Settlement. I dare say many hon. gentlemen are familiar with the place and the name. In establishing this colony and working it out so far as he was able to do so successfully, this gentleman took into account the liquor traffic. What he says with regard to it is as follows:—

"The next important question was in reference to the sale of liquor, a subject I now find greatly agitating the British public, and even the Government. I considered the subject solely as it would affect the industrial success of my settlement. I had witnessed the evil effects of the immense number of taverns which usually planted themselves in new places; I had seen very many towns with every natural advantage to favour them, and which at first were highly prosperous, finally fail, in a manner most unaccountable to the ordinary observer; but when I noticed the abundance of taverns, and considered the number of people they would draw from productive industry to carry them on, and the effects on their customers, I could easily account for such enterprises falling sick and becoming paralyzed. My success depended entirely upon the success of each individual who should buy a farm of me. I had noticed that those individuals who were sober in their habits were usually the successful ones in all pursuits; that those who were intemperate were the unsuccessful ones; that the families, whose heads were sober, were happy families; that where they were intemperate they were unhappy. It was of vital importance to me that a man's means should be economized, that he should be inclined to labour, and have the health to do it, and that his family should be contented, especially his wife. Intemperance is productive of discontent in families, and when the wife is in a new place, away from her relatives, and friends, and the husband grows intemperate, she becomes panic-stricken. Happy, cheerful homes were necessary to the success of Vineland. As the best account of my action in reference to this subject, I will give you an extract from a speech I delivered before the Judiciary Committee of New Jersey, in 1873, which was appointed to examine into the question:—'I am in candor compelled to say that I did not introduce the local option principle into Vineland from any motives of philanthropy. I am not a temperance man in the total abstinence sense; I introduced the principle because in cool abstract thought, I conceived it to be of vital importance to the success of my settlement. If I had seen that liquor had made men more industrious, more skilful, more economical, and more esthetic, in their tastes, I certainly should have made liquor selling one of the main principles of my project. Whilst disclaiming all motives of philanthropy, I cannot deny the feeling of intense commiseration that I have felt for the victims of intoxication.''

This, Sir, is the cool, dispassionate, business-like statement of a man whose sole energies were devoted towards the business success of his colony. He says himself that he was not a total abstainer, that he did not wish, on general principles, to bring that question before his people, but that because the stern logic of facts was so strong he had to bring it before his people. He felt it was his duty to his people to restrain them from drinking any intoxicating liquors, so as the better to bend their energies and efforts to the advancement of his colony and the success of his undertaking. I have already alluded, Sir, to the quotation from Mr. Hepworth Dixon and others, as to the State of Vermont. I have another very strong testimony to which I am going to allude—that is the testimony of a gentleman in Massachusetts with whom I am personally acquainted, and whose opinion on this question I know from frequent conversations. He is the head of one of the largest manufacturing firms in that State. I mean Mr. Ames, of the Ames Manufacturing Works, in Easton, Mass. There they adopted, for a short time, a totally prohibitory law. But that law was repealed, and this is what Mr. Ames says in regard to its influence on his workpeople, to whose amelioration and increased efficiency his chief efforts have been for a long time directed. What he says is this:

"We have over 400 men at work here. We find that the present license law has a very bad effect upon our employees."

I may say that the license law succeeded the prohibitory law in Massachusetts. In 1867, they had total prohibition, and 1868 they had a license law. He goes on to say:

"We find, on comparing our production in May and June of this year (1868) with (1867), that in 1867, with 375 men, we produced 8 per cent more goods than we did in the same months in 1863, with 400 men."

That is to say, under total prohibition, Mr. Ames' manufactory produced 8 per cent more than it did with twenty-five men more under a license law. This, I think, is strong evidence, not only that the waste that goes on under the use of liquor is bad for the work people, but also that the manufacturers themselves and the whole community through the length and breadth of the land are deeply interested in the suppression of this traffic. Mr. Ames adds:

"We attribute this falling off entirely to the repeal of the prohibitory law, and the great increase in the use of intoxicating liquors among our men in consequence."

I have met Mr. Ames since that law has been repealed and the licenses issued, and I know that it is one of the dearest wishes of his heart that the licenses should be abolished in his town in Massachusetts. I have several other quotations in regard to the effect of restrictions on the traffic in various places, which, however, I shall not read, as I find that the time has gone much faster than I had any idea it would. But I cannot refrain from alluding to testimony which comes from nearer home in regard to this traffic in our own country. I am not going to quote the statements of temperance people. I have tried as much as possible to take an unbiased view of this question, and to put aside wholly what is called by a great many, though unjustly, the fanaticism of temperance reformers; and I have endeavoured to bring forward the evidence of those opposed to the principle of prohibition rather than the evidence of those in its favour, because I do not wish to be thought to be advocating, without careful thought and consideration, the adoption of the principle proposed to the House. I will read an extract from the report of the Chief of Police of the city of Montreal for last year, in which he says:

"Less crime was committed in Montreal than in any other city comprising as large a population on this continent. This was no doubt greatly owing to the influence of the clergy, and the good moral character of the majority of the citizens, but most certainly in some degree to the vigilance of the police. The number of criminals arrested during the year was less than last year, the greater part of them being young and illiterate, or addicted to drinking; this fact should stimulate all who have the public morals at heart to use their utmost endeavours to lessen the number of liquor shops in the city. According to the returns of the Revenue Department, there are at present in the city 382 hotels and restaurants, and 448 groceries, where liquor is sold. The amount of money paid annually for licenses for these places, added to what is spent in them for liquor, and recklessly squandered or lost by persons intoxicated, would amount to an almost fabulous amount. Some of our influential citizens had lately been devising a scheme for the suppression of prostitution in the city: if they would use their influence for the restriction or abolition of the liquor traffic, they would be thereby dealing a death-blow at prostitution, the tavern being to most young people a stepping-stone to the brothel and all other kinds of vice. It would be a step in the right direction if the Police Committee would get a by-law passed regarding registry offices for servant girls, in order to protect inexperienced girls from the misleading advice of some unprincipled keepers of such places."

This is certainly very strong testimony of the evil effects of the liquor traffic in our very midst, coming from an authority which has been shown not in any way to be biased in favour of prohibition. Now, I have some Canadian manufacturing statistics which, I think, will be suggestive to read. They show the proportionate value of the products which are paid as wages in our different manufactories, that is to say, how much the workpeople get out of the profits of the goods which they manufacture; and they show very clearly that the smallest proportion of any is made by those who work in the establishments where the manufacture of liquor is carried on. In brass founderies the workpeople get 12 per cent; in distilleries, 6½; in founderies, 36; in cordage manufactures, 24; in printing establishments, 28; in cabinet making, 31; in carpentering, 33; in machine shops, 31; in clothing establishments, 21; and in carriage manufactures 34 per cent; showing that the lowest paid workpeople in the country in proportion to the value of their work in the market of the country, are those employed in the manufacture of drink. This does not certainly show that it is for the benefit of our workpeople that these manufactories should be carried on; and I think it is a very potent argument why

the rank and file of the voters of this country who have control over this House and the Government of this country should favour this resolution. Another significant circumstance is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, one of the great railroad corporations of this country, use their best endeavours in favour of temperance among their employees; and I think I am right in saying that they have absolutely commanded that they shall not drink. I have no doubt that this great corporation have at heart the well-being of their employees. But I do not think I am unjust in saying that their chief reason in enforcing this abstinence from drink is the reason that appeals to their own pocket, in consequence of their finding that it renders the workpeople whom they employ, more efficient Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain you longer. I will merely say, before closing, that although this House may treat this question with comparative indifference, although possibly it may be dismissed with a sneer and a laugh and that a large number of people throughout the country may think that those who have brought this question before the House have been premature and unjustified in so doing, I think there is a sentiment throughout the country which justifies us in the action we have taken. I believe that if not now, at all events at no distant day, that sentiment will press itself so strongly that the representatives of the people in this House will be forced, if they do no do it willingly, to take cognizance of and to discuss and ventilate most thoroughly some such proposition as that which you have now before you. If this discussion does not thoroughly ventilate the question, if the hon. members of this House do not thoroughly believe that it is in the interests of the country that such a resolution should pass, I do not wish them to vote for it; but I think it is time for them to discuss it, I think it is time for them to turn their attention to it, to review it and lay it bare before the whole country, to its very bottom, so that the people throughout the country who have not turned their attention in this direction may be induced to do so, and to judge this question according to its merits. I do not ask, and I do not hope, that we shall obtain any catch vote here to-night which might perhaps lead the country to believe that this proposition was universally accepted. I trust hon. gentlemen in this House will vote upon this question as they think their constituents would wish them to vote. It is only in that way we can obtain some opinion of the real sentiments of the people on this question throughout the country, and I believe that while we have in view the practical enactment of such a law as is pointed to in this resolution, one of the greatest inducements to the mover and myself in bringing this resolution forward, was to test the opinion of this House and the country. If that test is successful, and we find that we carry this resolution, I can promise hon. gentlemen, and the people throughout the country at large, that principle will be put into practice just so soon as we shall be able to carry it through; but, unfortunately, this Session has already advanced so far that probably we may not be able to do anything effective this Session. If, however, we obtain the endorsation of the principle, we shall be well satisfied with our work this year, and trust to a future Session to accomplish the practical part of it. Before closing, I have one more duty to perform which is at the same time a great pleasure, and that is to publicly acknowledge the kindness of those ladies of Ontario who, a few days ago, sent to the mover and myself an evidence of their earnest sympathy and encouragement in the work we are doing. Knowing the principles of the hon. leader of this House, knowing that at no distant day in the future, those ladies will probably have a voice in the election of members to this House and the Government of the country, I think it is a most decided encouragement to my hon. friend and myself to believe that if the House is not ready to pass the Resolution we have now before us, at all events, at no distant day, those ladies will force this House to do it; and with the expression of the confidence and the hope that we may succeed, I take my seat.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. After the able manner in which thi question has been discussed, it may seem out of place for me to detain the House—

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As it is now eleven o'clock and we sat very late this morning and will have to sit most likely very late to-morrow and the next night, it would perhaps be better if the hon. gentleman would not begin his speech now, but move the adjournment of the debate, so that on Wednesday next it will be the first order in Public Bills and he will have the first place in the discussion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not intend to occupy the House for more than ten minutes at the outside, and do not feel anxious to speak if the hon. gentleman wishes the House to adjourn.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BERGIN. I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. leader of the Government will promise that the Government will not take next Wednesday, I will be very glad to support this motion; otherwise, I must oppose it.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETIES AND LOAN AND SAVINGS COMPANIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Before the next order is proceeded with, I would ask, with the permission of the House, that the last order on the list of Public Bills and Orders be allowed to have its second reading. The Bill is a matter of very great public importance, affecting building societies' securities, and if not read a second time to-night, it cannot be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. It is a Bill from the Senate, which has been fully discussed there. I move, with the permission of the House, that Bill (No. 122) to amend the Acts 40 Victoria, chapter 49, and 45 Victoria, chapter 24, being Acts relating to permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in Ontario, be read the second time.

Bill read the second time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:55 o'clock, p.m) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MULOCH. I move for leave to withdraw Bill (No. 52) further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. I may mention in making this motion that it is made in accordance with an understanding arrived at this morning in the Railway Committee. The Bill in question, which I had the honour to introduce, provided for a time limit in crossing

public roads. And in the discussion of the Bill in Committee this morning, upon arriving at the clause dealing with the time limit, the Minister of Railways undertook to bring in a Government measure dealing with the matter. I make this motion in accordance with that understanding.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if it is his intention to introduce a Bill dealing with that subject separately.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that we have had this subject very fully considered, and have taken a good deal of testimony before the Railway Committee. I stated there, that if the Bill were withdrawn I would submit to my colleagues a measure dealing with this subject, and some others of a good deal of importance, which were found to be inseparably connected with it, and as to which it is thought desirable to amend the Consolidated Railway Act. I expect to be able to submit this Bill at an early day for the consideration of the House, and I think it will cover the Bill which my hon. friend introduced, in such a way as fairly to meet his views.

Motion agreed to.

EASTERN EXTENSION—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the Resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole respecting the Eastern Extension Railway be read the second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 125) for giving effect to an agreement therein mentioned between the Dominion Government and the Government of Nova Scotia.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself in Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

20. Stationery Office, for stationery.. ..... $10,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I perceive that the amount is increased from $7,000 to $10,000. What is the reason for the increase?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is owing to the increased amount of stationery imported for the use of the different Departments throughout the Dominion; and I think it is expected to cover any loss that may arise in connection with the importations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you expect this to be a permanent increase, or for this year only?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount usually voted is not required; but owing to the increased importations, the Department suggested that the vote should be increased this year to make the matter safe. It is only for this year and I doubt if it will be required for this year.

21. To meet the possible amount required for new appointments by an extension of the staff or by any other change..... $5,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is the usual vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is only for the ordinary staff I suppose.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The ordinary staff.

22. Amount required to provide for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, and to provide £100 for the salary of the Secretary hitherto charged to unforeseen expenses $4,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see the hon. High Commissioner in his place, but it would be a convenient time to let us know whether we are to lose him or to have him. The hon. First Minister was good enough to say that he could keep the office as long as he liked. Perhaps he will now be in a position to tell us how long he will be likely to keep it, especially as we are asked to vote a little more money for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The High Commissionership is to be a permanent office, and I think that when the hon. gentleman is on this side he will have a High Commissioner in England too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us how soon that event will happen also.

Mr. BLAKE. Originally house rent, fuel and taxes were paid directly by the Government, but subsequently an arrangement was arranged by an Order in Council giving a lump sum of $3,500, in lieu of house rent, fuel and taxes, and since that time we have paid practically the whole amount of $4,000 in a lump sum. Is it intended this amount shall cover those expenses?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The vote is to cover the same services as formerly, and there is no arrangement with reference to any of these services being paid out of any other vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This covers rent, fuel, and light and secretary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has nothing to do with the item of contingencies for offices at all?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. At the time the office was created the right hon. gentleman told us how important it was that this officer should reside permanently in England, and how greatly inconvenienced the public service would be by not having a permanent officer there. But for several months the High Commissioner has been on this side of the Atlantic, so that the hon. gentleman must have modified the opinion he expressed so strongly to the House two or three years ago. Will the hon. gentleman tell us now whether he has come to the conclusion that it is not so necessary the High Commissioner should reside permanently in England?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The High Commissioner's place of residence and duties must be in England and are in England, but he is not like a barnacle fastened to a rock; he may occasionally come across in order to communicate with the Government, but his permanent residence is in England.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he a barnacle fastened to the office?

Mr. MILLS. Or to the Government?

23. Post Office and Finance Departments—Contingencies—Amount required to make payment to those officers of the Savings Bank Branch, Post Office and Finance Departments, engaged in balancing and computing interest in Depositors' Accounts to 30th June, 1884:—
Post Office Department.....$1,350 00
Finance 1,000 00
$ 2,350 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister of Finance answer now the question I put a few evenings

ago as to the proportion of expenditure charged to his own Department of Finance which properly belongs to the Savings Bank ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have asked for a memorandum which is being prepared, and which I will give the hon. gentleman before Concurrence.

24.	Amount required for salaries of Board of Examiners and other expenses in connection with the Civil Service Act	$4,750 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the expenditure has risen from $2,500 to nearly $5,000. What is the cause of the increase?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We will be obliged to add $500 or $600 to the amount already asked. Year after year more expenditure is necessarily incurred, on account of examinations being asked in different parts of the Dominion. The number of examiners for the work, and the expenditure, are, I think, very limited, when we consider that for the last examinations over 15,000 different papers had to be examined. There are only three Commissioners, one of whom is secretary and who is certainly doing a work almost impossible for a human being to perform. From every part of the Dominion people are corresponding with us, and we will probably have to ask an additional grant for this branch of the service. If we compare the expenditure with that of similar Departments in other countries, in the States, for instance, we will find that we are doing the work at a very limited outlay, and that for the good working of this Board more expenditure is required. The addition, probably, of a clerk will have to be made, for whom a salary of $500 or $600 will be asked, and this will be in addition to the amount now required.

Mr. MILLS. I would like very much to have from the Secretary of State information as to the number of persons who have been appointed since this Act has come into operation, and who have passed the required examinations; also the number of persons who have been appointed since then without having been required to undergo the examination called for by the Act. It is important we should know whether there is really foundation for the rumours that have gone abroad through the local press, that a very considerable number of persons have been appointed without examination, on the ground of their special qualifications. I do not think that such appointments are in keeping with the spirit of the Act or the intention of the Legislature. It is clear that the elementary examination required is such that no one fit for the service ought to be unable to pass it; and unless in the case of persons holding positions for a long series of years, it seems to me that however special the qualifications may be that are required, and however well fitted the particular party may be, this much, at least, is necessary, that he should be able to pass the examination required by the Act. It will be satisfactory to the public to know that this Act has been fairly and fully carried into operation, and that under the pretext of possessing special qualifications, a large number of persons have not been appointed to office without being required to undergo examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very thankful to my hon. friend for the question he is putting and the explanation he is asking, as it affords me the pleasure of stating that I think the Civil Service regulations and the different clauses of the Act have been put into practice by the Government, as far as I know, with the utmost severity, and in a great number of cases I think really with too great severity. The law has been complied with in every point. As the hon. gentleman has referred to rumours, and I have seen some questions put, one of which is still on the Orders of the Day, if it was intended to refer to my own Department, I may state that no appointment has been otherwise made, though some applications were made by parties, but refused by the Treasury Board and by the Government as not being in compliance with the requirements of the Statute regulating the Civil Service. There is only one instance in the Department of the Secretary of State where a special officer has been appointed, and the establishment of that office is not due to this Government, but to the preceding Government. It was the office of the Keeper of the Records, of the Archives of the Dominion. Everyone knows that the Department of the Secretary of State is the Department in which all State papers should be preserved, and that, during the time of the administration of our predecessors in office, and at the demand, I think, of one of the members of that Government, a large number of the most valuable papers were transferred from the vaults of the Court House in Montreal, where they were kept perishing, to Ottawa and placed in the rooms of the Department of the Secretary of State. I would refer my hon. friend very modestly to the small report of the Secretary of State this year in which there is a special mention of the subject of which I am now speaking. The officer who was first specially appointed to fill the office which was then created was Mr. Henry J. Morgan, a gentleman who was well qualified for that work, which is not at all ordinary office work. It consists of selecting and perusing old documents and classifying them in a certain order, which requires knowledge of the history of the country which an ordinary officer is not supposed to have. That officer was appointed specially to that office. In the course of last year, that gentleman was appointed to the chief clerkship of the correspondence branch of the Department, the vacancy being caused by the transfer of the Under Secretary of State to the Senate and the appointment of the chief clerk of the correspondence branch to the Under Secretaryship. Mr. Morgan was then transferred from the office of Keeper of the Records, and a special officer was appointed there. Still I may say that the officer who succeeded him might be called a Civil Service employé, because he had been for several years in the employment of this House. Beside that—and that was a necessity, we had to do it—there has not been a single appointment made to my knowledge in my Department, or that I know of in any other Department, and I know that the requirements of the Civil Service Act have been very strictly and rigorously carried out. This I am very glad to put before the House, because, if I were to put before the House the correspondence and the reproaches, and the blame about the severity, the utmost severity I may say, which the Department has shown in that respect, it would perhaps not edify the hon. gentleman in reference to the good will, or the too great good will, which is perhaps supposed to be in theS ecretary of State. In the office of the Civil Service Board no new appointment has been made. The three Commissioners who were appointed are the only Commissioners, and we may ask this year, perhaps, to give them a secretary, but there has been no other officer. They have had assistance, when it was required, among themselves, but no other officer has been appointed.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think the Secretary of State has altogether apprehended my enquiry. His statement, of course, is satisfactory as far as it goes, but what I asked the hon. gentleman was as to the number of persons who had been appointed to offices since this Act has come into operation, and how many of those parties have been appointed to the offices they now hold, since the Act has come into operation, without passing the examination required by the Act? I think it would be very satisfactory if that information could be given, for I understand, on the plea that certain parties have special qualifications, they have been appointed without undergoing the examination which the Act requires, and some, it is said, are notoriously without the qualifications which are required of persons in the public service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think I have answered the hon. gentleman. I have told him to the best of my recollection, as a member of the Government, I do not recollect any instance except the one I have mentioned, which I may say was imperative. My colleagues are here and can speak, as I cannot be supposed to be acquainted with the details of every Department, but I speak to the best of my recollection, and I am sure that the greatest severity has been shown in all the Departments.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, I may say that there have been no appointments made except under the terms of the Act, without passing in the first place a probationary examination and afterwards a qualifying examination, with the exception that is stated in the Act, of those officers who were temporarily employed before and proved valuable officers, and were actually in the service, some of them for years. They were excluded by the express terms of the Act, and some of them have, under the terms of the Act, been made permanent; but, with that exception, I am not aware, as far as my recollection goes, and I have a general knowledge of what is done, that there have been any appointments made.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman give us before Concurrence the number of persons and the names of the offices to which they were appointed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was going to ask the hon. the Secretary of State what the Government do now, where they have a large number of qualified parties. Are they introducing to any appreciable extent the competitive system? I observe that some of these candidates are examined in optional subjects, and, when they are appointed, after having passed in these optional subjects, they get $50 a year additional. That affords a means, I dare say a very tolerable means, of practically enforcing some sort of competition, and obtaining in a moderate degree the benefits of a competitive examination, but I want to know from the Secretary of State what the practice is. I have observed that a large number of people pass these examinations. Are they classified, is a record kept of the number of marks they respectively receive, and are the appointments made with any reference to the number of marks they receive, and to whether they pass in these optional subjects or not? Of course, that is to a large extent a question of policy, but I should like to know what has been done.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A record is made and kept very carefully not only of the number of points the candidates have gained, but also the optional subjects upon which they have succeeded. Those might be required in some branch of some Departments, and not in others, and it is, of course, for the different Ministers or the chiefs of Departments to recommend the appointment of those whose names they see there. More than that, even after the examination, the examiners give remarks and notes of what is the peculiar fitness of anyone examined, so that the Minister might choose those who might be more fitted for one branch of a Department or another. As to the appointments being strictly made in accordance with that, I am sure that, as far as it conduces to the efficiency of the service, as much as possible they are.

Mr. GAULT. I can testify to the very great stringency with which the Government are appointing those clerks. In Montreal I took a young man out of a situation where he was receiving the same salary as he was to get from the Government. He passed the preliminary examination, and, because he was not capable of passing the qualifying examination, he has received instructions that he will not be required any further. I think the the case is one of great hardship. He left a good situation indeed to take a situation in the Montreal Post Office, and now he has been informed that his services were no longer required. It seems to me that in this particular case the Government have been more than stringent in the application of the test.

Mr. BEATY. I would like to call the attention of the Government to matters pertaining to the promotion examinations. It has been largely said throughout the country in connection with the different offices, that the promotion examinations should not be required from those officers who were appointed before the late Act came into force. They think it a great hardship that they should be subjected to them, though they may be entitled to promotion on every other ground, having become acquainted with the work of their offices, and been engaged for five, ten or fifteen years. It has been represented very strongly from my own city, and from various other places, that this is a hardship, and seems to me unreasonable that persons who have been in the service, who have become adapted to their work, and against whom there is no complaint whatever, cannot obtain promotion unless they have passed a school boy's examination, to which, perhaps, they are in no sense adapted. I trust that the Government will give this matter the attention it deserves. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Government to it, and I trust that particular clause in the Act which requires examination for promotion, may be modified so as to meet the demands of the different officers all over the Province of Ontario, at all events.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The point mentioned by the hon. gentleman has already been brought to the attention of the Government, and it will be provided for in the amendments which it was announced the other day were to be introduced in the Civil Service Act. Those amendments will provide for the promotion due to officers who have been long in the service, and whose promotion before the Act was passed was left with the Deputy Minister. It is proposed hereafter that such officers shall not be subjected to an examination that might better apply to literary bachelors than to employés in the Departments.

Mr. HESSON. I am very glad to hear the remarks of the Secretary of State. It has been found that many valuable civil servants were unable to go for their promotion examinations. It is a positive fact that to a large extent the Civil Service is filled by young men coming from the high schools and colleges of the country instead of by experienced men who have been employed in the Department, and who were qualified for the work. It is quite possible that the duties in many of the offices may be better discharged by some gentlemen of long experience in the Departments than by young men who may have a first-class education and possess higher educational qualifications. I am glad that the Government propose making arrangement by which those who have been long in the service may receive the promotion to which the experience and service entitled them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said. But there are two sides to the question. There is always a danger in our Civil Service of men getting promoted without special merit by mere length of service; but I presume it was the intention of the Government to put a stop to that to some extent, and to see that no man got promotion, as a matter of course, unless he was reasonably qualified for it. At the same time I am bound to say that there are many qualities, and many important ones, which no examination will test; and I would be sorry enough to see a competitive system introduced in the higher grades of the service for the reason that I know, as everybody else does who has had any experieece in these matters, that many of the qualities

which are the most important in public servants are precisely the ones which no competitive examination will touch. Still, I think the Government ought to be chary about abolishing qualifying examinations which are totally different from competitive examinations; and I hope the Secretary of State and the Ministers generally, will be firm upon that point and see that no man is promoted, as of course, from one class to another without passing a reasonable qualifying examination. I would like to know from the First Minister, as this is a question of policy, whether he sees his way at all to introduce competitive examinations in the first rank. I admit that after the first appointment competitive examinations ceases to a great extent to be a good test, but I still think that competitive examination, particularly if a number of people are applying, as I see they are, would be a great safeguard, both to the public service and perhaps to the gentlemen themselves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After the best consideration I have been able to give to the matter, I think it would be very difficult to have a qualifying examination which would satisfy the heads of the Departments. We have found that, in fact, a competitive examination, which allowed the highest number of marks to give a priority or right to the appointment, would result in denuding the common schools of all their schoolmasters. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I can assure him that there is a rush of schoolmasters for appointment in the service, and they, of course, are able to do the most abstruse problems in arithmetic and geometry, qualifications which may be very valuable in a teacher, but which are not, perhaps, so obviously useful in a clerk in an office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would not the age test pretty effectually exclude these?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; there are a great number of them under 35.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Civil Service Act allow them to be examined up to that age?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, up to 35 If you look over the list of those who have got marks in book-keeping and arithmetic, a majority of them are school-masters, and many of them are farmers' sons who have passed the qualifying examinations. A man may have half-a-dozen sons, and he wants to see one of them in the public service. If a civil servant has good physical health, sufficient education, and has passed the qualifying examination, he thinks he should not be cut out by the man who taught him arithmetic. I do not think it would be right. Some of these special qualifications, of course, at once give a claim to consideration. I know both that in the Department of the Interior when I was at the head of it, and in the Indian Department, we have found it necessary especially to look out for good accountants. A good accountant is very difficult to get, and we take great care on that point in selecting from those who have passed examinations in book-keeping and arithmetic. We have taken great care about that matter. With that qualifying examination we should be slow in introducing competitive examinations into the service. Of course the moment parties are placed on the list as qualified to hold office, the Minister at the head of the Department makes his own selection, and I dare say hon. gentlemen opposite would not object to the practice that there should be a kindly feeling of preference giving to sons of political supporters—I think whether it were considered objectionable or not it would be practiced by any Administration.

Mr. MILLS. The Committee understands from the First Minister that the system of competitive examinations is one which the Government have declined to adopt and that they are satisfied with the qualifying examination. It seems to me that the qualifying examination has in many instances been very greatly qualified. I think I can give names of parties in the service who have failed to pass the examination, and with respect to whom the First Minister would find it difficult to say they were specially qualified.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should like to hear them.

Mr. MILLS. It is perfectly obvious from the statement of the First Minister, that the system of political appointments is to be kept alive; that the Government are resolved to appoint their friends, and that the most the qualifying examination does is to protect them against persons notoriously unfit for the public service being thrown into it. We know that in England one of the principal objects aimed at by the system of examination is that the special fitness of the parties offering themselves as candidates shall determine whether they shall or shall not enter the public service. If they show themselves eminently well qualified then they are appointed, and their political preference is a matter which is never taken into consideration. We know now from the statement of the First Minister that the English rule at all events is not to be the rule here, and that the appointments are as much political to-day as they have ever been. What is the result of this particular system? It is that when parties cannot undergo examination, or are not inclined to undergo them, other grounds for the appointment will be sought. I might ask the Minister of Militia, whether Colonel Bacon or Mr. Donaldson, the latter of whom was not in the public service at the time, the Civil Service Act was adopted, passed the examination before they entered the service? I might ask the first Minister whether the son of Mr. Boultbee, who I understand is in one of the Departments, has undergone the examination, or whether he is specially qualified for the post which he occupies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure the son of Mr. Boultbee passed the examination, or he is not in the Civil Service.

Mr. MILLS. I think he is in one of the Departments. How far do Ministers supervise the examinations? While the Government may determine generally what the character of the examination should be, beyond that the examination should never be interfered with by the Administration. If there is any class of men in this country who ought to have nothing to do with the examinations, or interfere in any way with them, it is that of the Ministers of the Crown. The Board of Examiners should be wholly independent and distinct from the Government, and the examinations ought to be conducted in such a way that the public will feel that everyone examined has been fairly dealt with, that there has been no favouritism, and that the standing of each one is fairly indicated by the answers given to the questions and the conclusions arrived at by the examiners. This is a matter of very great importance, and I repeat it is specially important that the examiners should be wholly free and independent of any interference on the part of Ministers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Ministers have nothing to do with the examinations. The examiners, moreover, are perfectly independent. If there has been any interference by the Government it has been only on one or two occasions after the examinations have taken place, when complaint was made that something was done decidedly out of what was intended to be done under the rules. For instance, in one examination for promotion special questions of arithmetic were considered to be of such a complicated character that the number of points was reduced slightly by the examiners themselves. So far as the examinations are concerned, the Ministers have nothing to do with them up to

the moment they have to select from the list of successful candidates persons to fill appointments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not gainsay the truth of what the First Minister has said—which I did not before understand—that the examinations for the first grades of the service allow men to enter up to 35 years of age. I thought the law fixed a younger age, and at all events, it would be a great improvement if such were done. In England, a candidate could not pass an entrance examination for the Civil Service if he was over twenty-four, unless he happened to be one of those persons brought in, as we bring them in, as possessing special qualifications. It is not desirable to encourage men of anything like the age the First Minister stated to become candidates for third-class clerkships at from $400 to $500 a year. But that particular evil could easily be remedied by making a different age limit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a matter for legislation.

Mr. CARON. The cases of Col. Bacon and Mr. Donaldson, to which the hon. member for Bothwell referred, come under the exceptional cases provided for by the Civil Service Act. Col. Bacon has been placed in charge of all the documents and title deeds relating to ordnance lands, succeeding Col. Walkem, who recently died, Col. Bacon's appointment being made owing to his knowledge of engineering and his ability as a draughtsman. Mr. Donaldson was transferred from "B" Battery at Kingston, where he was almost indispensable, to Ottawa, owing to his special knowledge of stores belonging to the artillery branch of the service, and this knowledge could only be attained by a service extending over a number of years in the British army. No qualifying examination or examination provided by the Civil Service Act would in any way qualify either of those gentlemen for the positions they now hold in the Militia Department.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose in that case that if either of these gentlemen die this particular branch of the public service will need to be abolished, because no person will be found capable of filling the place.

Mr. CARON. We would follow the same system as we did when Mr. Walkem died. If Col. Bacon dies I suppose we will find another gentleman in the service, as we did in his case, who would be transferred from one branch to the other.

Mr. BERGIN. It seems to me that this kind of criticism is very unfair, and that hon. gentlemen should know what they are talking about before attacking the Minister. Col. Bacon is one of the oldest officers in the Department, or in the militia service. He has been a Brigade Major for many years, and when he was at Montreal he came from the Grand Trunk to the militia service, and was one of the best engineers in the service of the company who left the Grand Trunk. He has very special qualifications for the office for which he was appointed; and I am only sorry that the Minister has not seen his way to appointing him to a still higher place in the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Secretary of State how he proposes to distribute this sum of $4,750. I see that in last year's account the Civil Service Board are only down for $500. This, of course, indicates a much more extensive system, and I would like to know who are the gentlemen appointed, and what sums they receive.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The amount voted last year by the House has been found inadequate to the work. The sum of $5 per day for sixty days was what was voted by the House. It was perhaps found that what was given before was too much, and in the hurry of legislation last year the amount voted was too little, as the number of examinations, and their length, is not entirely at the discretion of the examiners, but depends largely upon the number of applications, and consequently the number of places where examinations have to be held. Under the legislation which will be proposed we will ask that $3 a day be given to the chief examiners, and $5 a day—which was the old allowance—to the sub-examiners. This will add a certain sum to the amount voted last year. We have done the best to limit the amount expended as much as possible, as will be found by the report of the examiners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the report brought down?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, within fifteen days of the beginning of the Session as required by Statute. The other day I was comparing the cost of the Civil Service Board and staff in the United States with that of Canada, and taking the population into account I found that the comparison appears very advantageous to the Dominion—in fact that it is here about 50 per cent. less, taking population into account, than what is spent there for the same purpose. Of course as we go on perfecting the system new expenditures will necessarily be required; but I can assure hon. gentlemen that not a penny more than is required for the work has been asked.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Are these examinations partly *viva voce*, or wholly by papers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Wholly by papers.

Mr. MILLS. Might I ask the Secretary of State if all who choose are at liberty to come before the Board for the purpose of being examined, or if they require to be recommended by some Minister?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I find that the hon. gentleman has not read the Statute and so I will explain it to him. Notice is given in due time of the examinations, and applications are made to the Board by candidates from all parts of the Dominion. The examinations are held at different places, according to the number of applications from each place; that is to say, if there were only two applicants, or a very small number, in a particular place, no examination would be held there. The examination papers are sent to the different places where the examinations are to be held, such as Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Ottawa, London, Hamilton, Winnipeg, Victoria, &c. Three of the examiners each take one of the largest places, and they appoint sub-examiners. The sub-examiners distribute the papers to the candidates, and as the answers are given in writing, and as they have all to be re-examined here by the examiners, the hon. gentleman can see the amount of work which is to be done. So far as the examinations for promotion are concerned, they are held in the Department when vacancies occur; the parties make application and they are examined for promotion, and I may say that these examinations are of the character of competitive examinations for the Department. That is to say, every employé below the class where the vacancy occurs is allowed to compete and go for the promotion examination. That examination is more or less superintended, not by the Minister or the Deputy Minister, but according to the fitness of the candidate for the class of work required, by the sub-chief of the Department.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has scarcely hit the point he aimed at by the question; or else the Secretary of State has turned the shot aside. By this I do not mean to imply that my hon. friend's question was not properly put, or not well put; but the real evil at which the hon. gentleman wished to get by that question is further on, and deeper down than the working of this Act. I understand quite well, and probably he did, that no recommendation is required for entrance into these

examinations, but the great point remains, one of which we have always complained, that a recommendation is required for the appointment. The most successful of those who may be examined has not the slightest claim whatever for an appointment. The man who comes out at the head has no more claim than the man who comes out at the foot. I fear also that the Secretary of State is under a misapprehension when he states that the promotion examinations are competitive.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say they are in a certain manner, so far as the Dpartment is concerned.

Mr. CASEY. Which Department?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Any Department in which the vacancy occurs.

Mr. CASEY. The Statute does not provide that the examination should be competitive in any Department at all. It provides that a man shall not be promoted unless he passes the examination, but it does not provide that the man who comes out ahead shall be promoted, though there are certain Departments in which that practice was carried on long before the passing of this Act. In the Inland Revenue Department the practice of promoting officers for efficiency, proven by examination, was carried on for years, before the passing of this Act, and was shown to have most beneficial results. I was Chairman of a Committee which enquired into the working of the service here in 1877, and which had the most convincing testimony from the officials of the Inland Revenue Department to show that this was a good plan, and that when a vacancy occurred in the higher ranks of that Department they were able to ascertain by means of an examination alone, without taking any other consideration into account, who was the best man for that place. That was the testimony of Mr. Brunel, then the head of that Department, and Mr. Miall, his assistant, and all others concerned in the working of the Department. What I complain of, as one who has always advocated Civil Service reform in this country, is that this system has not been applied to other Departments—that the promotions have not been made by competition. The Act provides that a man must pass a qualifying examination on entrance; yet his promotion must depend upon the good will of his superior.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not at all. If the hon. gentleman knows the Act, he knows that it provides for a promotion examination.

Mr. CASEY. I think I know as much about that Act as the hon. Secretary of State, perhaps more. I was here when it passed, before the hon. gentleman was in this House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman knows much, he has forgotten a great deal of it.

Mr. CASEY. I have not forgotten that, at any rate. I do not know but the hon. Secretary of State may have instituted the plan of promotion by competition in his own department, but I know that the Act, as passed, does not require it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no competition provided for in the Act at all.

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. Secretary of State will accept this rebuke from his leader if he did not from me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman should know that there is a promotion examination provided for in the Act, but not a competitive one.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will show the hon. gentleman in a moment that he has forgotten a great deal, if he ever knew much.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister is very new in his place, very new to the legislation which he has to carry out, and much more apt than his older colleagues to take a high and lofty tone in the House. In this respect I could not recommend a better model for him than his colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is always master of the details of his Department, always courteous to this side of the House, and always prompt in supplying information. The hon. Secretary of State will do well to follow in the footsteps of his older colleague in these respects. In this particular instance he has maintained that there is competition for promotion under this Act. He would not take my statement as to what was in the Act. He has now to take the statement of his leader, that there is no competition provided in the Act at all.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As a matter of fact, this is misrepresentation. It is a wrong statement.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend the Secretary of State, it appears, now accuses the hon. Premier of misrepresentation. He says his statement is a wrong statement. Well, I think the right hon. Premier and myself will be found to be right against all comers in regard to the interpretation of this Act. I understand that the case of Col. Bacon was brought up as an instance of the point in question. I do not know whether there was any objection or not to Col. Bacon on the ground of fitness. The objection was taken to the mode of appointment, he having been placed over the heads of others who were entitled to promotion. Such cases as this are constantly occurring. Even this Act, which was intended to provide that the higher places should be filled by promotion, is constantly disregarded, and men are taken from other Departments to occupy positions over the heads of those who ought to be promoted. That is what I complain of, and it is only in exceptional and special cases that men should be brought in from other Departments. I do not profess to say anything about Col. Bacon's fitness for this particular post, but I insist that it would have been quite right and possible, first to ascertain by competitive examination amongst the officials in that Department whether one of those occupying a lower place there was not fit to fill this position. Until that was done and the incapacity of those in the Department demonstrated, an outsider should not have been appointed. It has been found in England, where they have had real Civil Service reform, carried out by a truly independent commission in a truly independent manner for a quarter of a century, that there is no difficulty of testing men's fitness even for positions requiring special knowledge by competitive examinations. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia tells us that this is a position the qualifications of which could not be decided by an ordinary Civil Service examination. I think that it is quite likely, and it is a very good reason for not trusting to the ordinary examination. But we have a Board of Examiners, and a Minister at the head of that Department, competent to advise together and to form a special set of questions to test a man's fitness for this particular office. That is what is done in England. A special examination is held, special papers are prepared, and the appointment depends upon the success of a candidate at that examination. There is another case, in regard to which I put a question to the hon. Secretary of State the other day, on which occasion, however, he refused to be catechised about it; that is in regard to the appointment of one Audet in his Department, who, I am informed by himself, is one of the chief clerks in a sub-department of his Department. I do not profess to know many particulars about this man Audet, and that is why I am asking for information. I understand, however, that he was appointed to this position after having been in the service of the House of Commons as a translator, and that he was appointed to a place over the heads of all the other clerks in the sub-Department; and he should have been appointed under the Act by an Order in Council, stating his special qualifications. He may have been examined; I do not know whether he was or

not. As I understand the Statute, it provides that when a man is appointed over the heads of others, it should be on the ground of some special fitness, and that ground should be stated in the Order in Council, as is done in England. I hope, for the credit of the Government, the same course has been followed in the case of the special appointments they have been making, and in the case of this Mr. Audet among others. As my motion asking for information is so far down upon the paper, that it is not likely to be reached this Session, I hope my hon. friend the Secretary of State, will waive ceremony and tell me now for what special qualifications Mr. Audet was appointed to a position so much above the positions of others possessing much greater experience in that Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman fulfilled his duties to the electors sufficiently to be in his seat at the proper time, he might save the time of this House in asking Ministers to repeat what they have said before. But if the hon. gentleman wishes to remain outside of the House, he may look to-morrow in the *Hansard* for what I have said already to the House, and what I will not repeat. The hon. gentleman said I was new in the House that I did not know much about my position, and that I was taking too high a tone. I do not generally take too high a tone nor too a low tone. I do not think that I have been accused, as somebody in this House might be, of trying too much the patience of the House. The hon. gentleman says I did not know much about my business, being new; but I do know something about it and I am not new in office though I am new in this Government. I generally know what I hit; I do not take a cow for a crow. I am not new in office; I have seen something of a House of Assembly before; I have seen before members in the House talk without knowing at all what they were talking about; I have seen hon. members telling Ministers that they had stated a certain thing when they had not said it, and men who, on being corrected, would not stand corrected but say a certain thing was so when it was not so. I am not new enough not to know those things, and I will tell the hon. gentleman one or two things which he does not know, for if he has been on a Committee concerning the pubic service and learned something then, he has since forgotten a great deal. He did not know, or if he knew, he has forgotten, that a competitive system for entrance to the public service does not exist; but that it exists in a certain manner in the case of promotions. I have said that a competitive system would not work well for entrance to the service, and that a qualifying examination has been found the best system. With regard to promotions, they are not made only on the recommendations of Ministers. There is not a Minister, from the first to the last, the one who is now addressing you, who can make the slightest promotion without having an examination for promotion. Promotion is not made on the recommendation of the Minister alone. It cannot be made except after a promotion examination to which all the officers of the Department holding positions below the one vacant are eligible; all the other employés in the Department, or those in another Department may be chosen from to fill the office. I need not repeat what I have already said about Mr. Audet in the Department of the Secretary of State. My answer has been given and the hon. gentleman can refer to it.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman, in that short skirmish which he had with my hon. colleague the Secretary of State, has thought fit to recur again to the appointment of Col. Bacon, and he has shown, in referring to that appointment, the same lack of knowledge about the Civil Service which the hon. Secretary of State has just proved he possesses. If the hon. member for West Elgin will refer to the Statute of last Session he will see that in a certain given circumstance, it is not only possible but necessary that certain appointments should be made without complying with the examination. If the hon. gentleman will refer to clause 34, section 2, he will see that "when the Deputy Head of a Department in which a vacancy occurs, requires that, for reasons set forth, the qualifications requisite are wholly or in part professional or technical." At any time, I am willing to answer any question put me in reference to my Department, but I think it is taking up uselessly the time of the House in repeating several times what had been already said. I stated to the hon. gentleman, and I say so again, that Col. Bacon was selected, not placed over the head of anyone else in the Department, because in the Department of Militia there was no person who had the qualifications required to fill the position left vacant by the death of Mr. Walkem. He was selected from the outside service; he belonged to the military staff, as brigade major, a position which he filled in a most efficient manner during a number of years, and in the interest of the service he was placed in the position left vacant by the death of Mr. Walkem, being an architect and an engineer possessing all the special qualifications required in the position he now holds. In consequence of these special qualifications he was exempted from the examinations required in ordinary cases.

Mr. CASEY. I repeat that I did not intend to impugn the fitness of Col. Bacon for this office; what I objected to was merely his appointment without examination over the heads of others. The hon. Secretary of State has not taken my criticism as calmly as his military friend, the Minister of War, who is much more peaceable than the Minister of State. The latter, although he has not been very long in the House, has evidently been posting himself in the current humour of the House, but I am afraid that the humour, although it may be fresh to him, is not so very fresh to the rest of us. He referred to an unfortunate incident which occurred in my past shooting experience and to all the shame of which I confess, but I was under the impression that I had killed the cow in question; now, however, I find that I am mistaken, for she comes up smiling every Session, and the last person to resurrect that famous quadruped is my hon. friend the Secretary of State, whom the story has apparently struck with all the force of novelty. On that occasion, I was supposed to have fired at a crow and hit a cow by mistake; but on this occasion it is evident, by the agitated manner of my hon. friend, that my aim has been true, and that he, at all events, has been hit very badly. In regard to the questions put, he tells me that they were answered before I came in. I have to confess that I was unavoidably detained, but I must ask him whether he explained the case of Audet?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did.

Mr. CASEY. Then I will have to wait for *Hansard* and be content with the answer I find there.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend has put a notice on the paper. He will have his answer then also.

Mr. CASEY. We will not reach that motion this Session, and if the explanation is not given now it will not be given at all. It is well known that this is the time to give such explanations, and the hon. gentleman's colleagues, at all events, have never hesitated to give them when required. If not satisfied with the answer in *Hansard* I will again refer to this matter, but I will not take up any more time with it now. In regard to the question of competition, I am afraid the hon. Minister and I are misunderstanding each other as to the meaning we attach to the word "competition." I mean that there is no competition in the way in which it is understood in the English Civil Service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said there was no such competition here.

Mr. CASEY. Then the Minister and I are at one. That is what I mean by no competition. I mean by competition, that a man who comes out ahead gets the highest place, or, if there is only one place, he gets it. That is the meaning of competition in the English sense, and to call anything else competition is apt to mislead the public. To say that, because all the clerks of lower grades are called up to be examined, in order to select one of them for a higher grade, that is competition, is a misnomer. The hon. Minister's understanding of the Act is the same as mine after all, that among those shown to be qualified in this examination, the Government can select the one they wish to promote. That is the understanding of the Act I have always had. It is perhaps not the time now to go into the abstract question of whether we should or should not have competition for admission into the service, but the Minister has shown that there are reasons for introducing competition in regard to promotion which do not exist in the case of competition for first appointments. He can see from the experience of years in the Inland Revenue here, and the experience of a quarter of a century in England, that competition has a good effect, and I hope he will commence by introducing it tentatively in his own Department and then recommending its extension. There is no reason why a man's fitness for promotion should not be tested by an examination, except so far as his general character, and fitness to rule others, and assiduity, and industry may interfere with his efficiency.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

25.

Miscellaneous Justice, including the North-West Territories	$15,000 00
Travelling expenses of Stipendiary Magistrates in the North-West Territories	3,000 00
Circuit allowances, British Columbia	6,000 00
Travelling allowances, Supreme and County Court Judges, Manitoba	2,500 00
Precis Writer of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court	2,000 00
Clerk in the office of the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court	850 00
Second Clerk in the office of the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court	650 00
Senior Messenger of the Superior Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court	500 00
Second Messenger of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court	450 00
Third Messenger of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court	310 00
Contingencies and disbursements, Judges' travelling expenses; also salaries of officers (Sheriff, Registrar as Editor Usher, &c.), in the Supreme and Exchequer Courts of Canada, and $150 for books for Judges	5,000 00
Printing, binding, and distributing the Supreme Court Reports	2,000 00
Sundry disbursements connected with the Maritime Court of Ontario, Judges' travelling expenses, &c	100 00
Salary of Registrar of Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec	666 66
Salary of Marshall of Vice Admiralty Court, Quebec	333 34
For the purchase of Law Reports and Text Books for the Supreme Court Library	1,500 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give the details. Miscellaneous justice, including North-West Territories, $15,000; that is the same as last year. The Public Accounts will show how that sum was expended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that include examination of titles, and so forth, to any extent? I see quite a lot of suits were put down last year; all manner of suits and miscellaneous charges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, it includes that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it intend to include examination of titles?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should say so.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because some of the charges that I have heard of on the score of examination of titles struck me as very extraordinary ones indeed.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the examination of titles comes under miscellaneous justice. I think it comes under the department which is concerned in the construction of the buildings.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is so. It is only when the matter arises in the Department of Justice, or there is litigation. Then, travelling expenses of Stipendiary Magistrates in the North-West Territories, $3,000. There is an increase of $500. There was a vacancy last year in the Stipendiary Magistrates. One has been appointed since, and this is to aid in paying his expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many are there—three?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Three. Circuit allowances, British Columbia, $6,000, the same as last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this North-West Territories, does this cover all the territory outside of Manitoba?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The whole of the four Provinces, or whatever they are?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are not Provinces.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Districts?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Divisions. Travelling allowances, Supreme and County Court Judges, Manitoba, $2,500, the same as last year; precis writer of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court, the same; clerk in the office of the registrar, that is the statutory increase; second clerk in the office of the registrar, statutory increase; senior messenger of the Supreme Court, the same; second and third messengers, statutory increase of $30 each. Contingencies and disbursements, judges travelling expenses; also salaries of officers in the Supreme and Exchequer Courts of Canada, and $150—it should be instead of $1,500—for books for judges, $5,000. That is the same. Printing, binding and distributing the Supreme Court Reports, $2,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an entirely new item, what is the reason of it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This sum has hitherto been paid out of the $5,000. That amount was exceded in 1882-83 by $2,172, and in 1881-82 by $477. As a revenue is derived from the sale of the reports, it is thought advisable to make a specific vote for the printing, binding, and distribution of these reports, and to that extent it will relieve the vote for contingencies. In this connection, a letter has been received from Mr. Cassels, the Registrar, which I may as well read. It is addressed to the Deputy Minister:

"DEAR SIR,—Referring to my letter of yesterday's date respecting the reports, since writing it, I have found the Queen's Printer's account, showing how the receipts stood up to the date the publication was placed under my sole control, and, after making what I think will be a very close estimate of the cost of Volume VII, and ascertaining from the Queen's Printer the actual cost to the Government of printing the first six volumes, and deducting also the total amount paid to the publisher, and the various amounts paid out for postage and insurance as closely as those items can be estimated, I find that the Government, on the first seven volumes of the reports, will receive in cash about $1,000 or more over and above the amount disbursed, and have to their credit a large number of volumes, not less, I should think, than 1,500, now in stock, worth at least $3,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like a little further explanation than has hitherto been given of the system upon which

these reports are published, and now, as this is made a separate vote, seems to be a good opportunity for the new departure. Is this $2,000 the gross expense of editing, publishing and distributing the reports or is it supposed to be a net balance representing the expected stock on hand after the distribution, and after the receipt of the revenue which is obtained from the sales of the reports? The proper course, as I understand, in all these things—and I am afraid it is a course which has been departed from in this particular thing—is that the whole charge to the country of the service should be voted, and that you should get in as revenue, and put on the revenue side of your account, whatever the country receives in return for the reports sold. If, therefore, the editing of these reports, and the publishing of these reports, and the distribution of these reports costs more than $2,000, inclusive of the stock which is reserved, the surplus of the copies which are always printed for future reference, we ought to vote the whole amount of that, and on the other hand get credit on the revenue side for the receipts from it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the correct statement beyond doubt. I find that in the item concerning contingencies and disbursements, Judges' travelling expenses, also salary of the Sheriff, &c.—$5,000—the vote that has just been considered, there is an omission, and that after "Sheriff" there should be "Registrar as Editor." I understand that ever since the Court was organized and under both Governments, the Registrar has received $400 per annum as editor of each volume—that is, he is paid out of that $5,000.

Mr. BLAKE. So it is proposed to insert "for Registrar as Editor?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. Then the $2,000 is the gross amount of the expense of printing and distributing the Supreme Court reports, and all the receipts go into the Treasury.

Mr. BLAKE. So that $2,000, plus $400 a volume, will represent the total cost to the country. If there are two volumes a year it will be $2,800 a year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state his estimate of the revenue, as I am afraid that from certain circumstances it will not be so high as it has been.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will get an estimate of that.

Mr. WELDON. These reports are getting up to such a high price that very few persons are able to buy them. It is important that they should be published at as cheap a rate as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the cost I do not think it can be objected to. The cost, as I understand, is $2 a volume. That is exceedingly cheap, and will no more than pay expenses. A book of reports published in English would cost you $8, I fancy, a volume. A I understand it $2 a volume is the cost to the profession. Certainly I do not think the Government is bound to supply the tools of trade to lawyers more than they are to anybody else.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is a very important object that the Supreme Court reports should be circulated as widely as possible. The Law Society of Ontario some time ago undertook, out of its own funds, to circulate them to all of the profession in that Province. That resulted in a large edition being rendered impossible, and a large edition means a cheap price per volume. But the Law Society has been obliged to give up that, and the result will be that there will be a great diminution in the edition, and a corresponding increase in the price per volume to the public. It may be, that under the new *regime*, the circumstances having been before the authorities for a considerable time, the Government has ascertained the cost at which they expect to be able to issue that volume to the profession. That is dependent, to a considerable extent, upon the number of customers they expect to have. They know, of course, that there is no reason to expect any increase in the demand, at any rate, so far as Ontario is concerned. In Ontario I do not know whether steps are being taken to ascertain what the profession would do; but once again that depends upon the profession. The higher the price the fewer persons will take them. I agree that it is not expected that these volumes should be supplied to the profession at the public cost; but to a certain extent they are supplied at the public cost when the salary of the reporter is paid out of the public funds. But we ought to obtain from those who buy—I will not say the whole expense of printing and publishing the reports—but the expense of printing and publishing all those copies that are sold. It would not be good policy to charge the cost of the surplus copies upon the number of copies that are sold. They will ultimately bring a return and the cheaper you can issue the book the more copies you can circulate. My theory of the case would be that the sum, whatever it may be, $2,400 or $2,800—being the gross cost of printing all the copies, including the reserve copies—that we ought to deduct from that gross cost what would be the cost of getting out the copies that yearly may remain in stock and which may subsequently be sold, and make the remainder of the price, divided amongst the number of copies expected to be sold, the cost of the edition. I am afraid it will be something more than $2; because I think it was $2 to the general public; and to the law society of Ontario who took 1,000 or 1,200 volumes in bulk, a considerably smaller sum was charged. Of course, these are considerations that ought to be taken into account.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the volume should be sold to the profession at as low a price as is consistent with the public. I do not think that we are bound to furnish these books at the cost of the Government, but they should be furnished at cost price. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that to the price should not be added the whole cost of the edition, because the reserve copies are certain to be sold some time or other, and the computation should be made at what the copies likely to be sold within the year will cost, and that should regulate the price. I understand the matter is under the consideration of the Department of Justice, and that it may be found necessary to add another dollar to the cost and make it $3 instead of $2. The next item is sundry disbursements connected with the Maritime Court of Ontario —travelling expenses, $100; salary of Registrar of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Quebec, $666; salary of the Marshall, $333; for the purchase of law reports and text books for the Supreme Court of Canada, $1,600. The last named item appeared formerly under the heading of Legislation or Miscellaneous.

Mr. WELDON. With respect to Vice-Admiralty Courts, I may remark that I moved for a return of the despatches with respect to the Vice-Admiralty Courts in the Maritime Provinces. These are Imperial Courts, and a new procedure came into operation on 1st January which is much more simple than that formerly in force, and which will make the courts more valuable. In England the High Court of Admiralty has power to order a sale; our Vice-

Admiralty Courts have not that power. If the Government would call the attention of the Imperial Government to this and other important points in the Act of 1868, it might be so amended as to give our Vice-Admiralty Courts powers equal to those possessed by the High Court of Admiralty in England.

Mr. LISTER. While the hon. member for St. John has called attention to the Vice-Admiralty Courts of the Maritime Provinces, I desire to offer some observations respecting the Maritime Court of Ontario. The Statute creating that Court provided that the rules, regulations and tariff of fees should be prepared by certain officers in Ontario. A tariff of fees, &c., was prepared; but an order was afterwards issued by the late Judge Mackenzie providing that in cases of seamen's wages, where the amount claimed was under $100, only $10 should be allowed as fees. In all other claims, such as for collision, supplies, &c., provided for under the Statute, the usual tariff of fees is allowed for prosecuting the claim; but in the case of seamen's wages, affecting the class of people intended specially to be protected, only $10 is allowed for fees in cases under $100, as I have already stated. From my own experience for the last two or three years I am aware that seamen have been discharged from vessels with claims for wages, running from $10 to $30, and it was found impossible to engage a lawyer to undertake their collection on account of the low tariff of fees, the disbursements for any suit amounting to more than $10. I call the attention of the Government to the fact that, while in all maritime countries sailors, who are as a rule an improvident class, are carefully looked after by the Government, the Maritime Court of Ontario is of very little benefit to them, because it very seldom happens that a sailor has $100 in wages due him on leaving his ship. The procedure under this Act, which is at present cumbrous and costly, might be very much simplified and cheapened. In the United States they have Maritime Laws which are executed in a very simple and cheap manner; and in the interests of our seamen and others concerned, a like state of things should prevail here. I particularly call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that the Act is of no real benefit or advantage to the sailors.

Mr. BLAKE. We had a discussion on this subject two or three years ago, and I think it was the opinion of both sides of the House—it was certainly expressed very strongly on this side—that the small claims referred to should be placed on an entirely different footing from that which they at present occupy as regards procedure. They are almost identical with Division Court cases. There should be a simple summary procedure; the parties should be heard and the cases at once disposed of at trifling cost. The present procedure, which, I am told, is as simple as can be devised for cases which will bear minute investigation, might be retained for such cases, and for smaller claims a simple and inexpensive procedure might be arranged. The Act was framed so as to leave the whole business in an elastic condition. The rules and practice were made by the Judge and approved by the Governor in Council. If the Government were to call the attention of the Judge to this matter, no doubt the necessary change would be made in the disposal of simple cases.

Mr. GUILLET. In the Session of 1881 an Act was passed providing a process by which sailors are able to obtain the summary collection of their wages. They can proceed against the vessel, and wages are the first lien on the vessel and running gear. The sailors are satisfied with this measure; the Sailors' Union petitioned for it, obtained it, and are now, I say, satisfied. A sailor can go before two magistrates, or a police magistate, demand his wages, and the magistrate has authority to proceed and levy distress on the vessel if the wages are not paid. The magistrate has, moreover, power to seize the vessel for wages.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. LISTER. That is not proceeding under the Maritime Court Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must look at the Act referred to by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Guillet), which seems to provide a summary mode of procedure, where the very name of the court implies something like regularity of proceedings; though it is quite true, as the hon. member for West Durham says, that a summary process like that in Division Courts might well be provided for. I shall call the attention of the Minister of Justice to that matter so that he may communicate with the Judges of the Maritime Courts, in order to see if the necessary regulations may be made. The hon. gentleman says that the process is complicated, and that the expense is very great. Well, providing that there are magistrates in the immediate vicinity it is much more to the advantage of the sailor, who wants his money immediately, who wants the vessel to be liable, to go to a neighbouring magistrate and get a summons returnable immediately, and tried immediately, with a process of attachment or detention in some way.

Mr. LISTER. That would be all right if there was a right to detain her from the first. I do not think, however, that there is any such right.

Mr. BLAKE. One must remember that the poor sailor may be in the wrong, and that it is expedient that while there should be the utmost simplicity of practice, men trained to the law, and trained judging conflicting statements, should be, as far as possible, Judges in the case. It may be ruinous to the vessel owner to have his vessel detained, and to have it detained by two magistrates is much more dangerous than to have it detained by a Judge of the Maritime Court. I am not speaking, however, from anything which has been done with regard to magistrate's decisions, but inasmuch as there is a jurisdiction *in rem* I am only assuming that the process should be made practically effective by giving a simple and inexpensive procedure to work it out, irrespective of the Act of which the hon. gentleman speaks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with the hon. gentleman in every regard.

Mr. LISTER. In the State of Michigan there is a very simple procedure which might very readily be imitated here.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the remark of the hon. member for St. John, I may say that I suggested an application to the Imperial Government to modify the Act with a view to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Maritime Courts. Now I hope it is not disrespectful to say that they go slow over there. It has been many years since we endeavoured to obtain the change in the practice of these courts which has only lately been obtained. As long ago as 1877, when I was across the water, that subject was deemed ripe for action, but action has only been taken within the last few months, though the subject had been a grievance for at least seven years. The Government took another line, and I think rightly enough, when some years ago, either in the Speech from the Throne or otherwise, it was indicated that they were going to move in the direction of obtaining authority to create Maritime Courts for the seaboard as well as inshore, and if they should prosecute their endeavours in that respect it would be much better, as we could then enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction, and change the practice and procedure of the courts, according to the necessities of our own people. When I say that the practice in the Vice-Admiralty Courts, which prevailed up to the 1st of January, 1884, was the old, obsolete, antiquated practice, which had been in force, I think, for fifty years in England, and was abolished for some 20 or 30 years as being intolerable, I think I point out

a good reason why we should ourselves obtain, if we can, power to create these courts, and do away with the abuses, for I do not think the word is too strong, such as those which have subsisted. There was, I believe, in many cases on the seaboard, a denial of justice and the practice was so intricate and slow, and the cost so large, that the court was almost as much of an abuse—though not an abuse of the same character—as in the old days when the judge, being paid out of the fees of his office, was sometimes regarded as a public robber. For that reason I am heartily in favour of the remedy proposed by the hon. gentleman and would reinforce his efforts to get the matter under our own control.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may state that from information obtained in the Department of Justice, I find that correspondence has been going on on this question, and that an answer has been requested again and again, but they have not been able to get one up to this time. The matter is a very important one, and I agree with the hon. member for West Durham that without the regulation of our own courts, the fixing of our own process, and the regulation of our own proceedings and tariff of fees, there will be no satisfaction in connection with these courts. The country will not be satisfied with anything but courts having jurisdiction in maritime cases, Vice-Admiralty cases, in all matters brought before them—all these matters being fixed by our own legislation. The matter has been pressed and will continue to be pressed on Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know of course what line the hon. gentleman has taken in discussing the question with the Imperial authorities, but it has always seemed to me very clear that we have authority to create these courts under the British North America Act. We have control over the subject of navigation, and we have also power to establish such courts as may be required for the better administration of justice. Maritime laws are part of the laws of the country, and what is really required is that the right which has already been conferred on us by the Imperial Statute should be recognized by the Imperial authority, and that the present court should be withdrawn. It is not a power to create a court which we do not possess, that we should demand, but we should insist on the exercise of a power given to us and that the Imperial Government itself should not persist in the maintenance of an authority which Parliament, under this Imperial Act of 1867, has withdrawn from it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not sure that Her Majesty's Government would agree with the conclusions of the hon. gentleman, but the question might be decided by our passing an Act here, and making it only operative on proclamation. Then it would be submitted to Her Majesty's Government and through them to the legal authorities there. Then the question would arise whether we could have any jurisdiction beyond the three mile limit, which would be a question of some difficulty. If we establish those courts we would have right within the three mile limit and perhaps more, but that might be dubious. However, if we passed a law of that kind, and submitted it to Her Majesty's Government, they might pass an Empowering Act, enabling our courts to have jurisdiction beyond the limit, as if they were a branch of the Imperial Admiralty.

Mr. WELDON. The Admiralty gets its jurisdiction by virtue of the vessel being within the limits, and of the proceeding being taken *in rem*. No matter whether the collision takes place in the high seas or not, they get jurisdiction in that way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not if the cause of action were beyond.

Mr. WELDON. Yes, we can bring our action in the ordinary courts of the country. Practically, so far as our courts are concerned, the Judges, I understand, are within the appointment of the Dominion Government. The Vice-Admiralty Act was passed in 1863, and the High Court of Admiralty was created in 1861, and my impression is that they are acting under the previous Commission. It appears to me that if their jurisdiction were extended as I propose, there would be a great improvement in the course of justice.

Mr. MILLS. I would call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that among the things which the British North America Act places under the jurisdiction of the Dominion are militia, military service, and naval defence. Let us suppose that the hon. gentlemen should commission a ship for naval defence, and gave the officer in command certain instructions; and suppose the officer took the ship beyond the maritime league; could the hon. gentleman argue that his instructions had ceased to be operative? Suppose the hon. gentlemen were sending a ship to explore Hudson Bay, would that ship while on the high seas be beyond the jurisdiction of Canada? It appears to me that when this provision was inserted in the British North America Act, it was intended that that ancient rule in regard to the marine league should not be held to operate in the case of Canada, and that we have conferred upon us the power to enforce our rules and regulations beyond the limits of the colony.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that any good purpose can be served by entering into a discussion of the constitutional question. The hon. gentleman asks if we had a ship of war, whether or not our jurisdiction would extend beyond the marine league. I think there must be considerable doubt whether it could or not. It was found necessary to pass an Act called the Colonial Defence Act to enable certain Australian Colonies sending out ships of war to use that power when they sailed beyond their own jurisdiction. There was an Imperial Act passed to put that beyond doubt.

Mr. BLAKE. I think my hon. friend has done in this case what he has not always done, carried his views as to the marine league into actual practice, because when he did get a hostile vessel he got one which it was not safe to send beyond our jurisdiction.

Mr. WELDON. The Admiralty Courts formerly only exercised jurisdiction on the high seas; but now their jurisdiction extends to harbours and rivers. I myself have taken cases from rivers into the Vice-Admiralty Courts, and it was held that they had jurisdiction.

Mr. KAULBACH. I observe that the Vice-Admiralty Court in Quebec receives an amount of money much greater than the courts in the other Provinces—in Nova Scotia, for instance, where the court receives comparatively nothing. In Quebec there are a Judge, a Registrar and a Marshall, all receiving salaries, whilst in Nova Scotia the Registrar receives nothing except the fees he manages to collect, which are quite insufficient for the services he renders.

POLICE.

26. Dominion Police..... $15,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may take this opportunity of asking the hon. First Minister if he has any explanations to give as to the mode in which he disposed of the sum of $3,000 which was in the Public Accounts of last year. I have not been able, though I have tried two or three times, to get him before the Committee on Public Accounts, and I would like to get the information now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would rather give it before the Public Accounts Committee.

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

PENITENTIARIES.

27. Kingston Penitentiary..... .... $98,620 17

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that one part is detailed for an insane asylum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is simply for an insane ward in the asylum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe only 500 convicts are estimated for against 625 in 1883-84. Is that based on any positive information, or is it mere guess work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On account of the limited cell accommodation in St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, it was found necessary on several occasions, during the last few years, to remove a large number of convicts thence to the Kingston Penitentiary, and for this reason provision was made in the latter for 100 convicts, besides its own, a very large number having been discharged, and there being no likelihood of more transfers in consequence of the completion of two new cell wings, the Warden has based his estimate for the year ending 30th June, 1883, on the probable requirements of Ontario alone.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A good deal of attention has been drawn at various times to the somewhat defective drainage in this penitentiary. Several times the Warden and others connected with it have mentioned to me on my going through the institution, that there was considerable difficulty in this respect, that the original plans of the drains had been lost and there was difficulty in discovering where they all were. Another defect, but one which cannot be altered, is the smallness of the cells which makes it more difficult to ventilate them than could be desired.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has not been any complaint lately about the drainage, as we have made some improvements in that direction. I do not think there is any great complaint just now or the complaints would have been laid before me. Of course, the cells are built, and they must remain. Any improvement in ventilation would require a special vote, but my attention has not been brought to that lately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the First Minister know anything about that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I have not heard; there have been no complaints made by the inspector or by the warden as to drainage to the Department; but, with reference to the old cells especially, those are far too narrow, and one could not help observing, although the place is scrupulously clean, that there was a little prison smell in the older portion of the building. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works tells me it is now in contemplation to break down the walls of the older cells and join two into one. I dare say the hon. gentleman is right in his supposition that the original plans of the drainage have been lost. That is possibly the case. Some years ago, once or twice, there was something like incipient typhoid, but of late years that has not appeared, possibly in consequence of an improvement in the drainage; at all events, there have been no complaints which have reached the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the Minister of Public Works thinks he can improve the cells by knocking two into one?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I am aware the thing is a difficult one to remedy, but, living in Kingston, I have occasion sometimes to go over that institution, and I have noticed that some of those cells are not fit to keep people in for fourteen hours together, as they must be often kept. I think in 1882 we had some discussion over this subject, and I think the Minister of Public Works or somebody suggested then shafts in these drains to ventilate them better. The Minister of Public Works has, no doubt, been over the penitentiary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is what may be called a large rotunda round which the cells are built, and of course it is doubly necessary in a building constructed in that fashion to see that there is some shaft or other that will completely ventilate it. I do no know if that has been brought to his attention, but I would take this opportunity of doing so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Traps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would require more. In England they erect a sort of chimney and turn hot air into it in some way. Sometimes they go so far as to keep a fire. That keeps a steady up-draught from the drain, and where a number of human beings are crowded together, something of that kind is very necessary. It may perhaps be difficult to apply that system in this country. I am not prepared to say how that is, but where it can possibly be done, it is a very effective mode, as I think all medical men will concur with me in stating. Do I understand that these 500 convicts are likely to be the normal number for Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, with an increase of population, there will be an increase of convicts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, and that varies also according to whether we have good or bad times.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, a good deal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there is a considerable reduction in working expenses, no doubt due to the reduction in the number of convicts. What is that account used for at present? Is that the expense of working the farm?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the quarry, I suppose? What does that $16,629 represent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The cause of the reduction is on account of saving under the sub-head of repairs to building and maintenance of machinery and light.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the $16,000 spent in, then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Everything except mere maintenance—working expenses, repairs, maintenance of machinery and light, apparently, and matters of that kind—all except maintenance, and salaries of the officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What industries are going on just now? How are the men being employed? How many go to the farm?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only contract is that of making locks. Then the labour is principally employed on the farms and about any buildings that may be wanted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The boot and shoe manufacture has been entirely discontinued.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is discontinued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And furniture also is discontinued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So nothing remains but the locks?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many are employed on that, roughly? Do you know?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I must refer the hon. gentleman to the Report attached to the Report of the Minister of Justice. He will find all that there. I cannot turn it up in a minute.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought you had the details in your hand there. Then, practically speaking, with the exception of the lock industry, the bulk of the convicts are employed either at quarry or farm?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quarry or farm.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you know whether the quarry is paying; that is, whether it is possible to cut stone and sell it at a profit just now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before Concurrence, I will read the warden's report, and save the hon. gentleman the trouble of doing so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, you are paid for doing it, and I am not. However, I am glad to find you have reduced the industries. There is another point, however, which I suppose is stated in the brief in the hands of the hon. First Minister. These accounts, I suppose, are really the surplus cost, after deducting the proceeds of the produce of the farm which go to the maintenance of the convicts. Apparently the total sum you require for these 500 convicts is very little over $60 per man. I should doubt whether $60 per man would feed the convicts and provide for them, unless a considerable portion of their maintenance is derived, in some shape or other, from the farm.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the whole cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Including vegetables and everything?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the uniform, not the clothing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would include the clothing of the convicts, apparently.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The receipts go to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, to the Receiver-General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So the real cost of this is not quite as great as it appears?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a matter of some moment in comparing the relative cost, and I suggest that it would be no harm if a little memorandum were in future put at the bottom of the Estimates, stating the amount that had been received for the farm products or other earnings of the convicts during each year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure that will be in the report, but it would be well to put it as the hon. gentleman suggests.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be convenient to have it here. I am not in the least degree blaming the hon. gentleman for not having it, but it would be convenient for the whole House, because it is a matter of some little moment, in comparing these expenditures, to see how nearly each penitentiary is going towards supporting itself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will see that is done in the future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are three items which the hon. gentleman can take up in their order—capital account, industries, and miscellaneous, which did not appear last year, apparently. What are these for? Before you go to that, I may just enquire whether there is any intention of going on with the walls enclosing that field at the rear of the penitentiary. Immediately behind the Warden's house, there is a large property belonging to the penitentiary, and a wall was begun some years ago. Is it intended to enclose that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman now, but I will answer him when my own estimates come down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason I asked was that I notice the wall is only half built. Would the First Minister just mention what the capital account, industries, and miscellaneous items are?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The capital account is $400; the Warden states this amount may not be required. As regards industries, $168, that is for tools in the workshops, and may not be required. Then miscellaneous, $840, is for postage, freight charges, and unforeseen expenses, formerly charged to contingencies.

28. St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.....$80,768 48

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a decrease of $700. The amount is about the same as last year, with this exception, which is in consequence of the Clerk of Works being transfered from the Justice to the Public Works Department, as well as all the other officers who were under the Department of Justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call attention to the fact, that although St. Vincent de Paul has only 325 convicts as against 500 in the other, the relative expense is very much greater. Here we pay $60,768 for 325 convicts, as against $98,000 for 500 in Kingston. When you come to the head of maintenance you find the 325 cost nearly $100 apiece, whereas at Kingston they cost about $65. I should be glad to know what is the cause of this extreme difference. Of course, one understands that you may require a few more officers in proportion for the 325.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It so happens, the expense of maintenance, as of all the other expenses there, has been out of proportion to those in Kingston. However, the hon. gentleman will see that a very considerable change has been made in the right direction. We know that the contracts are given for supplies at St. Vincent de Paul the same as elsewhere, but for some reason or other they cannot get food so cheaply as at Kingston. One reason may be that the Kingston Penitentiary is close to a town, and for many years there has been a great deal of competition among the people for furnishing supplies, and contractors have frequently lost money. As perhaps the hon. gentleman knows, contractors have suffered severely from the unwholesome competition. St. Vincent de Paul is more isolated than Kingston, and I suppose that the penitentiary is furnished with supplies by contractors from Montreal. However, the Government cannot help that. All they can do is to give the contract to the lowest tenderer. It is certainly a remarkable difference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure that he has given the whole cause of this difference? I suggested just now that the Kingston people feed themselves to a great extent. The difference seems altogether too great to be accounted for on a mere supposition of extra prices. It amounts to quite 50 per cent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. As I understand there is a valuation at Kingston of the products of the farm, and it is charged.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is it with respect to St. Vincent de Paul? Have they got a farm there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, a small farm, but they do not raise much.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose the First Minister is better pleased with the condition of things at St. Vincent de Paul than at Kingston. I think he has usually contended in this House that it is a great misfortune to a country where very much is done, and where labour is successfully employed, in penitentiaries, that these scamps, by being confined there at work, come into unfair competition with the honest industries of the country, and there is not the same opportunity of protecting honest labour outside from the competition of those who are thus in the public service, as there is of protecting them against foreign competition. That is a feature of the commercial policy of the Finance Minister that has not yet been fairly worked out. But there is no doubt the condition of things at St. Vincent de Paul, according to the theory hitherto laid down by the First Minister, is much more satisfactory than at Kingston, because there they cost a great deal and do very little. Unless the hon. gentleman has very greatly changed his views in the past two or three years, he must be very much better satisfied with the condition of things at St. Vincent de Paul than at Kingston, and perhaps with a little exertion he might produce the same state of things at Kingston as at the other place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is an old war between the hon. gentleman and myself. But, Sir, without going into the economical question, it is of great consequence, I think, to the honest workman outside the penitentiary, that he should not feel that he is being injured. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that, rightly or wrongly, the working classes, especially those employed in industries which have usually been introduced into penitentiaries, have constantly protested against convict labour, and it is of considerable importance that they should be satisfied that they were not interfered with, or interfered with as little as possible. I think it is worth while, on higher grounds than mere political economy, that these men should feel that their special trades were not interfered with. At the Kingston Penitentiary there is only one contract given, that for making locks and keys, and as there are but few and very small manufactories of locks and keys in Canada, that contract does not interfere to any considerable extent with the industry of the working classes. But where the convicts make boots and shoes, or furniture, or woollen goods, or anything of that kind, industries in which large numbers of people are employed, there is likely to be a great deal of dissatisfaction. At Kingston, the convicts are employed in farm labour and in raising their own food, and there seems to be no objection to that—at all events, the farming population do not complain of it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is trying to shift his opinions upon the shoulders of the artisans. That is not fair to the artisans. If those fellows in the penitentiaries were labouring outside, their labour would come into competition with that of people outside, but because they happen to be labouring inside the penitentiary, the hon. gentleman's contention is that they cannot possibly do great mischief. If their labour comes into competition with that of the agriculturist, the agriculturist has as much reason to complain, and upon the same grounds, as any other class of the population. The hon. gentleman has laid down the rule that, instead of it being in the interest of the public to make these institutions self-sustaining the more expensive they become the better the people will be satisfied. The hon. gentleman will not find many artisans disposed to support his views.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to St. Vincent de Paul, a large number of escapes, or attempts to escape, were reported. Was this fact brought specially to the notice of the First Minister?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was, last year. These attempts to escape were accounted for by the fact that there was no external wall. The external wall has, indeed, not yet been finished, and it is due to greater precaution being exercised and to good fortune that we have had no escapes lately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the works completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are not completed. We ask a vote of $30,000 to proceed with them. I will give the details when we come to that item.

29. Dorchester Penitentiary $44,962 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The salaries are the same. Retiring gratuities, $500—that may not be required. Under the head of uniforms, there is an increase of $1,151; that is in consequence of winter dress being required for a greater number of persons during 1884-85. On maintenance, there is an increase of $1,086, in consequence of the increased number of inmates. Working expenses show a decrease of $381. Industries—$300, to provide tools for the workshop.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there is a matron and also a deputy matron. How many female convicts are there?

Sir JOHN. A MACDONALD. On 30th June, 1883, there were 120 male and 5 female convicts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fact is, I suppose, that these matrons represent the two separate penitentiaries of St John and Halifax.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it was thought unfair to dismiss them; they are both very good officers.

Mr. WELDON. Is the external wall round the penitentiary finished? There was an escape last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not a stone wall, but palisades. We are going on with the work of constructing the external wall; $30,000 were voted last year, and we ask for $25,000 more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that Dorchester Penitentiary seems to be very considerably over-officered. There are 42 officers for 140 convicts, as against 59 officers for 325 convicts at St. Vincent de Paul, and 69 officers for 500 convicts at Kingston. I do not know what the peculiar circumstances of the Dorchester Penitentiary may be, but it does seem a very large expenditure for salaries, and a large number of men for the number of convicts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The disproportion is very great. No doubt the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice will be called to this debate, and the remarks of the hon. gentleman. I may say, however, that I am told that the farm at Dorchester is some 600 acres, as against about 150 acres at Kingston, which would require, of course, more guards if the men are scattered over so large a farm. Notwithstanding that, however, I should say that the institution was, to say the least of it, fully officered.

Mr. WELDON. Are there any occupations carried on there other than the making of brooms and brushes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is the sole industry.

30. Manitoba Penitentiary $44,874 26

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here there is a very large increase, as to which I would be glad to hear somewhat fully from the First Minister. In former times, of course, it was necessary to incur very large expense in Manitoba, but as the hon. gentleman knows, that has been considerably altered of late years. The maintenance of the

convicts and many other expenses, I should think, have fallen considerably.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase of two officers: one a blacksmith instructor at $900, and the other a guard at $600. The former has been found necessary in order to teach the Indians, who may be sentenced for long periods, the trade of blacksmithing. It was thought that they might be well employed in learning this trade as well as carpentering. In retiring gratuities there is an increase of $100, which may not be required; then there is $137 for officers' uniforms for winter and fall; and an increase of $5,153 in the maintenance of convicts, the maintenance *per capita* being $150.71. The increase is on account of increased population and estimated increases in the price of various sub-heads, such as rations, discharged convicts' clothing, discharge allowances, &c. The last item is asked for, but it may not be required. Then there is an increase of $4,685 in working expenses. The Warden states that for heating alone they have to expend at least twice as much as would be expended for a similar institution elsewhere, the winter being a great deal longer and a great deal more severe. They can, he says, always count on six months winter. The prison is so badly built that they have to pay a very large amount for steam heating, and the pumping also requires a great deal of steam, the well which they have to use winter and summer being very deep. The item for light is also large, by reason of the winters being so long and the days so much shorter than in the Eastern Provinces. They have to use a very large quantity of oil, and moreover the breakage of lamps is very great, owing to the cold and other causes. The Warden has also asked for a considerable increase on the farm, as he intends going into farming extensively in 1884-85.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be correct; but I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in 1883 84, 80 convicts cost only $120 per head, while in 1884-85 they are estimated to cost $150 per head. Now that does appear to me rather unreasonable, unless there be some explanation not yet given, seeing that while everything in Manitoba has apparently fallen in price, the price per head has increased 35 per cent., and that for a larger number of convicts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that last year's estimate was too low, and in the Supplementary Estimates there will be an item to make up the deficiency.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman said something about Indians serving long terms.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; a good many are committed for very serious crimes, such as homicides and horse stealing, for which they have to undergo long sentences. It was thought that these convicts might well be instructed in blacksmithing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With regard to this question of terms it has been brought to my attention by various parties, some of them convicts themselves, that there is a very great discrepancy in the sentences inflicted apparently, for precisely similar offences by different Judges. No doubt this is somewhat delicate ground; but has it occurred to the hon. Minister that the Minister of Justice might, in some way or other, more or less supervise this matter? I know that in the minds of many men a feeling, and not an unnatural feeling, exists, that there is a good deal of injustice done as between different people in this way. One Judge will sometimes give a man seven or ten years for an offence for which another Judge inflicts only two or three years. A good many such cases have come to my attention.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question has long attracted the attention of jurists and legislators in England and elsewhere; but no remedy has been found. A Judge must act according to his best judgment and discretion in the circumstances of each case, taking into account not only the crime itself, but the moral guilt of the criminal Then, again, the Judge may find that a particular kind of crime becomes epidemic, and may have to inflict severe sentences in order to crush it out. There is, it is said, a passion among the criminal classes to imitate and catch the contagion of a particular crime that becomes epidemic, and that attracts public attention, and severe sentences are inflicted to crush out such crimes. Of course the law fixes a maximum and a minimum of punishment; that is all the law can do; it must be left to the discretion of the Judge to fix the sentence. However, it has always been the practice of the Minister of Justice, when a petition is presented, as is frequently the case in favour of a prisoner whose crime is supposed to be rather severely punished, to transmit the petition to the Judge, with a request for a copy of his report and the evidence; and very frequently, if the man has behaved well and is considered to have been punished sufficiently by that time, or likely to be in two or three years more, and the Judge recommends a mitigation of his sentence, the report of the Judge is always acted upon. Then, a well-behaved convict receives a certain number of marks, which very materially diminish his sentence; and these marks roll up very rapidly. So that, on the whole, I think there is no practical severity. There may be individual cases; but there is no means of avoiding the fact that a Judge sometimes takes a rash view of a prisoner's crime. Some Judges are perhaps too lenient, and others too severe. The hon. gentleman, in reading the criminal history of England, will find that one Judge is called a hanging Judge, while in the case of another Judge it is said a man must have strong interest to get a severe judgment from him. These are idiosyncracies which cannot be guarded against. But while I believe there is no undue harshness in this Dominion, the proper administration of the law all over the Dominion is proved by the peace and order which prevail in the country. I think there is as little crime in this country as in most countries in the world. Of course, in times of great distress, crimes of larceny increase a good deal; but on the whole, I think there is very little crime in this country, as the certainty of punishment is so great as to be an effective deterrent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, no doubt, is all true; but it is also true that there is a very great difference in the sentences of different Judges for the same crime. It is a very difficult question, I admit; and I suppose it could only be dealt with by diminishing the maximum and minimum in some cases, which might be worth consideration. There is nothing like the amount of violence in our country, I am happy to say, that there is in most countries; but I am afraid there is a good deal of disposition in certain counties to convict offenders, and that has to do with the comparatively small number of penitentiaries.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). Is it the intention of the Government to put anything in the Estimates this year for enlarging the Manitoba Penitentiary and building a prison wall?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not prepared to answer the hon. gentleman now. There is nothing in the ordinary Estimates; but the Supplementary Estimates have not come down. I will not forget that the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter to me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much land is attached to the Manitoba Penitentiary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 160 acres.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). I hope the Government will seriously consider the subject of building a prison wall. In its present condition, the prison is not safe. I visited the penitentiary about two months ago, and I found

seventeen prisoners living and sleeping in one corridor, with nothing but a glass door, and thereby eight iron rods between them and the open prairie. If an outbreak were to take place there, I am satisfied that it would result very seriously. Therefore, I hope the Government will consider the necessity of building a prison wall there, or commencing it, at any rate, this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the North-West prisoners are sometimes sent there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; because there is no other prison. There will be a vote asked for two or three lock-ups over the North-West, not merely to hold persons for trial, but sufficient to hold prisoners for short sentences.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought there were some in the cities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are a few small prisons attached to the city police stations, but they are overcrowded. To save the great expense of sending prisoners under sentence all the way to Winnipeg, these buildings will be put up and will be a very great saving indeed.

31. British Columbia Penitentiary..... $29,569 29

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase in the salary of the Warden, from $1,400 to $1,750.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that officer reside, as usual, in the prison? I presume he has light and fuel and the rest of it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; he is a very deserving officer; he has less salary than the officers of Manitoba or Dorchester.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is he?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. McBride. The Warden has $350 of an increase for increased duties, as well as to place him more on an equality with other Wardens; there are two instructors at $750, one for tailoring and the other for shoemaking. It is intended to have all the clothing required for the officers and convicts made in the penitentiary, as this will give employment to the convicts and be a saving in the expenditure. Formerly, this clothing was made in the Kingston Penitentiary and sent west. On account of the increased population, the Warden appointed two additional Guards, at $600 each. There are two instructors at $750 each, which, with the guards, $1,200, and the Warden $350, make a total of $3,050. The miscellaneous items amount to $400 for telegrams, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is besides a large increase, amounting to nearly $8,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The maintenance increase is $3,896, or $113 per capita. There is very likely to be a very considerable increase, owing to the great number of miners coming in from the south; there is great excitement among the mining population of California who believe there is a great find of both gold and silver in the mountains.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not that on the eastern slope?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On both sides.

Mr. CHARLTON. The maintenance per capita shows a considerable increase—$113 against $83.89.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It must be owing to the increase in the price of bread and supply. All these things are done by contract and the lowest tenderer always get it. We must take the Warden's estimate.

Mr. MILLS. Is any large number of these convicts Chinese?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are 21 Chinese.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk).

Mr. MILLS. Can the hon. gentleman say what proportion they bear to the population?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have heard it estimated at from 12,000 to 18,000 Chinese, but I fancy that is very uncertain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very vague, I fancy.

Mr. CHARLTON. The increase in the working expenses seems to be out of proportion to the number of convicts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The vote for last year was found too small; the Warden has asked for increases under the following heads: light, armory, kitchen, farm and stables. The working expenses have increased $621.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the tailor shop in the Kingston Penitentiary still exist?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; there is a tailoring instructor there at $1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose they still make for Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that was done under the late Government, and that system has been continued. The hon. gentleman will see by that note of the Warden from British Columbia, they propose to make their own clothing there, so they must have got their supplies from there up to this time.

LEGISLATION.

Senate.

32. Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate..... $56,038 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member will notice that there is a reduction of $700 in this estimate—$500 is in stationery and $200 in subscriptions to newspapers. That is the only change.

House of Commons.

33. Salaries, House of Commons, per Clerk's estimate	$61,000 00
34. Expenses of Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c	12,800 00
35. Contingencies	20,500 00
36. Publishing Debates	20,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may state here that the same sum is entered as for the current year; but, in the Supplementary Estimates, which will be brought down in a few days, it will be found necessary to add very considerably to this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The increased expenditure, the number of employees, and the larger volume. When I bring that down, I will state the reasons reported by the Committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. A portion of the increased expenditure will be due to the fact that five copies of the bound *Hansard* are to be furnished hereafter, in place of two, as heretofore.

37. Salaries and Contingencies, per Sergeant-at-Arms' estimate..... $28,482 50

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say here that there was an item last Session: "to pay to F. Houde, M. P., the amount of his Sessional indemnity." That was under circumstances we all know. There are circumstances which will warrant me in asking the House, in the Supplementary Estimate to make up a deficiency in the indemnity of two hon. members last year, my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail), and my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Robertson).

Miscellaneous.

38. Grant to Parliamentary Library	$10,000 00
39. Salaries of Officers and Contingencies of Library	19,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the detail o that?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is in the vote for the current year. There were special votes for collections, such as that of the O'Callaghan American collection, purchased in New York. That is in the appropriation for the current year. We have no such requirements this year, and so the vote is reduced by $1,260

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no detail of that. It might be well for the Clerk of the House to put that in another time. All the other details are given.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will have that prepared before we close.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By the way, is the First Minister prepared to give any information as to who shall be appointed Librarian? That would be of some interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a matter under consideration just now.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I suppose the system of promotion will be adopted?

Mr. BOWELL. After examination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Qualifying examination or competitive?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are a good many applications, and I am proud to say that it is looked up to as an office of great importance. Gentlemen of the first rank in science and literature in Canada, have thought it worthy of their acceptance if it were offered to them. The question is not literary or scientific attainment. I know a good authority on these matters, Goldwin Smith, who says a Librarian who reads is lost. We want a man who understands books and looking after books. It ought to be a matter of very great care to select the Librarian. He should be a man acquainted with literature, a man of business, a man who knows the trade of book-selling, in fact, who knows how to purchase books at the cheapest rate in the best market. Then he ought to be a sort of walking dictionary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He must read the books.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He must have read before he is appointed Librarian, and of course he is expected to keep up his reading, to a certain extent; but a man may be a very scientific man or a very literary man, and yet make a bad Librarian.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall try, with the assistance of the two Speakers, who will have to be consulted, to get a good man to satisfy all these requirements. I think my hon. friend called the attention of the House to the necessity of carrying out the principle of promotion, which has been advocated so strongly to-day. I think that is a correct principle—if we find in the Department persons who are fit for the work. Whether they are or not, I am not prepared at present to say.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are all united in heartily wishing the First Minister abundant success in filling the position properly. We hope he will get a good man, who will in some measure fill it as well as the gentleman who filled it lately.

Mr. MILLS. To whom have these applications been made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy some have been made to Mr. Speaker, and some to the Government.

Mr. MILLS. Is it the intention to allow these names to go to the public?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that it would be well. I do not think those gentlemen who applied and were rejected, would like the public to know it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The public is interested in knowing the names of these men, and would like to canvass their qualifications.

Mr. MILLS. The public might assist the hon. gentleman in making a selection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the public cannot take the responsibility.

Mr. CHARLTON. The public, however, can express its opinion, and that is of some value.

40. Printing, binding and distributing the laws. $12,000 00

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I wish to make a remark on this item. There appears to be a good deal of dissatisfaction in the country with reference to the distribution of the Statutes. In the first place, they are very late in coming out. Last year they were not sent out until within a month or two of the present Session; and when they do come out, they are sparsely distributed, so that it is a very difficult thing for people to get the laws. Now, every man is bound to know the law, and it appears to me that something should be done towards making a larger distribution of the laws. I may mention, in connection with this, that a large sum of money was expended last year in printing the reports of the Agricultural Committee. Each one of these reports is about the size of the Statutes that were passed last Session, and, I suppose, cost nearly as much as those Statutes did; and I venture to say that a more useless work has hardly ever emanated from this House than that report—at least that is my humble opinion. A man taking up that report and reading first one statement and then another, can hardly fail to see who is the author of each one. One man is a Grit, to be sure, and the other is a Tory. After they have made their statement, some of them think it necessary to explain on which side of politics they are. One boasts that he is not Conservative, but just a good Baldwin Reformer. Another man says "I am no Grit, I can assure you, but I believe in the hon. Edward Blake." That is the way they wind up some of their reports. Now, this House went to the expense of publishing that report and distributing a number of copies among the members—some twenty-five or thirty copies; and when we remember that the Statues have been but sparsely distributed, I should hope that the Government would take some means to extend more generally their distribution throughout the country, so that the people can have the laws more freely.

Mr. CHARLTON. I consider that report is perfectly useless, and it certainly was a most unnecessary expense to print it to the extent of twenty-five or thirty copies for each member. So far as I am concerned, I never distributed them at all. The information contained in them was not reliable, and in many cases it was misleading. It was purely an electioneering document, and was issued for electioneering purposes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is quite evident that my hon. friend (Mr. Robertson) represents a city constituency. I distributed those reports, and I can say that they were read with the greatest interest by those who received them in my constituency. A Committee of Parliament went to considerable expense in getting that evidence, and it does seem to me that the least that can be done is that the public at large should have the benefit of the report. At any rate, the report was published by order of this House, and on the recommendation of a Committee of this House; and I think that the argument in favour of a larger distribution of the Statutes might have been urged without reflecting upon the House itself, and upon one of its Committees.

Mr. MILLS. I am an agriculturist, and I entirely concur in the views expressed by the hon. member for Hamilton. I think a more useless report never emanated from the press. In my opinion, it is discreditable to Parliament to

publish such a document. It conveys no information upon any question that it is important the public should be informed upon. Many of the questions are framed in such a way as not to elicit facts but to elicit opinions. Now, I venture to say that in the whole history of Parliamentary Government, no such document can be found. If you look at the old reports that have been collected at various times in England upon the state of agriculture, you find that enquiries were sent out to ascertain what the facts were. Why, Sir, when we wish to investigate any subject we don't want to know what the opinions of even a thousand men are; we know, as the hon. member for Hamilton said, that those men were either Conservatives or Reformers, and we know what their political opinions were; and if you ask any farmer his opinion upon those questions, you will get an answer in accordance with his political bias. But in order to enable us to come to a conclusion, we want the facts from which we may draw our own conclusions. We are not in the slightest degree better informed, after we have received such a report, than we were before, and I think it does no credit to Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He is not discussing the question before the Chair at all. The question is upon the vote for printing, binding and distributing the laws.

Mr. MILLS. I am just following in the wake of the two gentlemen who spoke before me. However, I am not disposed to discuss the matter further at this moment. With regard to the publication of the Statutes, the hon. gentleman from Hamilton says that he received them very late. Well, Sir, I can say I have not received them at all, and I believe I was elected at the same time the hon. gentleman was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It had not been found out at the time.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, it was; and it was because it was found out that I am here now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was a matter of opinion, merely; it was not a matter of fact.

Mr. MILLS. It was a matter of fact. There was no doubt as to the fact, but the hon. gentleman appointed a returning officer, who was so devoted to him and his party that, upon the condition that his expenses should be paid, and upon condition that he should be protected against all injury and loss, he returned the gentleman whom the electors refused to return.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear the highly favourable account which that report gives—I have not read the report, not a word of it, and, perhaps, I never shall—but the flourishing account it gives of the agricultural condition of the country, renders it very distasteful to hon. gentlemen opposite, who will not admit that this country can be prosperous or ought to be prosperous.

Mr. KIRK. So far as my own county is concerned, I will tell you what answers to these questions——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman from Hamilton says that these Statutes were very sparsely distributed. In this connection I may mention that the free distribution of the Statutes last year amounted to over 20,000 copies. In Ontario alone, 6,000 copies were distributed to Justices of the Peace. The distribution to Judges, to public institutions, to clergymen, to registrars and to all other officers, is as liberal as can be made. Of course it is not the fault of the Government if hon. members of this House wish to provide each one of their constituents with a copy of the Statutes at the public expense; but I do not think the Government are really able to do it. I hope, if the project which is now before a Committee of this House is accepted, for establishing a national printing house, that the cost of the Statutes will become so low as that even a more liberal distribution may be made to the people than is made now. Every member of this House receives, I think, three copies of the Statutes, and if they choose to give them to their friends, they may buy some other copies for themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the custom to stereotype these?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think not. I think they are only printed and distributed.

Mr. LISTER. I only received one copy of the Statutes. But the complaint is not so much about the number of copies that are furnished to the members of this House, as about the lateness of their being furnished. I presume it will be several months before the Statutes enacted this Session will be distributed. People who have to obey the law want to know what it is, and the legal profession throughout the country want to know what laws are passed in this House. My hon. friend the Secretary of State spoke of the establishment of a national printing bureau. I trust a Government printing bureau will never be established in this country, if the experience of the United States, as to the benefits to be derived, be any criterion.

Mr. WELDON. Copies of the criminal law have been furnished to only a few libraries, and several applications have been made to myself for the volumes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We hope next Session to lay on the Table the Consolidated Statutes, and these will render the past Statutes comparatively valueless. A liberal edition of the Consolidated Statutes will be issued at once.

41. Printing, printing paper and book-binding $70,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The additional $10,000 is asked by the Printing Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the early part of the Session, I called the attention of the House to the question whether we could or could not supply former members of the House with copies of the various Sessional Papers. I should like to know what decision has been arrived at.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is quite right, if any gentleman has sat in Parliament, although he may have retired, either voluntary or compulsory, that he should have these documents. Such gentlemen are not very numerous and the arrangements will not greatly add to the expense. I think that ex-members should have copies of the Bills, papers and documents issued during the Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I refer to the Sessional Papers and Journals more particularly. Some gentlemen file them, and would like to keep up the continuity. Of course, there will be some additional expense, but not enough to break us. I have received communications from several retired members, saying that they would be exceedingly glad to receive those documents. The Clerk has also received similar communications.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The matter has been discussed two or three times in the Printing Committee, in regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Huron, but on investigation it was found that the proposal would add enormously to the expense. Very nearly half the members of the present House are new members, which means that nearly that number are retired members. Such was the case with the previous Parliament, and if we send the Sessional Papers, which are very expensive and are bound volumes, it will be found an exceedingly expensive operation, and increasingly so. To send those papers simply for

the succeeding Parliament would not, I fear, meet the view of the hon. member for South Huron, as his suggestion is that many ex-members would like to keep up the continuity of their sets. I had a letter the other day from an ex-Speaker, not of the Dominion Parliament, but of the old Legislature of Canada, and he desired to obtain the Sessional Papers. So far as the discussion has proceeded, it is manife st that the suggestion cannot be carried out, except at a very considerably increased expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before I made the suggestion, I entered into a little calculation, from which it appeared that the additional number of Sessional Papers required would not exceed 250 or 300.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What we thought was this: every member receives two copies of the Sessional Papers and Journals; and as the former member of the county would be a prominent man, he might probably be able to obtain a copy from the member.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Copies might be furnished only to those who applied for them, and a considerable number of ex-members would never apply.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I think it would be advisable that our Mechanics' Institutes and public libraries should be supplied with copies of *Hansard*.

Mr. BERGIN. Extra copies of *Hansard* were allowed to members of this House last year for the very purpose suggested now by the member for Leeds, that is, that they might provide the different institutions of this kind in their constituencies with this delightful literature.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). But we did not get them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). You will, this year.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Secretary of State, a few moments ago, informed us that it was contemplated by the Government to establish a Government printing house. I would like to enquire whether a plan has been decided upon by the Government, whether the present mode of printing has been found to be a satisfactory one, and if they have arrived at the conclusion that the work could be done more cheaply and more satisfactorily by another system?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a Committee of the House now enquiring into that matter, and that they will give the House and the Government the result of their enquiries. The Government has not yet come to any decision about the subject, and I think, before doing so, we will make enquiries into the working of the system in the neighbouring Republic; and in any case, it would only be after full enquiry that the Government would make such a change.

Mr. MILLS. Will this practically be a revival of the old Queen's Printer system?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole matter is now under consideration, but I may say that I do not think the present system is very economical, and certainly we do not find it conducive to speed and regularity. We hear complaints about the issue of the Statutes being postponed for months, when they should be issued a few weeks after Parliament prorogues. We find, as I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite did, that the printing of Bills, reports, &c., are very much delayed, and sometimes these delays are exceedingly vexatious I believe the experience in Washington has not been favourable to economy in printing, but there they have plenty of money and they are rather inclined in those things to be extravagant. In England, the system of printing under the Queen's Printer, Mr. Spottiswood, and the management of the Stationery Department, under the well-known Mr. W. R. Greg, has proved to be most economical, the paper being procured at a cheaper rate than under a contract, and the work being carried on with all promptness and regularity. In fact, the printing of the Statutes, which is done by the Government Department, has been found to be a matter of profit. Of course, there the issue of free documents is very limited indeed, and they are sold at a rate a little more than their actual cost, and, as I said, there has been a profit. I do not think, however, we can hope to introduce that here just now. The custom has been from the beginning to make large issues of Statutes, reports, &c., and to distribute them freely; and in the case of important Bills or returns, or other important public documents, large extra issues are asked for, and are printed and freely distributed. I do not think public opinion would be satisfied at present with the alteration of that system, by the cutting down the free issue and the selling of the documents, though it might be an economical system. I do not suppose we could hope to attain the same results as in England, though it would greatly conduce to regularity and speed to have the work done in one Department. The hon. gentleman asks if the old system of a Queen's Printer would be re instituted. The fact is, that the expense of that system was so great that it broke down—it is only *in nubibus*, and would have to be commenced on a different footing and with a view to the custom in England, rather than that in Washington. However, as we have arrived at no practical conclusion on that subject, it is hardly worth while discussing it farther just now.

Mr. MILLS. The reason I referred to the old Queen's Printer system was, that the present proposal looked almost to me, like a revival of that system, which broke down because it was not satisfactory. I do not know that we can look to the English system, because there, as the hon. gentleman has said, the free distribution is very limited. The documents are printed at a fixed price, and given to those who are ready to pay that amount; whereas, in the American system there is a very large free distribution. In the American system, there has been found to be very great extravagance, as the Government there have taxed the people very highly, and the difficulty is to find objects on which to expend their money, and, as we have noticed they are spending very large amounts in pensions. The pension list has grown so that we should almost imagine that millions of people were engaged in the public service during the Civil War. This has gone on increasing, year after year, until now there are several hundred thousand people on the pension list. The hon. gentleman has the same fiscal system here, the same advantages in the way of high protection ——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Here comes the National Policy again!

Mr. MILLS. Yes; and so long as those views are dominant and a large public expenditure, the same results will follow as in the United States. If the hon. gentleman is anxious to economize, he should hesitate about keeping up that system.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is one grand distinction between Washington and here; there they find great difficulty in expending their surplus, and here I do not think we shall find any difficulty of that sort.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. I think there is the strongest probability that that difficulty will not stand in his way.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Government adopt the new system of printing, I suppose it should stop the system of having the Government sending their printing to Chatham and other outside places, as at present.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; or to St. John or Halifax.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, there is something in that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the suggestion that the Votes and Proceedings should be sent to the Mechanics' Institutes, is worthy of consideration by the House, for I do not know of any means by which so many people could be placed in possession of the reports and proceedings of this House at so little cost. Almost every class of the community belong to the Mechanics' Institutes. You will find in every Mechanics' Institute throughout the country, merchants, mechanics, farmers and all other classes of people, among the members, and if you send these documents to them, they will have an opportunity of seeing and reading them. A Mechanics' Institute, in fact, without these reports, is not a properly equipped institution. The hon. First Minister says the expense of sending out these reports is considerable. It is true, a very large volume, consisting of the report of the Committee on the operation of the Tariff, was sent out, and there are many people who think that the expenditure upon that was ill-judged and ill-advised. I gave some copies of that report to some of the farmers in the riding I represent. I saw one of them afterwards, and asked him how he liked it. He said he found it very useful to light his fire with, and he thought he had enough left to last him all winter. I think the expenditure for sending out that vast edition was uncalled for and unnecessary; but I think the House will see the propriety of sending these sessional papers and reports to the Mechanics' Institutes throughout the country. The expenditure for that purpose will only be a drop in the bucket, and it will place the reports and Debates of this House under the supervision of a large number of people, who will value them very highly, coming from so intelligent, wise, and important an assembly as this. The present system of giving them to this one and that one does not commend itself to my judgment as being so beneficial as the one suggested by the hon. member for South Leeds, which I heartily approve of. Now, I hope this matter will be considered by the Government, and that unnecessary reports may not be printed and the amount thus saved expended in furnishing the Mechanics' Institutes throughout the country with one copy of *Hansard* as it is issued from day to day, and also with a copy of the various Sessional Papers.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I think the Government must see the propriety of the suggestion I made, that these papers should be sent to the Mechanics' Institutes and to the people of the country as liberally as possible. I hope my constituents will preserve and read them, as they always do. All my constituents can read, and I do not think any of them will convert these reports into fuel purposes.

Mr. KIRK. It has been said that the report of the Select Committee on the operation of the Tariff, which was circulated so liberally throughout the country last year, is of very little value That is my opinion also. A list of questions were sent out to be answered. If these questions had been sent to the proper persons, I dare say the answers would have been valuable; but if they were sent in every county to the same class of people, as they were in my county, I do not think, as a rule, the answers are worth much. This report, I am told, cost $10,000. My opinion is, that if it did, it was $10,000 thrown away. I find that six persons in my county answered these questions: and who are they? The questions were for the purpose of ascertaining the operation of the Tariff on the agricultural interests of the country; and those who answered them in my county were fishermen and mechanics, not one of whom, except one, has ever bought an agricultural implement larger than a hand-hoe or a hand-rake: and yet people are expected to take their information with regard to the operation of the Tariff on the agricultural interests, from these people. Only one farmer answered these questions at all, and that man says that the effect of the operation of the Tariff has been to drive people out of the country, and that if they go away as fast as they have done for the last year or two, there will be none left to answer the questions, and therefore, they need not send any to be answered. These are the kind of answers we get. One of the questions was, "What changes, if any, are required to make agriculture a more profitable and desirable occupation?' One man, I notice says, "A slight increase of the duty on pork; that is all that is necessary." Another man says, "The National Policy is a humbug." Another says, "We want free corn, free meal, free flour, free coal, and free salt." Some others say it is only necessary to keep Sir John A. Macdonald in power, as he knows all about it—what he does not know about the Tariff is not worth knowing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Can any hon. gentleman say that that report is valueless?

Mr. KIRK. Another man says, "Our children and our children's children will respect and bless the names of Macdonald, Tupper, and Tilley." Another man says, "All that is necessary to make the agricultural interests prosperous, and to complete the National Policy, is to turn out all the Grit officers and put Conservatives in their places." These are the answers to the qustions, and this book was so valuable that it was necessary to spend $10,000 to furnish the people with the answers given.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the instances given by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), do not fairly show the character of these answers. I know that in my part of the country we were instructed to send these questions to the presidents and vice-presidents of agricultural societies, to reeves and deputy-reeves, to councillors of counties, and to ten of the most important farmers of each municipality. That instruction was fairly carried out, in so far as my constituency is concerned. Neither reeves nor the presidents of agricultural societies are of one political persuasion; and the answers came from a class of people supposed to be acquainted with the agricultural interests of the county. I do not wonder that the hon. member for Guysboro' asserts that the report is of no use, because he says the answers came from a class of men in whom he had no confidence. Well, who, in his opinion, would be the right class? The class of men who gave the opinion, as one man did, that all that was necessary was to turn the present Government out of power. I presume there are agriculturists down there following the mixed pursuits of fishing and farming, and the one in question may have distinguished himself as a farmer by buying some agricultural implements more expensive than a hoe or a rake. If that be the experience coming from the county of Guysboro', it is not the experience of the agricultural Province of Ontario. We consider the reports from there are very valuable and they come from a source that is respected by most hon. gentlemen of this House who know anything about the Province of Ontario.

Mr. KIRK. So far as Guysboro' is concerned, we have farmers there who would be able to answer very satifactorily questions about farming, but the questions were not sent to farmers but to mechanics and others. But one farmer has answered the questions at all. The answers I repeated are from farmers from Ontario. I gave but one answer from the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. TROW. I think myself that the report is useless expenditure. In the first place, the understanding of the Committee was that the report of the Committee itself, without the evidence, should be made. Being a member of that Committee, I took considerable interest in the examination of witnesses myself, with my hon. friends from Wentworth and Iberville. I disapproved of the action taken by the members of the Opposition at the time, having had no

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Another gentleman, Mr. James H. Bowes says:

"I have answered the doctor's questions; will he be kind enough to answer mine? How is it that the Finance Minister has asked $28,000,000 for the Civil Service of the Government, when he said in the Rink in St. John, in my hearing, that $22,500,000 was more than sufficient for all purposes?"

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

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

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

An hon. MEMBER. It was a recommendation.

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

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

Mr. BLAKE. And adopted in the Senate?

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

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

what the number of copies was which were sent to each member? Some appeared to have forty or fifty, while some had none.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Secretary of State has nothing in the world to do with it. It is not a Government paper, it is not a Government issue, it is not authorized by the Government. It is a matter of Parliamentary guidance or rule, altogether.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Who sends them out?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman should make an enquiry from the officers of the House to know why the usual number of copies which each member has a right to get was not sent to him.

Mr. FAIRBANK. That is what I enquired—what is the usual number of copies?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Each member has a right to the same number of copies as every other member.

Mr. ALLEN. As to supplying Mechanics' Institutes with Blue Books or other Parliamentary documents, I think no establishments in the country deserve them more. They are a reading people, and an intelligent people, and a tax-paying people, and I hope the Government will take it into consideration to supply the Mechanics' Institutes as well as libraries with Blue Books and other Parliamentary documents.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The main object to this, I presume, is to be found in the immense amount of money which has been expended in it, and the manner in which the report is got up Hon gentlemen who are conversant with it, know that a series of questions were sent out to different parties in different counties, and I presume the members then representing those counties were asked to name the people to whom they should be sent.

Mr. KIRK. I was not.

Mr. PATERSON. I think I was.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) was not in the House.

Mr. KIRK. I was not only in the House, but I was a member of the Committee.

Mr. PATERSON. There are some four hundred pages here, with answers that the parties named sent to the questions, and they are perfectly conflicting. There is where they become utterly valueless. You will take up a page and read the answers of one man, and they will be diametrically opposed to the opinions of another man.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the value of the evidence.

Mr. PATERSON. No; it is not the value of the evidence. Let me read you the testimony of one gentleman here. He says, in answer to question No. 1—I need not read the questions, for I presume the Chairman knows what they are:

"If we can buy an article free from duty, we can buy it far cheaper."

In aswer to the second question, he says:

"Since the National Policy is in force, he cannot buy corn—not to make it pay. There are very few that is raised in our market."

This is his answer to the third question:

"Our market is ruled by the Liverpool market; the National Policy cannot rule our market."

To the fourth, he says:

"Since the duty is on, we get less for our hogs."

In answer to the fifth question, he says:

"We cannot raise horses, to pay, for the home market."

To the sixth:

"It will pay to breed horses when there is a good demand in some other country, and the United States has been our best market."

This is his answer to the seventh question:

"It would pay well to buy corn, if we could buy it without paying duty."

In answer to the eighth, he says:

"The National Policy did not make it any better."

To the ninth:

"Free Trade would be very good."

To the tenth:

"Wool has been low ever since the National Policy."

To the eleventh:

"Hardly any raised in our part for market."

To the twelfth:

"It is increased, for the farmers have to pay the duty on implements."

That was the question whether the price had been increased for implements. His answer to the thirteenth question is:

"We must pay more for cotton since the National Policy is in force."

Now, the Finance Minister will admit that this is an answer which should not go to the country, because it contradicts his statement.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; there are other answers which put him right.

Mr. PATERSON. He says, in answer to the fourteenth question:

"It has not increased; it has given no encouragement to any class; it has not retarded emigration to the United States, or encouraged Canadians to return to this country."

In reply to the sixteenth, he says:

"Farm land has decreased, for most everybody wants to sell."

The idea of hon. gentlemen opposite helping in such an unpatriotic work as sending this through the country. His answer to the seventeenth question is:

"The labouring class has not improved, for everything they buy is dearer."

To the eighteenth:

"Reasonable Tariff, Free Trade, less money wasted, and less humbug."

Under "General Remarks," he says:

"I did not answer the questions as plain as I should have done, but I hope you know the meaning of it."

An hon. MEMBER. What riding is he from?

Mr. PATERSON. From a very good riding.

An hon. MEMBER. South Brant?

Mr. PATERSON. He is not from Brant. My hon. friend has made a wrong guess. He is wrong this time, as he has been many a time before. He is not from Brant, but he is from a very good county. On the other hand, I could read answers the very opposite of that. I say there is no sense in expending such a vast amount of money in printing 400 pages of directly conflicting testimony. If it was to be of any value at all, it might have been done in this way: that the answers received should have been assorted, and it could have been done in a brief statement of three or four pages instead of 400 or 500 pages. It might have been stated that, out of 600, or 700, or 1,000, or whatever number of answers were received, we find a certain number give testimony in this direction, and a certain other number give testimony in that direction. Then you would have had a summing up, and you would have saved all this money that has been wasted in the printing of this evidence, and would have prevented the thing from being turned into—I might use the expression—almost a farce, as it is, reading one gentleman's statement and, immediately after, the statement of another who gives it an emphatic contradiction. There is where I consider there has been a great waste of money in the publishing of this document. It might all have been avoided by assorting the answers. They would have come under three

or four heads, at most, and would have shown that such a number report in a certain direction, and such a number in another. But the result of all this vast expenditure can only be to excite amusement, if it does not excite indignation at the waste of money. I think all the gentlemen of the House will agree with the remarks I have made in that direction, when they look at the book and read it. The First Minister says he has not read it, but if he looks through it he will agree that it was a waste of money to print it.

Mr. MILLS. I have already pointed out that these questions were not calculated to elicit information which would enable the House to come to an intelligent conclusion. It was, instead, a sort of political catechism addressed to various electors throughout the country to elicit the political opinions which they held on various questions connected with the Tariff. When we look at the character of these questions, they seem to have been drawn up for the purpose of ascertaining the political views and feelings of the party to whom they were addressed. Now, here is question 13:

"Are woollen goods and hardware in common use amongst the farmers increased, or otherwise, in price by the Tariff?"

In answer to this question, I find one gentleman says:

"No; they are lower than they formerly were. Woollen goods are cheaper."

When I look further, I find in answer to that question that the same gentleman says that wool brings a better price than it did before, on account of the Tariff. You have dearer wool, higher wages, and yet cheaper woollen goods. All those things which make up the price of the article are higher than before, but the article itself is cheaper than before. Then, with regard to the prosperity of the parties, I find that those very parties who were selling their goods at a lower price than before are more prosperous than they were before. Now, are these answers of the slightest value to the House? It seems to me an utter waste of public money to employ it in the publication of a document of this sort, and I say so without any disrespect to the Chairman of this Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). If these questions constitute a political catechism, they possess a strange significance. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) said a few moments ago that he was on that Committee, and as a representative member of the Opposition he stated distinctly that very few members of the Opposition sent out those questions to their constituents. They either refused to do so, or were afraid to have that catechism answered distinctly.

42. Salary of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. $2,100 00
43. Contingencies of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery $1,200 00
44. Miscellaneous printing $2,000 00

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the hon. Minister how many copies of the report of the Committee on Interprovincial Trade were printed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government can not tell. That is for the officers of the House.

Mr. LISTER. That is another perfectly useless report. Hon. gentlemen sometimes come to this House full of projects. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint), as soon as he got here, moved for a Committee on Interprovincial Trade That Committee sat from day to day, and from week to week, and no doubt cost this country a good many thousand dollars. I suppose the report is a second edition of the report of the Committee of my hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton). I would like to know what this report on Interprovincial Trade cost the country.

Mr. PAINT. It was a small report of only 40 or 50 pages, but it contained all the information we could gather in the short time allowed us. I imagine that the cost of it, including expenses of witnesses and the printing, was not over $1,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can the Chairman of that Committee inform us what have been the results of that report?

Mr. PAINT. The result of it was this: That the Quebec flour merchants assured me that they obtained their flour 13 cents cheaper; that the Grand Trunk Railway had 200 cars of freight for the city of Quebec; and they found that the pressure that Committee brought upon them was to their disadvantage. They attached locomotives to 100 cars of freight and took it to Montreal, and started it by the North Shore Railway; and from that time the Lower Provinces have received their freight during the summer at less rates—25 cents less per barrel of flour. The amount saved the country was about $75,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member should move the reappointment of the Committee.

Mr. PAINT. I desire to say that, owing to the opposition offered by the hon. member for West Durham, we were prevented from doing as much good as we might have done.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has not informed us how the beneficial results were reached.

Mr. PAINT. The freight rate was lowered from Chicago to Halifax.

46. For binding, newspapers, &c..... $1,000 00
47. For purchase of works on America..... $1,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was done with the amount, $1,000, voted last year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman was not here last Session when the leader of the Opposition pointed out the importance of have a special vote of $1,000 for this service. It was voted last Session, and is continued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What works were bought with the money?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know. It was placed at the disposal of the Library Committee.

Mr. MILLS. It is very desirable that works relating to America should be obtained, as the Library is very defective in this particular. I should like to ask the First Minister whether any steps are being taken to transfer the Manuscript Department to the Library. I do not say the books should be placed in the Library where they would be exposed to injury and destruction; but it is very inconvenient to have them stored in the basement of the western block. I have had occasion to go there, and hon. members who are anxious to consult those manuscript volumes could do so with greater facility if they were more accessible. I hope steps will be taken to transfer that branch from the Department of Agriculture to the Library, and make it a branch of the Library. I believe Mr. Brymner is a very competent officer, and one who takes great interest in his work, and it is not of advantage to him or to the public that this Department should be placed in a basement, where it is almost inaccessible. There is not sufficient light and accommodation, and those historical records are rendered almost useless to the public, at the present time, on account of the inconvenient position in which they are placed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is inadvisable to place them in the Library. They will be safer elsewhere. In England, the Archives are under the charge of the Master of the Rolls, and are kept in a separate place, entirely distinct from the Library of the British Museum. The hon. gentleman was quite right in stating that our manuscript volumes are not accessible, because there is not sufficient room; but the new building in course of erection, will contain a good library room and fire-proof room, where all

documents and valuable books will be properly protected, and Mr. Brymner will be there.

QUARANTINE.

	Medical inspection, Quebec		$1,600 00
	Quarantine, Grosse Isle		7,666 00
	do St John, N.B		2,600 00
	do Pictou, N.S		800 00
	do Halifax, N.S		3,400 00
	do Charlottetown, P.E.I		1,000 00
	do Victoria, B.C		1,500 00
	do Sydney, N.S		1,400 00
50.	Tracadie Lazaretto		3,200 00
	To meet expenses of precautionary measures for Public Health:		
	Public Health	$5,000 00	
	Cattle Quarantine, Levis	5,000 00	
	do West	3,000 00	
	do Halifax	5,000 00	
			18,000 00
	Pictou Cattle Disease (revote)		5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe an item, Pictou Cattle Disease (Revote) $5,000. What is the condition of matters in regard to that particular vote?

Mr. McLELAN. That was for the suppression of the disease, which existed in a certain portion of the county of Pictou. Steps were taken to stamp it out, and they have proved very satisfactory, according to the report of the officer in charge. In fact, it has almost ceased to exist. Only twenty-five cases were reported during last year, and only two cases during the last three months. Compensation was given for all cattle compulsorily slaughtered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is a regular staff kept at Point Edward, or is the sum taken to enable the Minister to obtain assistance in case of need?

Mr. McLELAN. A staff is maintained during the year at Point Edward, for the examination of cattle passing through the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If these are permanent appointments, details should be given. Now, I should like to know what staff the hon. gentleman retains at these three points?

Mr. McLELAN. There is not a large staff maintained at any of these points. An inspector is kept at each station, and a permanent caretaker for the building, and if additional help is required, it is supplied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What salaries do the inspectors receive?

Mr. McLELAN. At Quebec the salary is $1,000; at Point Edward $1,200. The Inspector at Point Edward has some other duties in connection with the office.

Mr. LISTER. Who is the Inspector at Point Edward?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Orton.

Mr. LISTER. Is there a cattle quarantine at Quebec?

Mr. McLELAN. There is at Point Lévis.

Mr. LISTER. Is there any restriction upon cattle coming from Europe?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; upon cattle coming into the Dominion from any point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a large number of cattle at Quebec, and it is a most interesting place to visit—there being 300 or 400 thoroughbred cattle there at a time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice here the item for the Lazaretto at Tracadie. Was that not introduced last year for the first time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has been there for several years.

Mr. WELDON. How many patients are there in it, and is the number increasing?

Mr. McLELAN. The number is not increasing, I am happy to say. The increase in the item is an increase of $100 to the medical attendant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who used to pay the expenses of this institution?

Mr. McLELAN. The Local Government, until within three years ago.

Mr. WELDON. How many patients are there?

Mr. McLELAN. About twenty-three.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are all the leprosy cases confined there; are they isolated?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the Government were quite willing to take charge of it, because it is a disease which spreads most insidiously, and the causes why it originated there and continued there are mysterious. The Government thought it better, especially on a strong remonstrance being made by the Local Government that this was certainly a matter connected with the public health, that it should be maintained by the Dominion Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I should like to have the Minister make some explanations with regard to a matter about which I have received several letters. There is a difficulty in the minds of many people as to the reasons why the quarantine law is so very strict. Parties desiring to import some highly bred cattle, find them ordered under quarantine, where they remain for three months. And they naturally think that some concession could be made on the assurance they give their members, and which we will give to the Department, as to their respectability, and as to their being positively sure that there is nothing wrong with the cattle. If I rightly comprehend the matter, the Government themselves are not at liberty to relax the regulations in this respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. PATERSON. I believe it is a matter of Treaty with Great Britian, as well as part of the Statute law, if I understand it aright. What I desire is that the Minister should give a clear statement upon this point, which would go to the country, so that the people might understand the matter.

Mr. McLELAN. This cattle trade is, of course, one of great and growing importance. In 1877 the number of cattle exported was 6,940, and this trade has grown to 64,625 in 1883. The number of sheep increased from 9,504, in 1877, to 114,352 last year. This trade is of such great importance to the country that every precaution is necessary in order to preserve and maintain it. The hon. gentleman is aware from what has become public, that it stands in a very critical condition, that cattle coming into England are watched very closely for fear of infection, and if it became known that infected cattle could get into this country, and spread disease amongst our own cattle, it would very greatly injure that trade in England. The hon. gentleman is also aware that there is now a difference in the treatment of Canadian cattle in England, from those coming from the United States, the latter being immediately slaughtered without being taken into the country, in consequence of the cattle disease existing in the United States, while those from Canada are not so treated. So long as it is believed in England that there is no disease existing here, our cattle are allowed to land and are worth $20 or $30 per head more than those slaughtered on the wharf. If we relaxed in any way our vigilance over imported cattle, those who are in-

terested in the home production of cattle would take advantage of that fact, and use their influence to stop the importation of cattle from Canada, except upon the same conditions as now exist with regard to American cattle. So that I think the hon. gentleman will see the necessity of the utmost vigilance being used with reference to the admission of cattle into the country. Therefore, at Halifax, Lévis, and other points at which they are imported, they undergo a quarantine of three months, so that no disease may be allowed to enter and spread throughout the country; and this fact has its weight and influence on the other side of the Atlantic, in maintaining the advantages which we possess in our cattle trade there.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I learned myself, from personal enquiry at the Department what the hon. Minister has now stated; and my object in bringing the matter up was that he might state it openly and authoritatively. I think his statement will commend itself to the people of the country. Though there may be some cases of hardship, the people will understand, from the figures he has given of the enormous swelling of our trade in cattle, that the advantage of that trade is so great that personal convenience should not be allowed to stand in the way of its development.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows that in England strong attempts have been made to exclude all cattle, as much as possible, for the sake, it is said, of preventing disease from being introduced into the country; but I dare say there is an *arrière-pensée* there, and that the object is to favour English cattle by keeping out all foreign cattle. We know that legislation has been introduced into the House of Lords for this purpose. So we have to take the greatest care not to give any excuse to the authorities in England, especially to those who examine cattle at the port of debarkation, for killing or destroying cattle coming from Canada as being infected. In order to prevent the possibility of that arising, we must take care of the cattle coming from England; because the Americans have learned the great advantage of our system at Point Lévis. It is most interesting for any person, even though he is not an agriculturist, to visit the quarantine ground there. The fortifications built on the south bank of the St. Lawrence at Point Lévis, and the surrounding champaign lands have been devoted to and fitted up for this purpose. The classification is perfect. I visited the quarantine last season, in company with the Minister of Agriculture, and I saw considerable herds of cattle which were brought there for the western States by one of the largest importers of shorthorns in the western States, who preferred to bring the cattle by way of Quebec, and to feed them for three months at Point Lévis at his own expense, to taking them through the United States, where they have the same quarantine, but with greater expense and with less care to the cattle. Our system is so much better that it has got to be a regular branch of business to bring cattle for the western States by the St. Lawrence. The trade, as the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) truly says, is of such importance that no precaution too great can be taken to preserve to us the exclusive market, so far as North America is concerned, of the live cattle trade; and our friends, who may occasionally grumble at their cattle being kept too long at Quebec, must put up with it, for the benefit of the trade concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is quite right. It would be a thousand pities if anything were done which would interfere with our live cattle trade, which has grown to such enormous proportions within the last ten years. Have many cases of disease occurred in the quarantine during the last year or two?

Mr. McLELAN. No cases at all have occurred. I may mention, in connection with this subject, that the Minister reports that a cargo of Canadian cattle were sent in February, through the United States, and became infected in some way. On arriving at the Mersey they were all ordered to be slaughtered; and he points out that this shows the importance to Canadian shippers of shipping their cattle through ports in their own territory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it comes under the authority either of the Minister of Railways or the Minister of Agriculture to see that precautions are taken for the proper treatment of cattle on the railroads. Some short time ago, a good deal of complaint was made of the cruelty with which cattle were treated by neglect to give them water, and so forth. That matter, I think, was brought to the notice of the House, and, if I remember rightly, one or two clauses were put into the Railway Act bearing on the subject. Has the hon. Minister any information as to how far that evil has been remedied? It seems to be a cause of disease.

Mr. McLELAN. Arrangements have been made for the care of cattle on the railways.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals provides that cattle shall not be allowed to travel more than twenty-six hours without stopping for rest and food. I wish to ask if there is any danger of infection to cattle in Canada from American cattle passing through Canada, from one part of the United States to an other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every care has been taken to provide against that danger. That subject caused great anxiety to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. On the one hand, he wished to prevent the introduction of disease, and on the other hand, he was very unwilling to deprive our railways of that great source of traffic. But complete arrangements have been perfected, by which these American cattle trains going through Canada are completely isolated; and after the discharge of the cattle, the cars are fumigated and scoured and cleaned; and I understand that there has not been a single case of infection on that account.

Mr. TROW. It is satisfactory to know that the Government have taken such precautions to prevent any disease. This trade has grown to such dimensions and is such a source of profit that it behooves the Government to take every precaution in their power against any injury to it. Our route is much preferable to that of the United States. I have heard from good authority that the cattle get inured to a sea voyage in going down the St. Lawrence, while from New York they are immediately upon the ocean, and the result is, they frequently become sick the first or second day, while ours do not.

Mr. WILSON. Has the Government appointed inspectors at some of the points on the Canada Southern to inspect the cattle when they arrive? Is there an inspector at St. Thomas?

Mr. McLELAN. There are inspectors at three points, Sarnia, Amherstburg and Windsor.

Mr. WILSON. Is there an inspector at St. Thomas? I understand there is a man there, Mr. Smithers, who is officiating in that capacity. I wish to call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that the Government appointed a man at St. Thomas, apparently, who, as far as I can learn, is not competent for the position.

Mr. McLELAN. He is there merely as a caretaker. The cattle are inspected before reaching that point.

Mr. WILSON. Should any disease break out among the cattle on arriving at St. Thomas, where they are detained some time, there is no one competent to inspect them. There is no one there competent to ascertain whether any disease has arisen on the way.

Mr. McLELAN. They are all inspected a day or two previous to their arrival at St. Thomas. They are only a day or two on the train, and during that time it is not probable that a disease will break out.

Mr. WILSON. I should like to know what are the duties of this caretaker at St. Thomas?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To take care of the cattle.

Mr. WILSON. I should suppose the shippers would see to the performance of that duty.

Mr. McLELAN. He has to see that the regulations respecting the transport of cattle are carried out at that point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To see that they get the necessary food, rest and water.

Mr. WILSON. This man has been acting, then, under false pretences. He has assumed the duties of Government Inspector, and is so regarded.

Mr. McLELAN. He is an inspector of all the regulations. While he may not be a scientific man, with respect to the diseases of cattle, yet he is an inspector of the transport of cattle, to see that the regulations are carried out.

Mr. WILSON. Then he has no duties at all in reference to disease, and if any disease should occur, he has nothing to do with it. He has no right to prohibit cattle being shipped on account of disease.

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I see an amount of $5,000 for public health. That question is exciting attention more and more in our midst. This morning there was a strong deputation of medical men asking for a grant towards a publication that would enlighten the people as to the hygienic measures to be taken for the public health. Unfortunately, the hon. Minister was sick and could not attend to that deputation. I hope, however, the Government will consider the matter, and see what they can do towards extending the attention of the people in that direction.

Mr. BAKER. With regard to the quarantine station at Victoria, there is a reduction of $100, and that at Vancouver Island is erased. Will the hon. Minister explain this?

Mr. McLELAN. The item, $1,700, last year was a supplementary vote for Victoria, where the quarantine was established, and the vote for Vancouver, therefore, is not required. It was changed last year in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. BAKER. I wish to take this opportunity of stating that it has come to my knowledge that, contrary to the representations of my colleague and myself in favour of having this quarantine station at Albert Head, where there is every facility for it and which is within easy distance of Royal Roads, it is the intention to place it at Plumper Bay, Esquimalt Harbour. This appears to me to be anything but the correct thing to do. To get inside Esquimalt Harbour, you have to pass a very narrow entrance; you have to thread the needle, so to speak, through all the shipping, passing about a mile and a quarter inside, where all the men-of-war are at anchor, to get into Plumper Bay. I would like to know on whose recommendation this decision has been arrived at, and to take this opportunity of placing on record my protest against this selection, as it is not a fit place for the quarantine station, and I wish to be held blameless in the matter.

Mr. BAIN. I would ask the hon. Minister whether the cattle quarantine at Halifax is in active operation, and to what extent it is availed of?

Mr. McLELAN. The cattle imported by way of Halifax are quarantined there the usual time.

Mr. BAIN. The reason I ask is, not that I am disposed to find fault with the station, but a gentleman from that station, General Laurie, seemed to be unaware there was a quarantine station there in active operation. I understood him to say they had to import by way of Quebec.

Mr. McLELAN. The facilities for keeping them at Halifax are not yet very good, and they are taken charge of by the quarantine officers and kept separate and guarded until they reach Quebec, where there is every means of caring for a large number.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what precaution has been taken to prevent the importation of diseased cattle into the North-West, for ranching purposes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no disease.

Mr. McLELAN. There has been none in the North-West.

Mr. CASEY. It might be well to have some inspection.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I should like if some hon. member of the Government would pay me the courtesy of giving me an answer to the question which I put, as to who gave the recommendation on which the place for the quarantine hospital was changed at Victoria.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be enquired into before Concurrence. The hon. gentleman having asked the question, of course he will get an answer, and before Concurrence he will be informed what are the grounds why this particular place has been selected.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand it was mainly on the recommendation of the Admiral of the fleet, to Sir Alexander Campbell, while he was there. He is supposed to be an authority on such matters.

Mr. BAKER. That gives rise to a very nice point. What has the Admiral to do with my constituency. I have made certain recommendations to the Government, and I have taken a good deal of trouble about it. I went down there with my colleague to see if Albert Head would be a place to be approved of, and a recommendation has been made to the Department recommending Albert Head as the most suitable of all places; and then, in face of all this, supported, I believe, by the Dominion Government agent, I find that an alteration has been made, which has caused delay, for the quarantine hospital has not been gone on with, and I am told, forsooth, that it has been done on the recommendation of the Admiral. I should like to know what the Admiral has to do with the district of Victoria. I believe I represent the people in that part of the world, and I should like my recommendation attended to, or some very good reasons given why it is not.

Mr. McLELAN. We will get the explanations for you.

Mr. WILSON. I should like some detailed statement as to the $5,000 which is asked for the public health. I hear an hon. member say it has stood for several years. If that is so, we would like some explanation, we would like to know the results of the expenditure.

Mr. McLELAN. Under the head of public health, there are statistics gathered, mortuary statistics and otherwise. I believe the expenditure has not been very large, but it is considered necessary to take a vote to cover any expenditure which may arise, and the expenses which must necessarily follow the collection of mortuary statistics.

Mr. WILSON. Will the Minister explain to me the method by which those statistics are obtained?

Mr. McLELAN. Agencies have been established at a number of the principal towns, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton,

Ottawa, St. John, Charlottetown, Winnipeg and Quebec, and it was proposed to establish agencies at all other points to obtain returns from medical gentlemen connected with the medical society during the year, but only a very limited number of returns have been received during the past year. It was expected by the Minister that a public system would be established and maintained throughout the Dominion, but up to the present time he has not been very successful in getting returns from a very large number of medical gentlemen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the chief object of this vote is the collection of statistics?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I notice in the Public Accounts of 1883 that, under the head of public health, there is a considerable expenditure, amounting to $14,000, but it appears to have gone mostly to medical men. I do not see any item there for the collection of statistics at all. There is a large grant to the Winnipeg General Hospital, and then, apparently, payments to nine or ten medical men for professional services, such as attendance on sick immigrants, and all that kind of thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is separate from this. This is the $5,000 which has been voted for several years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is for public health.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To meet expenses of precautionary measures for public health.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am looking at the Public Accounts for 1883, in which precisely the self-same vote occurred, and immediately after the lazaretto, which is the item preceding, and immediately before the cattle quarantine, which is the item following, I find these items I refer to, and not one syllable is in that referring to the collection of statistics, at all. I think the hon. Minister must be confounding this with some other vote. I am referring to page 143 of the Public Accounts.

Mr. McLELAN. I think the hon. gentleman is naming the salaries of quarantine officers throughout the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; the quarantine officers are quite distinct. The item of public health is under the head of Quarantine Service, between the item for the lazaretto and the item for cattle quarantine. There can hardly be any possibility, looking at the Estimates, of mistaking it.

Mr. McLELAN. The quarantine officers would come under the head of public health.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But these are not quarantine officers. They are separately charged for. If the Minister will just look at the Public Accounts, he will see that this evidently does refer to the item under discussion.

Mr. McLELAN. This large item of $10,487, forming part of that $14,000, is a special sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that is a special sum. The minor items, however, refer to the public health.

Mr. McLELAN. The officers at Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, St. John, N.B., Charlottetown, and Quebec have all made returns, and have all been paid for them, but it is not found possible to commence the work of compilation from these returns until September. The information obtained from these cities will be published forthwith, and submitted.

Mr. WILSON. Who are the parties employed in these cities?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are the local Boards of Health.

Mr. McLELAN. They are the local officers in the cities. The system was suggested by the Medical Society, and it was upon their recommendation that the Boards undertook to do something in this respect.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that so far as they can conveniently, they utilize officers appointed by the Provincial Board.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The local Board.

Mr. WILSON. I think they are appointed under local legislation, forming local boards, and empowering municipalities to appoint health officers. I think it would be much better for the Dominion Government to co-operate with the various Local Governments and have a more efficient system of collecting those statistics. Virtually, we are unable to learn from the Minister to-night that any practical results have been obtained for these $5,000. I am not complaining of the amount, but I do complain that the House is not in possession of full information as to the results obtained from the expenditure of this money.

Mr. McLELAN. I think I stated to the hon. gentleman that the reports would be published forthwith.

Mr. CASEY. There is one item here for 400 copies of Dr. Playter's Sanitary Journal. What is done with these copies?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the first vote of this kind was taken last Session, December twelve months. The leading physicians of the Dominion met in Ottawa and had a conference with the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Railways and Canals was present. An arrangement was come to by which these medical gentlemen, on their return to their respective sections of the country, would induce the members of the Boards of Health to co-operate with the Minister of Agriculture in obtaining statistics. It was agreed by the Minister of Agriculture that the Board of Health in each city, where one existed, should nominate their officer, and the Government would pay him a sum in proportion to the population of the city where such board was established; and it was under that arrangement that this vote of last Session was expended in paying these local officers which were recommended by the local Boards of Health to the Government. These persons were employed and paid for the collection and forwarding to the Minister of Agriculture of statistics from that particular city. To a certain extent, that vote was an experiment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think if the Minister would look a little more carefully at vote No. 8, he will see that the explanations he has been giving has reference to a different vote. There is a vote of $20,000 to meet expenses in connection with health statistics which comes under the head of agricultural statistics. Now, all the explanations that have been given are quite pertinent as regards that vote, and would be quite right if that was under discussion; and I think the Minister will see I am correct, and that this particular vote of $5,000 is intended for a different purpose in statistics, that it is intended, as it was actually used in 1883, for defraying certain expenses in connection with hospitals. $5,000 would go no distance at all collecting health statistics, which is an expensive subject; the $20,000 which is asked for probably would go some distance.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister has not yet told me what is done with these 400 copies of the Sanitary Journal.

Mr. McLELAN. They are sent to the health officers of the different cities, for distribution.

Mr. CASEY. Besides the expenditure on hospitals—some unnamed hospital, $650—there are four or five parties pu-

down here, under the vote we are discussing, for services. Are they professional services? Of course I do not expect the hon. Minister to be prepared with details; but he can give an idea of the general nature of those services.

Mr. McLELAN. The details of that have not been submitted to me, but they can be given on Concurrence.

Mr. CASEY. Then there are professional services mentioned here, one of them a considerable amount, $1,200.

Mr. McLELAN. That is at Winnipeg, for attendance on emigrants.

Mr. CASEY. I think this discussion has brought out one point of value. Although this vote was taken to promote the public health, nearly nothing of that kind has been done, so far as we can see. No precautionary measures have been taken, so far as we can make out. I think a vote for precautionary measures would be a highly proper one, but very little can be done with $5,000. I hope that a good deal has been done with the vote for statistics, but unless those statistics are supplemented by direct measures of precaution, for which a vote should be taken sufficient to do something effectual, there is no doubt that in cases of the outbreak of epidemics, but very little can be done with so small an amount of money. I think the Government are quite justified in taking a vote large enough to do something substantial. I am aware the Provinces do much for this sort of work, but still there are many districts for which it is the duty of the Dominion Government to provide.

Mr. PLATT. The information given in regard to public health last Session was somewhat indefinite, and it is still more indefinite this Session. I understand from the Minister that several of the health officers have not yet reported. If so, the scheme adopted last year, and which has been carried out at the public expense, has, to a certain extent, at least, proved a failure. Are there any new plans about to be adopted whereby greater efficiency in this service can be secured. We know that deputations are now of frequent occurrence in this city. Various schemes have been proposed to the Government, and I should like to know if some other plan is to be pursued.

Mr. McLELAN. The Minister has not yet fully decided as to what course he may take in future; but he has acted, so far, largely under the advice of the medical societies of the Dominion, and has attempted, with their advice and co-operation, to establish a system for gathering statistics in regard to public health, such as will lead to precautionary measures being taken against disease. How far the plan adopted may prove successful, remains to be proved. The best possible plan will be adopted.

Mr. PLATT. I am afraid the Department has relied too much on medical associations and too little on themselves. We know that these associations meet once or twice a year during which the Department obtains information from them, but after those meetings the Department hears very little from them. I know the feeling in all Governments is to rely on the medical profession in all such matters and carry out what they suggest; and if a failure should occur, the medical men are ready to propose some new plan. If any such scheme is to be successful, the Government must take hold of it in a different manner. Some thorough plan must be organized—though I do not think it is yet decided to what extent the Dominion Parliament should extend their measures with respect to public health, and to what extent such duty devolves on Provincial Governments. As I understand it, this Parliament can do little more than gather statistics, and the practical measures are largely left to the Provincial Governments to carry out. The scheme carried on during the past year for collecting statistics and doing certain work, especially in Ontario, has been simply doing what was, in my opinion, very much better done by the Provincial authorities. I cannot see that the money expended by this Parliament has done very much to add to the information gathered by the Provincial Board of Health. I hope, before Concurrence, the Minister of Agriculture will tell the Committee how much money will be spent during the coming year and what benefit he expects to derive from it.

Mr. McLELAN. The vote last year of $20,000 has not all been expended, and the Minister proposes to ask for only $15,000. The total amount expended last year is under $3,000. The Minister was not able to get the system into operation to spend more money, but he hopes to expend a larger sum during the coming year, by having the system extended. The object in attempting to co operate with the Medical Society was merely to restrain expenses. The proposition had been made by the medical societies to do certain work at merely nominal fees, and a scheme was prepared to co-operate with the Department; but how far it will be successful will be a matter of further experiment.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister tells us that the Government are simply carrying out the suggestions of some medical associations. There is no responsibility resting on those gentlemen; it rests with the Administration. While it may be proper and right to consult medical men and avail themselves of their services, they cannot shift the responsibility of the failure of any scheme on the medical gentlemen whose assistance they called in. The statement of the Minister is a very extraordinary one. Hon. gentlemen opposite obtained their present positions under the pretence that they were eminently competent and were able to find a solution for every question coming before them. Now, the Minister came forward and admitted that in this matter they were wholly incompetent and perfectly helpless; that they had again to call in medical men to say what they had better do. Then the Minister asked the advice of those gentlemen, acting on the assumption that if the system had not gone right, the medical men were responsible for it. That is not the ground on which hon. gentlemen opposite secured their positions on the Treasury Benches. The statements made to the people were of a different character. We know that the First Minister told the people that he was eminently qualified for the position of First Minister; that if he were just elected to the position of leader, supported by a majority of the people, prosperity would revive, people would become more industrious and confident than before. They now say we want this money set forth in the Estimates, and when they are asked to give some information, we ascertain, with a good deal of difficulty, that they were mistaken in the scheme. They now tell the House they are not responsible for the failure and that it was due to the medical men and not to them.

Mr. BERGIN. Once again the hon. gentleman opposite has discovered a mare's nest. He tells us that the Government know nothing about the expenditure. What are the facts? $20,000 were voted last year for the collection of statistics and not a dollar has been spent, according to the Public Accounts. $45,000 were voted last year for public health, quarantine and cattle diseases; and of this $45,000, $32,473.82 were spent by the Government, leaving unexpended $12,527.

Mr. SPROULE. I think last year we had merely an initiation of the subject, and the trouble was that insufficient money was given for the purpose. During the present Session there has been a meeting of medical men in this House, and in harmony with them a number of medical men in the country, for the purpose of providing a scheme for more effectually carrying out the object, than those heretofore adopted. I think it must be acknowledged that the statistics as collected by the Provincial Governments are very unreliable and unsatisfactory at the present time. It was

thought desirable to add this money to the amount given by the Ontario Government and devise a scheme whereby one set of officers could collect the information. I believe, however, that so far that scheme has failed. I think the importance of the subject demands that we should vote some money in this House, and I have no doubt that, now it is under consideration, in a short time a scheme will be devised which will accomplish the object, for not a very large amount of money; and from year to year if necessity require; and if this amount is added to, at no distant day we will obtain very valuable information for the country for a small sum of money.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid it is the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) who has found the mare's nest. He says the Government took a vote of $20,000 and did not spend any of it. That is a serious reflection upon the Government, because the money was given them for the purpose of spending it.

Mr. BERGIN. No; because the Government asked the medical men to present to them a well-digested scheme, and took a vote in advance, but the scheme was not presented because it was desired to take the opinion of the different medical societies throughout the country. That has been going on since, but it was decided to wait until the meeting of the Medical Association, in August next, when the scheme would be either approved or rejected by the representative body of the profession.

Mr. CASEY. Then they are voting for a scheme which is not digested, and I hope when they get it it will agree with them. If they have no scheme then they should not spend the money. I find, however, by the Public Accounts, that they did spend $1,718, though they had no scheme to begin with. So the hon. gentleman will find that his first idea was a mistaken one, and that a pretty fair amount has been spent, considering that no scheme had been elaborated. I think the Government should have had a scheme prepared before this time. If they are waiting for the doctors, and the doctors have not come to time, surely a scheme might be devised by themselves. This is not a question particularly for the doctors to consider; they are to cure the sick, but surely laymen could prepare and apply a scheme for obtaining statistics of deaths, &c.

Mr. LANDERKIN. As the Minister has intimated there was a meeting of delegates of the Medical Association a year ago, they came as a deputation to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Railways. At that meeting they passed several resolutions. Those resolutions respecting the public health were submitted to the Minister of Railways for consideration, and I will read you what the Minister of Railways said:

"Sir Charles Tupper thought them very good, but suggested they should have gone a step further, and have advised an amendment to the British North America Act, whereby the Dominion Government should deal with matters connected with the public health."

Have the Government, in the meantime, followed the suggestion made by the Minister of Railways? Have they proposed any amendment to the British North America Act, whereby this Parliament would be enabled to deal with questions affecting the public health? Afterwards, acting on the suggestion of the Minister of Railways, they passed resolutions stating that it was desirable that some steps should be taken whereby the British North America Act should be amended, so as to enable the Dominion Government to take charge of the public health. According to the Act, as it now stands, the charge of the public health comes purely within the control of the Local Legislatures. It was no doubt thought by the framers of the Act that those subjects belonging to the municipalities, such as drainage, the reclaiming of waste places, ventilation, plumbing, &c., coming within the Local Legislatures, this question of public health should be relegated to them. I presume those were the views of the fathers of the Confederation, of whom we have one or two here. I am surprised that the Minister of Railways says that this Parliament is not competent to deal with this subject, as there is an item in the Estimates, placed there by the Minister of Agriculture, stating that they are prepared to spend a certain amount of money therefor. This seems rather a peculiar position; there must be a division in the Cabinet. We sometimes hear of such divisions, and they are apparently divided on this important question. For it is an important question—one as important as any which has come before this Parliament. If we have not authority to deal with this question they should seek that authority, if it is not competent for the Local Legislatures to deal with it. Any measure tending to lengthen human life and prevent human suffering is one which will commend itself to right-thinking men in the House, and will receive the support of this House if it comes within its purview, though it appeared at the time of Confederation that these questions were relegated to the Local Legislatures. We have in Ontario a Board of Health, and I am prepared to state that they have done a great deal of good. They have given a great deal of information to the people, and wherever epidemics have broken out, they have advised with the local Boards of Health with a view of staying the epidemics, which have abounded in those localities. They have been active and energetic, and I am satisfied, and I believe the community is satisfied, that the Board of Health has been of singular benefit in many instances. Now, if this grant was given to supplement the action of the different Provinces, then it is a proper and legitimate one; but if the Minister of Railways' contention was right, that this House has no power to deal with the subject, and that an amendment should be made to the Act, so as to enable Parliament to deal with the question, then this grant should be given exclusively on the understanding that it should be divided amongst the Local Legislatures, with a view of aiding them in their local appliances for this purpose. The grant is a very little one, if it is for that purpose; it is insignificant compared with the good which will arise by a well devised, well digested, and well-matured scheme. It is well known, that by calling public attention to these questions, a great amount of good can be done. Statistics show—they have even shown in this House, on many occasions—that the greatest benefit has been derived by sound sanitary regulations being enforced. It is an alarming state of things, that so little attention is given to sanitary matters, and so little information is possessed by the people on this question—a question so vital to the welfare and the happiness of the people that it is very important that it should be settled. It is very important that this question should be dealt with in a proper spirit. It would look better if the Minister in charge of this matter were able to give us some information upon it. A good deal of attention has been paid to the subject of cattle disease, but the Government have not thought it worth while to pay any attention at all to the subject of diseases affecting the human family. I claim that no question of greater consequence to the people of this country has been brought before this House this Session. It is known, not only to medical men, but to every man of common sense, that by wise and judicious regulations, the public health can be very greatly benefited. But it appears that the Government are trifling with this question, for they do not propose to bring down any scheme or to say what they intend to do in reference to so important a subject. Now, I would like to know if the Minister of Railways was right when he tendered his advice to the medical gentlemen who attended this convention, I believe at the solicitation of the Government; and if he was right and sincere, have any steps been taken by the Government, or do they still intend to carry out the views of the Fathers of Confederation, and leave such concerns to the Legislatures

of the different Provinces? It is a very important matter, however, and I hope the Government will give us more information upon it than they have vouchsafed up to the present time.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Grey has taken such an interest in this question; but there is a strange feature about it. First, he finds fault with the Minister for not having a fully digested policy on this question already. The question has only been before the country for fifteen or sixteen months. How strange is the zeal manifested opposite will be understood, when I say that if my information and observation are correct, two meetings of the Medical Association of the Dominion of Canada have been held in the city of Ottawa, and yet not a single Grit doctor has attended or taken the slightest interest in them.

Mr. SPROULE. I think my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) mistook the object of the vote. I think it was explained by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and understood at the time, that the vote could not be used for promoting the health of the people, but for collecting health statistics, and that is the reason why the scheme desired by certain medical men in the House was not elaborated. I believe the hon. Minister of Agriculture went as far in that direction as the law allowed him, and he said he was willing to ask for an amendment to enable him to elaborate a scheme if it was thought desirable.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville has stated in the House that not a Grit doctor attended the convention held here. I attended on several days, but I never saw the hon. member there at all.

Mr. BERGIN. This, I believe, happened with respect to meetings held in this building. There were two deputations to the Government, and the hon. member for South Grey, like the King of France, walked up the hill and then walked down again.

PENSIONS.

51.	John Bright, Messenger, House of Assembly...	$ 80 00
	Lady Cartier.....	1,200 00

New Militia Pensions.

52.	Mrs. Caroline McEachern.....	$ 184 00
	Janet Anderson.....	110 00
	Margaret McKenzie.....	80 00
	Mary Ann Richey and one child.....	240 00
	Mary Morrison.....	80 00
	Louis Prud'homme.....	11 00
	Virginie Charron and one child.....	1 0 00
	Paul M. Robins.....	146 40
	Charles T. Bell.....	73 20
	Alex. Oliphant.....	109 80
	Charles Lugsden.....	91 50
	Thomas Charters.....	91 50
	Charles T. Robertson.....	110 00
	Percy G. Routh.....	400 00
	Richard S. King.....	400 00
	George A. McKenzie.....	73 20
	Edwin Hilder.....	146 40
	Fergus Schofield.....	73 20
	John Bradley.....	109 80
	James Bryan.....	109 80
	Ensign W. Fahey.....	200 00
	Mary Hodgins and three children.....	191 00
	John Martin.....	110 00
	Mrs. J. Thorburn.....	150 00
	Mrs. P. T. Wortington and one child.....	250 00
	Mrs. J. H. Elliott and one child.....	120 00
	Mrs. George Prentice and three children.....	352 00
	Mary Hannan Tempest and child.....	293 00
	T. Robinson.....	50 00
53.	To meet the probable amount required for pensions to veterans of war of 1812.....	$18,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister of Militia tell me how many of these old gentlemen still survive?

Mr. CARON. Last year we paid 784; this year we have estimated to pay 600 pensions, at $300.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to one of the veterans who, he led me to understand, was on the roll and receiving pay. I was also in correspondence with him during the recess, when I was given to understand that he was placed upon the roll. Since that time, I have been informed that his name is not on the roll, or if it is, he has not received his pension.

Mr. CARON. I forget altogether to whom the hon. gentleman refers. There are so many applications with reference to veterans in the course of a year, that the hon. gentleman will understand that I may easily have forgotten the particular one he refers to. Of course, whatever I answered the hon. gentleman at the time, was from the information I possessed. If he will send in the name of the veteran he refers to, I will be glad to give him any information I possess.

Mr. WILSON. I did send in the name and an affidavit along with it, and I got an answer from the Deputy Minister stating that his name was on the pension roll. That I thought was satisfactory, and I notified the party, who had written to me. Time went on, and when the time passed when he should have received his pension, I was asked why he did not receive it. Why he has not been paid I cannot understand.

Mr. CARON. As the hon. gentleman knows, it is necessary to carry out the Statute. The requirements imposed upon the Department are provided for in that law. Either, as the hon. gentleman supposes, that veteran was put upon the list—and if he has not received his money it must be by some mistake for which I am not able to account—or else he did not make out a case. The affidavits may have been found, in this, as in many cases, not satisfactory. If the hon. gentleman will send in the name of that particular person, I shall be glad to have the matter looked into.

Mr. WILSON. I was informed from the Department that these two men were on the roll. Mr. Richards is one, living in Port Morpeth; the other, whose name I forget, lives in Springfield. I was informed they were on the roll, and receiving pensions, but they told me they never received a cent.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I remember when this vote was first placed on the Estimates, it was as a consideration of merit, and of a plea also of necessity in many cases. I know many instances where the widows of these old men are in want of relief and the small amount of gratuity would be very important to them. I urged their cases but was met with the reply that it could not be done this year. I think, if possible, the Statute should be changed as a compliment to the widows of those old men. In many cases the $25 or $30 would be a very important item. They are tottering on the verge of the grave and in poverty.

Mr. CARON. These pensions are authorized by the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario in one case and by the Statutes of Lower Canada in the other instance. It it impossible for me to travel outside the Statutes and grant these pensions to the widows of the men provided for under them. Moreover, this is a part of the debt which has been assumed by the Dominion Government, belonging to the old Provinces, and we could not make any change now without referring the matter again to two Provinces.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the amount to remain at $30 per head?

Mr. CARON. When I came in, it was $20; I increased it to $30, which is fixed as the amount hereafter to be paid

Mr. PATERSON. As the number die, will the hon. Minister increase the amount?

Mr. CARON. It has been decided to keep the limit at $30

Mr. PATERSON. You estimate 600 are still alive?

Mr. CARON. Yes; last year we had 784.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This was introduced originally by the late Government. We intended, at the time, allowing $50, believing there was only 1,000 entitled to the pension, but it turned out that the air of Canada is so conducive to longevity that there were 3,000 instead of 1,000 as, according to actuary statistics, we thought there would be.

Mr. VAIL. How many have been put on the roll last year?

Mr. CARON. There have been few applications.

Mr. VAIL. It is high time this was stopped. The ex-Minister of Finance has stated we did not suppose that in the first instance there would be more than a thousand persons; for eight years it has been now going on, yet the amount is still $18,000. A man to be entitled to this must be ninety-years of age, and it is hardly possible there are six or seven hundred people of that age out of the number engaged in the war of 1812.

Mr. CARON. That is precisely what I told the hon. gentleman last year, when he came then to have a few new names put on the list.

Mr. VAIL. But these men were applicants in 1877, and if they were entitled to it then, surely, if living, they would be entitled to it to-day.

Mr. CARON. That is why I do not want to make any promise. If the hon. gentleman considers these two men should be put on the roll, they will, should proper representation be made, be put on the list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. gentleman give back pay when a claim is entertained?

Mr. CARON. No back pay.

Mr. PATERSON. If a claim is valid it should apply to back years. Because a man did not attend to his claim, he should not lose the pension he would have got in previous years had he attended to it.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. Minister of Militia is quite right with regard to placing of new names on the roll. If the proposition of the hon. member for Digby were carried out, these gentlemen, no matter how much they might be entitled to it, would be ruled out by such a proceeding, and I hope the Minister will not adopt any such hard rule. There may possibly be some old gentlemen who have no friends to direct their attention to the fact that the Government are making these annual payments, and it would be unfair that they should continue to be deprived of them because they have not been in a position to take advantage of them. If the hon. member for Digby were correct, these gentlemen who were not fortunate enough to have anyone to present their claims, would be deprived. I think probably my hon. friend from East Elgin is presenting a case which is a deserving one, and I think the Minister should not be placed in a position to draw the rule so straight as to prevent his considering such a case.

Mr. MILLS. No doubt if any parties, who are entitled to pensions and have not hitherto applied for them, can show they are entitled to them, they should receive them; but the fact that eight years have gone by is ground for a strong suspicion that they are not entitled to them, and it will require all the more careful examination in the office to see that the application is genuine. Seventy years have gone by since the war of 1812-15 closed, and the parties must have been more than sixteen years of age at the time, so that they must be now nearly ninety years of age, and it is rather extraordinary that so large a number, looking at the Census return of our population, are still alive. We must take care that the same condition of things does not exist here as exists in the neighbouring Republic, where the number of those who have been engaged in the military service increases from year to year instead of diminishing.

54. Compensation to pensioners in lieu of land.... $5,120 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this about military asylum pensions, put in on the opposite side of the page, for the first time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is statutory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the nature of it? I do not understand it exactly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that was for the Quebec hospital.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about the superannuation allowances? $10,000 additional are demanded under the Statute, or supposed to be. That has increased tremendously fast under the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is statutory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know, but we usually discuss it under the pensions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is merely an estimate. That is not a vote at all.

Mr. PAINT. I thought, when any hon. member addressed the Ministry, he usually stood up to do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; the hon. member is the sitting member.

MILITIA.

55. Salaries, military branch and district staff... $19,800 00
56. Brigade Majors' salaries, transport expenses, &c. 17,500 00

Mr. BERGIN. I would ask the Minister whether it is his intention to increase the pay of the district staff? There is a very general feeling, not only amongst the members of the active militia, but through the country, that the district staff is not sufficiently paid, and I must say that I was very much struck by an article in the Montreal *Star*, which has been copied by most of the papers throughout the country, and copied approvingly, which points out the very curious fact that subaltern officers in the new militia schools established last year are receiving a salary almost, if not quite equal to that of the Deputy Adjutants General, and I find that the head of the Artillery School, the Inspector of Artillery, receives $1,800, $600 more than the others, with an allowance of $500, the same as the Deputy Adjutants-General receive. Now, these officers are, many of them, men who have seen service, men who have been wounded in the service of the country; they are skilful men, able men, highly educated men, thoroughly competent for the positions they occupy, and it does seem somewhat anomalous that they should not receive a larger salary than that of subaltern officers, men who never wore the uniform of Her Majesty until they were appointed the other day. I am sure this has been an entire oversight on the part of the Minister, and I feel quite satisfied that he will be pleased that we have directed his attention to it, for I am quite sure, if he had noticed it, he would have placed the Deputy Adjutants-General upon a better footing. The salary that is given to them now is the salary that was given to them years ago, and surely, after such lengthened service, with the experience they have had, they ought to get a larger sum than they do now; and it ought not to be overlooked that these gentlemen were removed from their homes a couple of years ago, and put to a great additional expense, and some of them are put to great expense to keep their homes in good order, so that they may not go to destruction until their return, not being able to rent them to advantage. I hope the Minister will give his attention to this matter.

Mr. HALL. I am able to confirm what has been said in reference to these officers. The Brigade Major in the dis-

trict I represent was put to a great deal of expense in consequence of the expectation that he would be removed. He was notified that he would be required to remove, and he made his preparations, and sold his furniture, and closed up his house. He was not, however, removed, and he was obliged to live for some months in a hotel, and then to take a house and furnish it again. No allowance has been made to him for that, in which he must have been subjected to a great deal of loss. I can confirm the statement of my hon. friend as to the fact of these Brigade Majors deserving an increase in their pay. They are gentlemen of the highest social position, they are gentlemen of rank in the military profession, and they are obliged to occupy a position as gentlemen in the community and should have a salary commensurate with that position, in order to maintain proper respect from their men. I hope the Minister of Militia will see his way to do something for them and improve their salaries.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I quite concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), and I think it was a great mistake when the Minister of Militia adopted the rule of changing these officers, and limiting their period of service to five years. It was following a precedent in the British service which, even if it was justifiable there, there was no reason for adopting here. In the second military district, for instance, it takes the officer a year or two to know the district. The district is so large that it takes quite that time to thoroughly understand the country, and when he does understand it and knows his duty, he is sent to another district and has the whole process to go over again. The system is a bad one, and entails great hardship on these officers, and puts them in a far worse position than they occupied before. In fact I have often thought, and under the present regulations, I feel still more strongly, that no men in the public service are worse paid according to their services, than the district staff in the various districts throughout the Dominion. I think the best thing to do would be, in the first place, to repeal that order, and as long as a man is doing his duty to let him remain where he is. The idea of expecting a Brigade Major, for a salary of $1,200, to be shifted about every five years, or who is liable to be removed at the end of that time, I think is putting him in a position altogether unreasonable and altogether different from that of the officers in any other branch of the service. I venture to say there is no department in the service where men are so little paid in proportion to the requirements of their position, in proportion to their duties and to the position which they are required to occupy in society. If this Statute is to be continued, I think it is only fair and reasonable that the salaries should be considerably increased.

Mr. CARON. As far as the staff is concerned, I can bear willing testimony to their efficiency. I think we have a staff which we may well be proud of. But the hon. gentleman will remember that in the Militia Bill of last year the salary of the Deputy Adjutants-General was fixed at $1,200 a year. After discussion the House thought that salary was sufficient, and I am sorry to say that at present it is not the intention of the Government to increase it. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), who has spoken on the matter, has referred to one of the Brigade Majors. I can merely tell that hon. gentleman that that Brigade Major got the same allowance as was granted to other Brigade Majors under the regulation that was passed before I took charge of the Department.

Mr. BERGIN. Perhaps the Minister of Militia would explain why it is that the Commandant of a school, an inferior officer to the Adjutants-General commanding a district, should be paid $2,924, when an Adjutant-General gets only $1,700, the First Lieutenant gets $1,350, and the Second Lieutenant, who acts as Adjutant, gets $1,530, though they are inferior officers.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that the officers of the schools are paid according to rank. These officers are kept continually busy at the various schools, and they receive the same pay as any other officer in actual service; whereas, Deputy Adjutants-General have a salary fixed by Statute, and are not paid according to rank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still it does appear unreasonable that a Brigade Major or a Colonel, many of whom are men of considerable experience, should be receiving a smaller salary than inferior officers—an officer, for instance, of the grade of Lieutenant or thereabouts, attached to one of these new schools. It is a state of things which must produce considerable heart-burning, as hon. gentlemen have remarked. Take the case of such officers as we have to-day in the Public Service, officers like Colonels Worsley, Mattice, Maunsell, and Colonel Baker, who is now, I suppose, in the hon. gentleman's own Department, and four or five other gentlemen who are all well known to us, and who are officers of considerable standing and experience, and it does seem an unreasonable thing that such men should be practically worse treated than those who are attached to these schools; particularly if it be true, as I have heard, that two or three of the officers are very young men who have had no experience at all until they received commissions from the present Government. If I am not misinformed, one or two of these persons, who have been appointed to these military, cavalry and infantry schools, have had to be sent to some of the garrisons to be instructed in the rudiments of their profession before they became instructors of others. I do not think it is a creditable state of things.

Mr. BERGIN. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman's remarks would convey a false impression as to the officers of the military schools. We know that some Deputy Adjutants-Generals who had seen service in the Crimea were sent home to receive instructions before they took charge of these schools, and men who have commanded districts in this country.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) has called attention to the discrepancy in the salaries. I agree with him in thinking there must be something wrong. Either the Colonels in the schools are paid too high or the Brigade Majors are paid too low. It may be that the Government are satisfied as to the propriety of paying the Commandants of the new schools the salary they do, in which case they are undoubtedly underpaying the Brigade Majors. We must recollect that on the Brigade Major largely devolves the responsibility and the management of the force for the district. His responsibility is not only higher in rank than a Commandant, but it is usually greater, especially if he should have occasion, unfortunately, to call out the force for active service. We must keep that contingency in view, and we must keep men in those positions who will be qualified to fill them efficiently in case of active service, We cannot expect to retain men qualified to act as Brigade Majors for active service for the present salaries. I believe the gentlemen in question are not disposed to ask anything unreasonable in the way of an increase—I do not know whether they have asked for it at all—but I have reason to suppose that a moderate increase, sufficient to cover the cost of renting a house, and other incidental expenses necessitated by moving about from place to place, will satisfy them and make them well contented with their position. Speaking for myself only, and as a member of the Opposition, I may say I should have no objection to seeing the salary increased.

Mr. CARON. My hon. friend is mistaken about the pay of Lieutenants and Captains. A Lieutenant gets $2 a day,

and a Captain in the new schools gets $3. A Commandant gets a higher pay than a Brigade Major. However, the salaries have been fixed by Statute, and I cannot change the law.

Mr. CASEY. It is not so much a question of salary as of allowance, and we have had it made very clear to us lately that these are two very distinct things. I fancy it is possible to increase the allowances for rent, &c, made to these Brigade Majors, without changing the law. In regard to salaries in these schools, the Minister points out that a Lieutenant only gets $3 a day. But I think they get their allowances.

Mr. CARON. They have their rations and barracks.

Mr. CASEY. If they are married, do they not get extra pay for these?

Mr. CARON. No; they get no extra pay. If a married officer lives outside the barracks, he gets no allowance for rent, and gets no more than if he remained in the barracks. He gets rations over and above his daily pay and barrack accommodation. If he chooses to live in the barracks, he gets that accommodation; if not, he gets no allowance in lieu of barrack accommodation.

Mr. CAMERON (West Middlesex). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if all the officers appointed to these new schools are graduates of military schools?

Mr. CARON. I will answer that question when we come to the vote for those schools. I desire to strike out one Brigade Major from the item, which will reduce it by $1,200.

Mr. CASEY. Who is the Brigade Major to be struck off?

Mr. CARON. I estimated last year—it was an experiment—to pay a Brigade Major at Kingston. However, we considered it is not necessary to fill the office, and I now strike out the amount.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Is that one less?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Have two districts been combined to secure that object?

Mr. CARON. No. In very many instances we combine two or even three districts. Col. Taylor is now in command of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, there being only one Deputy Adjutant-General for the three military districts. In those we considered it necessary to appoint a Brigade Major to each; but in the case of Kingston, with a Deputy Adjutant-General and the district not a large one, we considered it unnecessary to have a Brigade Major.

Item reduced by $1,200 and, as amended, agreed to.

56.	Brigade Majors' salaries, transport expenses, &c.	$16,320 00
57.	Ammunition, including artillery ammunition and manufacture of small arm ammunition at the Cartridge Factory at Quebec	55,000 00
	Clothing and great coats	90,000 00
	Military stores	60,000 00

Mr. CARON. The increase of $10,000 is only an apparent increase. Previous to 1884 we issued out to the militia forces for their private practice, and for the various rifle associations, ammunition upon repayment. This ammunition was taken out of the reserve stores which we possessed. Since the establishment of the cartridge factory at Quebec we manufacture, instead of keeping a reserve store. $10,000 are estimated for the purpose of procuring from the factory from 600,000 to 700,000 rounds of cartridge ball ammunition, which is issued on repayment. Before the ammunition is delivered, the party must pay the amount to the credit of the Receiver-General. In 1881-82 the Department paid into the Receiver-General $11,117, in 1882-83, $10,631. Hence it is that we had to provide for the manufacturing of this ammunition, which is issued out, and the price of which is paid into the credit of the Receiver-General. If the amount which we receive for that ammunition were left to the credit of the Militia Department, it would not have been necessary to place this amount in the vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister inform the Committee what it costs to manufacture such small arm ammunition as is usually used by the volunteers.

Mr. CARON. At present it is not possible for the Department to give the exact cost of the ammunition as manufactured in the cartridge factory. The reason why we cannot give it with absolute accuracy is, that the machinery imported from England was not so perfect as we had hoped it to be; consequently, we had to expend a good deal of money in perfecting the machinery. In manufacturing the cartridges we had to employ new hands who have had no experience whatever in the various branches of the manufacture. A good many of the cartridges so manufactured were spoiled and had to be replaced; and consequently the expense at the present time is a little larger than the price at which they can be imported from England. This is $16 per thousand, and we have been issuing cartridges at that price. The head of the factory, however, Major Provost, who went to England and passed through a course of study at Woolwich to acquire all the information necessary to enable him to preside over that branch of the Department, believes that cartridges will be manufactured here just as cheaply as it costs to import them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that $16 per thousand is the cheapest price at which they can be sold.

Mr. CARON. We have been issuing them at that price. If further experience shows that the cost is more than $16, we shall have to increase the price of the cartridges.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The best way in which our volunteer force can be made efficient is by rendering them good marksmen, especially under the alterations in military discipline. It is a considerable tax on those endeavouring to make themselves good marksmen to be obliged to pay $1.60 for every 100 rounds, and it is worth considering whether, in case of associations, wholly composed of members of the force, for the purpose of improving themselves as marksmen, it would not be desirable to sell them cartridges at something below cost. There is no way in which a portion of the militia vote can be better employed. Our militiamen take much trouble and devote considerable time in order to become good marksmen, and it might be fairly considered whether it is not desirable to furnish ammunition at half cost, at least. The Minister would contribute much to the efficiency of the force if he were to agree to such a proposition as this.

Mr. CARON. I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the propriety of giving every possible advantage to Canadian marksmen, and if it is possible for the Department to reduce the cost of cartridges, the cost will diminished to those needing them.

Mr. MILLS. It is a Government manufactory?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman said this increase of $10,000 was only apparent, but I did not quite understand his explanation?

Mr. CARON. This amount which now appears as an increase is paid to the Receiver-General. It is merely a question of book-keeping. We do that because we must receive that amount to pay for the 600,000 or 700,000 rounds of ammunition which we manufacture. That is what is

required to manufacture it. Previous to this, we had a reserve store of ammunition, and the amount of money we received was paid into the Receiver-General's Office, as it is to-day. The ammunition required is 500,000 rounds of ball cartridge, and 500,000 rounds of blank cartridge per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been the cost of the cartridge factory altogether?

Mr. CARON. The amount of money expended came to between $45,000 and $47,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did that cover the buildings?

Mr. CARON. No; buildings were not put up, as the catridge factory is established in the old artillery barracks; but the cost of repairs is over and above the amount I have named, though I do not know the exact amount, as the work was done by the Public Works Department.

Mr. MILLS. What is the entire cost to the country?

Mr. CARON. The machinery cost, as I have stated, between $45,000 and $47,000; the staff, of course, is outside of that. Major Provost is at the head of the establishment, and receives $1,400 a year. He has a person under him who was imported from Woolwich.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Has any expenditure been made last year for machinery?

Mr. CARON. Not for new machinery, though some expense has been incurred in perfecting existing machinery.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman stated that $25,000 was the cost of making 1,000,000 rounds of ball cartridge and 500,000 of blank ammunition; does that include salaries?

Mr. CARON. That includes everything.

Mr. CASEY. I think it would have been better to put the salaries separately. What is Major Provost's salary.

Mr. CARON. He receives $2.50 per day. He has his quarters in addition, and is allowed rations.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Has he received that salary since the factory was established?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I notice that in a return to the House, he was reported as being an officer of "A" Battery, and as such getting no salary as superintendent of the factory.

Mr. CARON. He was paid in "A" Battery, and was transferred from there to the cartridge factory, after which he did not receive his pay in connection with the latter. But he has been transferred from the battery to the cartridge factory, and he receives $2.50 per day.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Has his place in "A" Battery been taken by someone else?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Is he getting any other pay?

Mr. CARON. No other pay.

Mr. CASEY. Does this represent the total cost of running the factory.

Mr. CARON. The total cost.

Mr. CASEY. I confess that I have not yet been able to understand the hon. Minister's explanation of this increase of $10,000.

Mr. CARON. This ammunition is for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the force for their private practice, and to supply the Dominion Rifle Association and the other rifle associations all over the country. Last year we had a reserve store from which we drew; but this year we have none. We manufacture every year as we require the ammunition.

Mr. VAIL. Will the hon. gentleman explain the vote of $90,000 for clothing and great coats?

Mr. CARON. It is proposed to secure 5,000 sets of uniform at a cost of $10 per suit, according to the lowest figure I have received, which will make $50,000. Then $40,000 will procure the great coats, at an average cost of $6.00 per coat—about 3,000 for infantry, at $5.89 each; 1,000 cavalry, at $9.60 each; and 2,000 artillery, at $6.54 each. The increase is caused by the fact that the stores got very low. The requirements of the force for the number of men we have, about 37,000, would be one tunic every four years, making 8,000 a year; one pair of trousers every three years, making 12,000 pairs a year; one forage cap every four years, making 8,000 a year; one great coat every five years, making 7,000 great coats a year. In 1880 we had only 5,050 great coats, in 1881 we had 4,896, in 1882 we had none, and in 1883 we got 5,040, consequently, the fact that the stores have got so low and the fact that we have now permanent schools of infantry and cavalry, have obliged me to ask Parliament to increase the vote, so that we shall be able to meet the requirements of the force.

Mr. VAIL. Will the hon. gentleman tell us where the clothing is to come from this year? Is it to be imported or to be made in the country?

Mr. CARON. The intention is to have the clothing made in Canada; and I may say that ever since I have had the honour to preside over the Department of Militia, I have been getting in Canada every article that could possibly be got here. I have formerly explained that some of the clothing could not be manufactured in Canada; but from the experience of last year, I hope that we shall be able to supply every article in the country. The competition is growing keener every year. I hope we shall be able to get Canadian manufactures, made from Canadian material.

Mr. VAIL. Are they furnished by tender?

Mr. CARON. Yes; the lowest tender in every case.

Mr. VAIL. Will it cost more to have them manufactured in Canada, or less?

Mr. CARON. The goods which we are getting in Canada are far superior in quality to the goods which we have so far been importing from England; and although the price may be a little higher, I consider that we get more than value for the extra amount we pay.

Mr. MILLS. I have not been able quite to understand the position taken by the hon. Minister of Militia. He tells us that these goods are a little higher than the imported goods. The Minister of Finance has been preaching to us for the last five years that each year the goods are cheaper than they ever were before. This is a very extraordinary statement for the hon. Minister to make, for he must see that he is embarrassing the Minister of Finance.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They did not pay any duty when they were imported.

Mr. MILLS. They never did pay any duty. Has not the Minister of Finance been telling us all along, that the consumer did not pay the duty? Certainly the hon. gentleman's statement is not reconcilable with the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance. It is extraordinary that there should be an increase of 50 per cent. in the vote, if the goods are cheaper than they ever were before.

Mr. CARON. The great coats are cheaper than the English imported coats. The other coats are from cloth which had to be specially manufactured for the purpose. From what we have been able to ascertain, the expense will

be smaller next year, because last year we had to go to a great deal of expense getting dyes and special men from the United States, to manufacture this cloth.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. member for Bothwell is one of those unfortunate free-traders who can never learn the cases in which the consumer and those in which the producers pays the duty. The other day the hon. gentleman showed remarkable ignorance, for one in his position, on that point, which is essential to the understanding of the Tariff question. With regard to this question of clothing, there is a very great waste in our system of clothing our men; we give our men, on going to camp, the one suit, and in this they do everything—cook, sleep and do fatigue duty. The consequence is, that the suits are worn out in one or two years, and it is almost impossible to get others to use them. One of the great practical difficulties we have in getting men to join the force is, that they are often called on to wear clothing unfit to be worn. The hon. Minister would exercise true economy by providing cheap suits to be used for every duty, except that of parade, and thus the other suits would be kept good for five years.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Is it contemplated to provide the volunteer force with helmets or other head-dress suitable to the climate. There is a very serious defect in that direction in the volunteer force, though it has been, to some extent, remedied. The head-dress worn in the old country may answer well in a damp climate, but for our intense sunshine we require gear which will protect the eyes and the base of the head. Volunteers coming out for a few weeks with their present head-dress, get their heads blistered and their eyes injured. This defect should be remedied, the more particularly, that the present mode of warfare being conducted with long-range weapons, renders the eyesight of greater importance than in previous years, when the fighting was at close quarters, and the result depended very often on the bayonet.

Mr. CARON. We issue only forage caps, or the price of forage caps, which is given as an allowance and is supplemented by whatever amount is required to purchase these helmets.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). What is the annual cost of the clothing, the number of suits worn each year?

Mr. CARON. The annual cost of the clothing and the great coats is $90,000, according to the item.

Mr. CAMERON. That leaves a sum for stores?

Mr. CARON. That is not what I require annually, and it does not provide for anything for stores.

Mr. CAMERON. There is $30,000 more this year than last.

Mr. CARON. Every four years we require to issue new clothing. The amount of money I am now asking is the smallest amount required per annum to keep up a force of 37,000.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Is it proposed to introduce the rubber capo?

Mr. CARON. I am afraid I would have to increase my estimate if I gave those luxuries.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It would not necessarily increase the estimate. The matter is worthy of serious attention. In making retreats and making marches, and in all camping work, these capes are very serviceable, and experience has shown they are the last thing a soldier will part with.

Mr. CASEY. It is possible the rubber coats will save the other clothes to the extent that would compensate for their cost. With regard to the forage caps, I can speek feelingly. I have been in the ranks and never got very much further, and I know what torture a young man, who has been accustomed to wearing a soft hat, is submitted to, when he first puts on these forage caps, and worse still, the Scotch caps, which afford no protection against the sun. Then, I think, if the troops are to be called out at all, the Minister ought to face the music and get them proper head-gear, for it is not safe and often leads to illness, and to weakening of men for life, to compel them to go out without proper head-gear.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I feel quite confident that the better soldiers are prepared for going forward the less necessity there will be for them to retreat, and next to the proper arm, the proper head-dress and clothing to protect them from the weather is of the greatest importance. Of those who are disabled in active service, those who are disabled from exposure in camp and field, are something like five to one of those who are disabled from gun-shot wounds. The best way to guard against retreat is to provide the infantry with some means of quickly entrenching themselves. With the long range weapons now in use, I believe that, in the first war that occurs among civilized nations, that one will conquer who is the best earth digger.

Mr. McNEILL. There has been a great deal of complaint in reference to the forage cap, and my attention has been called to it in my own riding. The men are very anxious indeed that the Minister should give them helmets instead of forage caps. They complain of the suffering they have to endure from the cap, and are anxious that some better head-gear should be provided for them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand the Minister asks for tenders for clothing. I would ask whether tenders are asked for the cloth by itself and other tenders for the making, or tenders are asked for the garment ready made; and also whether he receives many tenders, and whether he receives them from distant towns and cities or mostly from the city of Ottawa?

Mr. CARON. We called for tenders for a certain quantity of tunics and great coats complete, made up. We advertised in the papers in all the large centres, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, all over the country in fact, and out of the tenders we received we selected the lowest one.

Mr. PATERSON. How many tenders did you receive?

Mr. CARON. I could not say exactly.

Mr. PATERSON. From different cities?

Mr. CARON. Yes; from different cities, and we received a large number. Taking the great coats and the clothing, I think we received twenty-five or thirty.

Mr. PATERSON. How is it managed—is there a sample garment?

Mr. CARON. Yes; there is a sealed pattern sent to the various Deputy Adjutants-General. The tenderers go to the Brigade Office and inspect the sealed pattern, and make their tenders upon it.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Has any of the clothing been supplied?

Mr. CARON. Already? Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. Subject to inspection?

Mr. CARON. Yes; everything is subject to inspection. No single article is accepted in the stores until it is inspected by the inspector appointed by the Government. A quantity of clothing has been received and passed by the inspector; I could not say how much; it is coming in every day.

Mr. CAMERON. How long since these more recent contracts have been awarded?

Mr. CARON. I think about the last days of October, or the beginning of November.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has any one outside of Ottawa been successful in making the lowest tender?

Mr. CARON. Yes. In Montreal, O'Brien and Co. have had the great coats; and Auclair & Gagné the uniforms, in Ottawa, as the lowest tenderers.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Has the question been considered of supplying some sort of undressed uniform for the volunteers who are called out for partial service?

Mr. CARON. The suggestion is a very good one, and will receive the consideration of the Department.

Mr. CAMERON. I am entirely in sympathy with the suggestion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) on that subject. I know it would be of service to the country, and it would be a saving to the country as well, if such a course were adopted. Young men come in from the country who are not accustomed to the tight fitting uniform which is usually supplied. Besides, it is much too heavy for service at the time of the year when the volunteers are usually called out.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). The member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has made a suggestion which, I think, the Minister will find a difficulty in carrying out. He made use of a nautical expression, and suggested that provision should be made for head-gear. Now that, as I understand it, consists of flying-jib guys and martingales, and all sorts of things. The Minister of Militia will have to refer that to the Minister of Marine, who will be able to speak more definitely upon that subject.

Mr. CASEY. The late Major-General said there were lots of guys of all sorts in the militia.

Mr. VAIL. What about military stores?

Mr. CARON. There is an increase of $10,000. It is required for general services in connection with stores, fuel, gas, transport of stores, arms and ammunition, &c., pay of labourers, repairs to stores, &c., $15,000; for 500 tents, at $18 each, $9,000; 50 sets of saddlery, for cavalry, at $30 each, $1,500; articles required for repairs to harness of field batteries, the harness in many cases being worn out and unfit for service, $2,500; accoutrements, belts, haversacks, squad bags, knapsacks, and general equipment for militia, $22,000; 5,000 blankets, at $2 each, $10,000, making a total of $60,000. The amount placed in the Estimates for military stores is required to enable the Department to replace the articles now worn out and unserviceable. Many of these articles, such as tents, saddlery, harness, accoutrements, &c., &c., having been in use for a number of years, are now completely worn out and must be replaced by new and serviceable articles.

Mr. VAIL. The accounts last year show two items, aggregating $12,000, for blankets. Were they obtained by public or by private contract?

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will remember that this matter came before Parliament last Session, and I told him that from peculiar circumstances, as the militia was going out at a late period in the year, and as the number of blankets we had in store was only sufficient to give each man one blanket, the Department had not sufficient time to call for tenders, and they had to procure these blankets without calling for tenders last year. But since then, tenders have been called for. The whole question came before Parliament last year, and the papers were asked for, and I brought down every letter and document connected with the purchase of these blankets.

Mr. VAIL. I wish to get some information about the price paid for clothing and blankets. In 1875 the Department was obliged to purchase, at Halifax, a number of blankets for Prince Edward Island, and the average price paid per pound was 33⅓ cents. But I find in the items of the Public Accounts for the year that the hon. gentleman paid 55 cents per pound for his blankets. Now, that seems to me to be a very important difference, and I do not know how it can be explained except, upon the principle that goods have increased very much in price.

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman could say that the blankets for which he paid 33⅓ cents per pound, were of exactly the same quality as those for which we paid 55 cents per pound, of course he would be quite right, but I am very certain the hon. gentleman is not right. The blankets which we purchased last year were much superior to any blankets which we ever had before in the Department, even when we were importing them from England. As for the increase in the other items, I may repeat to the hon. gentleman that it arose from the fact that the stores which we had were very old and some of them were perfectly useless. Last year we had representations from almost every camp, complaining that the tents did not protect the men against the rain. It was necessary to replace the tents, and I am now providing for that.

Mr. CAMERON (West Middlesex). Have applications been made for knapsacks?

Mr. CARON. The sum of $22,000 is for the purpose of getting belts, haversacks and other accoutrements which are absolutely required for the force.

Mr. CASEY. Has the hon. gentleman given attention to the modern system of accoutrements?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. He is now aware that in England a much improved method of hanging the knapsacks and side arms now prevails. Is it of that sort that the new ones are to be?

Mr. CARON. Yes. I hope we may be able to get the Oliver pattern, or an improvement upon it.

Resolutions to be reported, Committee to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE *DEBATES*.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) from the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the present Session, presented the following as their Third Report:—

The Chief Reporter having submitted a letter, enclosing an application from Mr. J. W. Mathewson, (copies of which letter and application are hereto appended), asking that he be remunerated for his services in repairing and keeping in order the caligraph writing machines, used by the Official Reporting Staff—the Committee have carefully considered the same, and would recommend that the application be granted, and that Mr. Mathewson be paid the sum of $130 per Session for that service, such payment to commence with the present Session. The Committee would also recommend that one additional caligraph writing machine be purchased for the use of the House in connection with the Official Reporting.

He also presented the following as the Fourth Report:—

The Committee have had before them an application from the members of the Official Reporting Staff, respecting the remuneration they receive for their services—and have after carefully considering the same, decided to recommend, that commencing with next Session, the

salaries of the members of the Official Reporting Staff be $3,000 per annum.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that on every Monday for the remainder of the Session Government business will take precedence of other business after Routine Proceedings.

Mr. BLAKE. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman did not intend to press this motion at any rate until after next Monday. As I have had occasion to point out already, the hon. gentleman took the private members' days at a very early period this Session, for the purpose of considering the Canadian Pacific measure, which prevented the business in the hands of private members from being proceeded with; and almost immediately after the conclusion of that debate, he took Thursday. The result has been that private members have never had, within my experience, so little time for their business as this Session. There are now between ninety and one hundred items on the papers, and matters in the hands of private members—between twenty and thirty orders, and between sixty and seventy notices of motion; and I think we ought to have next Monday to clear off the notices of motion. I would suggest, as I have suggested before, that the paper should be gone over, with the view of disposing of undebated notices on that day; and after that I think there would be less objection to the hon. gentleman's motion passing—even so, with this qualification, that I think the hon. gentleman should make the modification that Government business should come after questions. These questions afford the only means we have of making enquiries into the conduct of public affairs, and it is very important that we should have that opportunity, which does not take longer than half an hour. I would ask the hon. gentleman, therefore, to alter the motion by making it inapplicable to next Monday, and by providing that when it does apply, it should apply to the order of business after questions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I can go half way for the hon. gentleman. I have no objection to insert, "after routine proceedings, other than questions;" but I think I must persist in my motion to take Monday. The hon. gentleman states that there are a great number of notices of motion. Well, Parliamentary practice makes it absolutely necessary that motions in the hands of private members should be made early, in order that they should not interfere with public business, which, according to the practice both here and in England, means, as a rule, measures in the hands of the Government. I think it is rather unfortunate that such has been the practice, but we cannot help it. It should therefore be pressed on the minds of members, to move any motion which they have to bring before Parliament as early as possible, because, we all know, for the first three or four weeks of the Session, it is impossible that the Government measures can be ready until after that time, for the consideration of Parliament. We met on the 17th of January, and I find that the first notice of motion was dated on the 3rd of March. There is no reason why the notices of motion should not be made a month sooner than they have been. If the hon. gentleman will look over the notices of motion, he will see there is no reason why they should not be made a month sooner, and if there is one thing that the House has settled more than another, it is that a three months' Session is the utmost extent to which it should run. If we wish to keep within that limit, we must, after giving in the first part of the Session full opportunity to members of the House, not connected with the Government, to introduce measures, take as many days as possible. However, I have no objection that in this motion questions should be saved. As to the calling over the notices of motion at the end of the sitting, and taking up those which are objectionable, I have found, after a good deal of experience, that the moment one motion is opposed, the member interested in that motion would oppose everything else.

Mr. MILLS. It is very unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should persist in this motion. If there is any class of members who should be ready with the business they intend bringing before Parliament, it is the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury Benches. There is no excuse for the practice which has grown up under the leadership of the hon. gentleman of submitting important Government measures at a very late period of the Session. The hon. gentleman will remember that in the early part of the Session, while the question of the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway was under discussion, the Government took the day at the disposal of private members, so that almost from the beginning the time of Parliament has been wholly in the hands of the Administration. It is well known that many matters come to the knowledge of hon. members after the measures have been here some time, and they take the earliest opportunity of submitting questions to Parliament after the information to them comes into their possession, so that it is important that Government measures should be brought down in good time; and if there is one class of members who ought to have the opportunity of bringing the questions and measures in their hands under the attention of the House, it is the private members. It does seem to me the Government are acting most unfairly towards the members of the House, and are proposing to stifle the voice of Parliament rather than secure the expression of public opinion.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has occupied a good deal of the time of the House in debating many matters of slight importance, and it is the general opinion of the House that we ought to get through business without more loss of time.

Motion, as amended, agreed to on a division.

AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 67) to make provision for giving effect to the agreement entered into between the Government of Canada and British Columbia. He said: I am very glad to know that the House has been rendered so familiar with this resolution and the proposition contained therein, both through the medium of the press and of the papers already laid on the Table of the House, that it will not be necessary for me, at this late period, to occupy a great deal of the time of the House in stating the grounds upon which we asked the approval of the House to these resolutions. It is well known that in 1871 the terms of union with British Columbia required that the railway should be commenced within two years, and completed within ten years to the coast of that Province; and it is also equally well known that, although due diligence was had by the Government in pushing the surveys, it was found impossible to secure such information as would warrant the location of the line in time to commence the railway within the two years stated in those terms of union. The surveys were pushed with all practicable speed, a very large amount of money was expended in exploring and surveying the very difficult and almost impracticable country, and it was finally decided that a practicable route could be had to the Bute Inlet. In 1873, an Order in Council was passed making Esquimalt, in the Island of Vancouver at Victoria, the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the expectations of the people of Vancouver Island were greatly excited by the prospect of having that harbour made the terminus of the Canadian

Pacific Railway. It was then expected that the line would go to Bute Inlet, and crossing either by ferry or subsequently by a bridge, that the railway would be extended down from that point through Nanaimo to the harbour of Esquimalt. Subsequent surveys proved that a better route could be found to the coast of British Columbia than that proposed by Bute Inlet. I may say, however, that the people of British Columbia becoming exceedingly restless and dissatisfied at the want of that rapid progress which they had been led to expect, agitated very strongly in favour of some additional measure to be taken for the purpose of advancing that work. The result was that a reference was made to the Colonial Minister, Lord Carnarvon, and after a great deal of negotiation and a great deal of explanation, both on the part of the people of British Columbia, the Government of British Columbia, and the Government of Canada, it was finally decided to adopt the recommendations made by Lord Carnarvon for the solution of this question. I need not remind the House that these recommendations of Lord Carnarvon, which were subsequently adopted by the Government of Canada, required not only the construction of the railway from Nanaimo to Esquimalt, but the immediate construction of that portion of the line, required that it should be proceeded with immediately. I will not detain the House by any lengthened reference to those terms, because it is known that, when the Government submitted a proposal to Parliament for the purpose of providing for the construction of the road from Nanaimo to Esquimalt, that measure was defeated, not in this House but, as will be recollected, by the other branch of the Legislature. Subsequently, the Government, in order to meet the difficulty that had thus been encountered, offered to the people of British Columbia, or rather to the Government of British Columbia, in consequence of the unavoidable delays which had taken place, delays which were held to have been extremely injurious to the development, not only of Vancouver Island but of British Columbia generally, the sum of $750,000 in compensation for these delays. An Order in Council was passed to that effect, but the proposal was not accepted by the Government of British Columbia. Then, the Bute Inlet route was finally abandoned by the Government, the Order in Council locating the terminus at Esquimalt was cancelled by the Government—I now refer to the Government of Mr. Mackenzie—and the terminus was fixed at Burrard Inlet. After the change of Government, that Order in Council, cancelling the Order in Council which had provided for the terminus at Esquimalt, was also cancelled, and the adoption of the Bute Inlet route was cancelled, and the subject again thrown open in order that there might be further examination and further consideration as to whether any better line could be obtained; and, as will be remembered, the Government investigated a line that had not previously attracted a great deal of attention, and where it was hoped that we could reach a good harbour in British Columbia at a much smaller cost than would be involved in going to Bute Inlet—I mean Port Simpson—and some delay was caused while that investigation was going forward. The Government of my right hon. friend, however, arrived, after full consideration, at the conclusion that our predecessors had adopted a judicious course, in selecting the terminus for the Canadian Pacific Railway, when they located that terminus at Burrard Inlet, and it will be remembered that, in 1879, a considerable portion the most difficult and important portion of the line going to Burrard Inlet was placed under contract, notwithstanding that, however, the Government of British Columbia were not satisfied with what was being done, and again, as will be remembered, Mr. De Cosmos was sent by that Government as a representative to the Imperial Government, to agitate the question as to the great injury which had been inflicted upon British Columbia, by the delay that had taken place in carrying out the terms of union. The Legislature of British Columbia also cancelled the land grant which had been passed in consequence of the Carnarvon terms, giving a belt of land twenty miles in width on each side of the line from Nanaimo to Esquimalt, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of that portion of the line. They incorporated a company for the purpose of constructing the line—a private company—and made an appropriation of lands to them for the purpose. They believed that they would be able with these lands to obtain the construction of the line. That belief, however, proved not to be well founded, and their efforts in that direction failed. Difficulties also presented themselves in connection with the question of the land grant which had been originally appropriated under the terms of union for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Legislature of British Columbia had been called upon and had appropriated the lands on the route extending from Tête Jaune Cache to the Fraser, and so down to Bute Inlet; and a difficulty arose as to whether the Government were entitled, after the change of location down to the Kamloops District, and the pass by the Kicking Horse, to change the location of this land which had been appropriated. Other difficulties arose in considering the question of the twenty mile belt to which the Canadian Government was entitled on each side of the line for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A considerable portion of land within that belt—some 800,000 acres—had been already appropriated to other purposes, and questions arose as to in what shape the land should be taken. It was found, owing to the location of the land by the gorges of the Fraser, that a question arose as to whether the land was to be horizontal or perpendicular, as in many places you would pass a mile or a long distance from the railway without reaching any land available for cultivation. Those questions were presented and made the subject of discussion between Mr. Trutch, the agent of the Dominion Government, and the Government of British Columbia, and that Government finally made a proposal to the Government of Canada for the solution of these various questions. That was in 1883, and the result of those proposals was that a new Act was passed, again appropriating the land in the twenty mile belt on each side of the line, on a new arrangement, which will be described a little later on, in the Bill which has recently passed in the Legislature of British Columbia, by which it was proposed to appropriate about 1,920,000 acres of land, described with metes and bounds, along the coast from Esquimalt or the neighbourhood of Esquimalt to Nanaimo, and above Nanaimo in the region of Comox. My right hon. friend and myself, to whom that despatch of the Government of British Columbia was referred, reported a scheme of adjustment which is the scheme which, I am happy to say, has practically been arrived at, as stated in the resolutions now before the House. I may, in connection with this question, remind the House that, under the first terms of union, we had agreed to pay the interest upon $400,000 to assist in the construction of the graving dock, and subsequently, as the result of negotiations, when it was found not practicable to obtain the construction of the graving dock in that way, it was decided to appropriate $250,000 as a contribution towards the construction of the graving dock as the work proceeded, the Government of British Columbia undertaking to make a contract, and being in a position to receive the aid of £50,000 sterling which was to be contributed by the Imperial Government. A contract under these arrangements was made by the Government of British Columbia for the construction of the work, but difficulties were encountered and it was ultimately found that the amount at their disposal would not be sufficient to secure the completion of the work. Its progress was slow and unsatisfactory, and as these resolutions indicate, it was decided, for the purpose of settling the whole

of these questions, of disposing of all the difficulties in reference to the change of the original alignment to one which would be infinitely more valuable to the Dominion Government, by the present line through the Kamloops District, and for the settlement of the question of the amount that had already been appropriated by the Local Government out of the twenty mile belt on each side, of their line, for the purpose of meeting the question that had been so long and so strongly agitated by the Government of British Columbia in regard to the injury which that Province had suffered from the delay in carrying out the terms of union, it was decided to offer that Province the sum of $750,000 towards the construction of the railway from Nanaimo to Esquimault, to take over the graving dock, paying the expenditure of $250,000 that had been made by the Government of British Columbia, and receiving from that Province a grant of 3,500,000 acres of land lying in the Peace River District, on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains. That in substance is the proposal which is now submitted for the approval of the House. I may say, Sir, that as we were not able by telegraph to arrange in time, and satisfactorily, the legislation required on the part of the Dominion Parliament and the Legislature of British Columbia, my colleague, the Minister of Justice, was deputed to go to British Columbia, and to enter into arrangements with the Province, subject to the approval of the Legislature of the Province of British Columbia, and the approval of this Parliament, carrying out substantially the terms which had been recommended in the report to Council by my right hon. friend, the then Minister of the Interior, and myself, as Minister of Railways and Canals. That object, I am happy to say, was attained; the Government of British Columbia and the Minister of Justice were enabled to arrange with a company composed of one of the most influential and able capitalists of the city of Victoria, Mr. Dunsmuir, and a number of associates, some within, and others outside the Province, in the cities of San Francisco and New York, capitalists whom the Government of British Columbia believed to possess undoubtedly the means of vigorously carrying this work to completion. This contract was arranged and a deposit of $250,000 by that Company was made satisfactorily to the Government of British Columbia, for the purpose of securing the prompt carrying out of this work. Under these circumstances the Legislature of British Columbia have passed an Act providing for carrying out the agreement entered into between the Minister of Justice, with the authority of the Government of Canada, and the Government of British Columbia, for the various purposes to which I have referred; and it is believed that if this Parliament assents, as I have no doubt it readily will, to the propositions contained in these resolutions, we shall have disposed once and for ever of all questions in regard to the past that have arisen between the Province of British Columbia and the Government of Canada, and that we shall have provided for the prompt and efficient completion of a graving dock there at not a very great additional cost beyond that which was contemplated by the Government; that we shall have secured by means of the valuable tract of lands given by the Province of British Columbia, and the $750,000 long ago offered by our predecessors to the Government of British Columbia in compensation for delays in connection with the progress of the Canadian Pacific Railway; I say it will be found that we will not only have secured that, but at the same time we will have acquired a very valuable tract of land lying to the east of the Rocky Mountains, adjacent to, and in connection with, our own prairie country, which can be settled and which can be administered and dealt with more effectively, I believe, by a Government on this side of the mountains than by the Government of British Columbia, on account of the barriers which those mountains interpose to communication between the two sections of the country. I believe, Sir, that the proposals which are contained in the resolutions will commend themselves to this House as being wise and just proposals. I am sure we all recognize the great importance of the construction of a railway between Nanaimo and Esquimalt. It is well known that although it is somewhat rocky and precipitous, and, to a considerable extent, barren country, there are valuable coal mines contained within that area; and I have been told by some of our friends from British Columbia that they have objected to the terms of this proposal because it was handing over to a company the development of these mines. But it must not be forgotten that, valuable as are these coal areas in Vancouver Island, they have lain for a long time in a comparatively undeveloped state. With the exception of Mr. Dunsmuir's mine, and another one which has not been very successful, I believe that up to this moment, practically, very little has been done in developing those coal areas. We have reason to believe—in fact I am informed by the able Premier of British Columbia, who is now here, that he has applications for large tracts of coal mining areas believed to possess very valuable coal mines outside of the section that is covered by these resolutions. Under these circumstances, if the result of these proposals is to meet all possible grounds of complaint on the part of our fellow citizens in British Columbia, if at the same time by a contribution of a comparatively small sum it is to secure practically the carrying of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to the harbour of Esquimalt to the city of Victoria; if it is to secure the prompt and successful development of the great coal industries of that country, and if it is to secure the prompt completion of a valuable graving dock at the harbour of Esquimalt, I think the House will agree with me that the arrangements that are made commend themselves to the judgment of this House as they will, I am satisfied, commend themselves to the approval of the people of this country generally. I do not believe, Sir, that it is possible to over-estimate the enormous advantage to Canada, to say nothing of British Columbia alone, of the rapid and prompt completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Burrard Inlet and railway extension from Nanaimo down to the Harbour of Esquimalt, with the corresponding development of that country, and the completion of a great line of interoceanic communication. Although a large portion of British Columbia is of a mountainous character—I will not say a sea of mountains—but although it is somewhat of a mountainous character, we all know that there is a large amount of soil, even on Vancouver Island, of a very rich and valuable description. We all know that British Columbia is possessed of sources of inherent wealth in the minerals of that country that are of incalculable value. We all know that with the delicious climate of British Columbia, I use the term advisedly, not simply the delicious but I might also say the incomparable climate,—it only requires easy and ready means of access to attract hundreds of thousands of people at an early day to that country, where they will find every attraction which settlers or persons seeking homes in any part of the world can desire. We know that the rivers teem with fish; that the forests, and they are magnificent forests, abound with game; and all that is necessary to open up that country and give to Canada the advantage and benefit of the rapid development of that Province, possessing such great and inherent resources of wealth as it does, is by the terms provided in this resolution to carry down, not only the Canadian Pacific Railway to Burrard Inlet on the main line, as already provided for, but by opening up the island by this railway, to infuse the same amount of energy and enterprise in the development of that section of country as the main land will enjoy from the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Under these circumstances, Sir, I have no hesitation in commending these resolutions to the acceptance of this House as settling all those vexed ques-

tions that have arisen between British Columbia and Canada upon a permanent and secure footing; but, at the same time, provided by a comparatively small expenditure of public money for the development of a most important section of the this Dominion in a mode that which perhaps it would be very difficult to secure it in any other way. I will not detain the House by going minutely into the details that are contained in these propositions, because they are fully stated in the resolutions which every hon. member holds in his hands. But I am quite prepared to give the fullest information with respect to any point in this arrangement which may be asked by any hon. member.

Mr. HOMER. It is with regret, Mr. Speaker, that, owing to the conditions contained in the agreement on which the resolution is based, I cannot give it my support. It was supposed, that after twelve months' deliberation on the negotiation between the Dominion Government and the Government of British Columbia, the result would have been some compensation to that Province for the delay which has occurred in carrying out the terms of union. But, Sir, instead of that Province receiving any compensation according to this agreement, it is being relieved of property consisting of lands, timber, coal, and other minerals to the value of $20,000,000, for which the Province is to receive a railway, seventy miles in length, involving a cost of about $2,250,000. It is true that the British Columbia Government have sanctioned this measure; but notwithstanding they have sanctioned it, it is our duty, as representatives of the Province, to consider the agreement arrived at. And let me strip this question of all the superfluous matters with which the Minister of Railways has surrounded it, and come down to the main points, which are three: (1) The graving dock, (2) the railway and coal lands, and (3) the 3,500,000 of acres of land in the Peace River Country. It was hoped that during the negotiations between the two Governments, they would have recognized that a very serious error was committed in connection with the terms of union, and that is the locating of the graving dock in its present exposed position in the harbour of Esquimalt. There is but a narrow strip of land lying between that dock and the waters of the Straits of Fuca, by which an enemy's ship could approach within a very short distance and blow the whole structure to atoms. When the Minister of Railways, during his visit to British Columbia, inspected the location chosen for the dock, he must have noticed that it was in a very exposed position, and it is the opinion of competent engineers that the dock should have been located in the harbour of Burrard Inlet, where there are many natural advantages for the construction of a dock, and where it could be located sufficiently distant from the outer water so that neither shot nor shell from an enemy's ship could possibly reach it, and where it could be constructed for a less sum than will be necessary to complete the dock in its present position. There is another reason why the dock should be constructed at Burrard Inlet. That is already one of the principal shipping ports in the Province; it is the port for the shipment of lumber abroad; it is also the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which when completed must make that port the great Dominion commercial emporium on the Pacific, thereby creating sufficient business to make the dock a paying concern. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of the House, I will occupy about five minutes in reading two or three extracts from a paper that was read before the United Service Institution on the 6th April, 1883, by a gentleman with whom many of us are well acquainted,—I refer to Major-General Laurie, who was Deputy Adjutant-General in British Columbia some two years ago, and who while there gave his attention to the examination of the harbours on that coast for the purpose of seeing where harbours, docks, ordnance yards, &c., should be constructed. Speaking of Esquimalt navy dock, he said:

"The history of this yard affords an amusing instance of how we 'drift' in our arrangements. When during the Crimean War the English and French squadrons united for the purpose of making the disastrous attack on Petropaulofski, the then Russian arsenal in the Pacific; our naval authorities obtained the use of a house on a point of land at the entrance of Esquimalt Harbour, and fitted it up as a hospital; from this beginning our naval yard has grown, and in a most unsuitable and exposed place, actually on the spit of land that divides the outside water, the Royal Roads, from the harbour; as if to encourage and invite hostile intentions; and vessels lying in the harbour, instead of in any way being able to cover the dockyard, and protect it with their guns, would have it between them and the assailants, and would actually have to fire over or through the dockyard, in order to assist in its defence."

"A dry dock is in progress of construction close by the naval yard, but at present rate of progress, it will hardly be available for use during the present century."

"But even supposing that Esquimalt were satisfactorily occupied and defended, the most important of our requirements would still be at an enemy's mercy. Nanaimo, to which Colonel Lovell's attention was directed as the source of our coal supply, would not be protected from hostile attack unless independent works were provided. An expedition launched against it from the Puget Sound ports, would not have to pass Esquimalt, and, even if notice of appearance of the expedition were sent to the vessels stationed there, they would but arrive in time to witness the destruction consummated, not to prevent it. With the shipping piers, &c., at Nanaimo destroyed, our vessels would be dependent on sail power—a pleasing condition for our mercantile, as well as our militant, marine. Of course, coal could be stored in quantities under the guns at Esquimalt, but the supply could only be limited, considering risk of loss, certainty of deterioration, and enormous increase of expense; it is therefore in all respects desirable to maintain Nanaimo rather than Esquimalt as our coaling depot, where the supply would be cheaper and practically inexhaustible. But it is also important to prevent an enemy not merely stopping our obtaining coal from Nanaimo, but obtaining possession and holding it as a source of supply for his own ships. A garrison shut up in Esquimalt would hardly guard against this, and the vessels there, as stated, could not readily prevent it."

After going into further details he winds up in this manner:

"It is from consideration of all this that I am led to recommend that our naval depot at Esquimalt be abandoned, and that one be established at Burrard Inlet. We are thus enabled to concentrate our available means of defence, making that the centre of our position; it is placed immediately opposite to Nanaimo, and can thus much more readily render assistance to that point than could be given from Esquimalt. In fact, an expedition coming from the south against Nanaimo could be observed, and met on the Straits of Georgia by ships from Burrard Inlet, whilst, as already mentioned, vessels from Esquimalt could only arrive after the mischief was done. Any protecting works considered necessary at Nanaimo could for these reasons be on a smaller scale, as assistance could be obtained so much more quickly."

"My proposed naval depot will be but thirty hours by rail from the fertile plains and great food-producing districts of the Saskatchewan, with which it will of course be in direct telegraphic communication, and as these territories are being rapidly peopled, they would pour down, not merely supplies, but reinforcements of men to assist in repelling any attack in force, an aid that could not be furnished to Esquimalt if our garrison there were attacked, and we had temporarily lost the command of the sea during the absence of our squadron."

These are the views of an independent gentleman, a person who has no private interest to serve, and I think they deserve every consideration at the hands of this Government. The Government are in possession of the reports of Captain Richards, who made the surveys of that coast about twenty-three years ago, Lieutenant Pender, who succeeded that gentleman when he went home, and also of Admiral Farquhar as to the superior advantages of Burrard Inlet; and last, though not least, we have the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways himself made, a few days ago in this House, in the course of his speech on the Canadian Pacific Railway alone:

"Her Majesty's vessels have during the last year surveyed the harbour and their officers have now represented to the Admiralty the propriety of making Port Moody the head-quarters for the Admiralty on the Pacific coast, as being the best location to be found there, and that there is nothing on the Pacific coast superior to it.

I think after all this evidence the Government should hesitate before expending $1,000,000 on that work for it will cost that amount from the time it was begun until it is completed. The sum of $341,000 has already been spent upon it, and at the lowest calculation it will cost $500,000

more to complete the dock. Under these circumstances I think that a further examination should be made with a view of determining the relative merits of the three harbours of Burrard Inlet, Esquimalt and Nanaimo. With regard to this railway to which we are asked to give 2,000,000 acres of land on Vancouver Island, including 450 square miles of coal land, it is true that a small portion of these lands have been alienated, but the greater portion of that which has been alienated is owned by one of the members of the present Company, thus creating the greatest coal monopoly in existence. They do not expect to realize their money from the railway, but out of the coal mines; and in addition to the Dominion Government granting this enormous monopoly, they are to receive $750,000, and the effect will be, to create one of the largest coal monopolies that ever existed—a monopoly far greater than that which existed in Nova Scotia twenty years ago, and which the people of that Province fought so long and so hard against. I do not think that the people of that portion of the country whose prosperity so largely depends on the opening and development of those mines would like to return to the condition of things which existed before that monopoly was abolished. Why then should the Dominion Government render assistance to fasten on British Columbia, and on the Dominion generally, a far more serious monopoly, one which will eventually prove most disastrous to the country. And to whom is the monopoly granted? It has been tried to be made out that they are British Columbia people, but though there are one or two members of the company who belong to our Province, the parties who really control it, are those who now control the Southern Pacific Railway, the Texas Pacific Railway, and the Central Pacific Railway, and I do not think hon. members of this House would be surprised to hear at any time that the Northern Pacific has passed under the control of this company. If these three trans-continental lines, the Equimalt and Nanaimo Railway, and all the productive coal lands on the East coast of Vancouver Island pass under their control, there would remain only one more Pacific lamb for them to encircle with their serpent-like coil—that is to say the Canadian Pacific Railway—thus creating a state of affairs which, in my opinion, would not be very conducive or healthy to the commercial interests of the United States or Canada. With regard to the 3,500,000 acres of land on the Peace River, according to the terms of the Union, the Government of the Dominion of Canada will receive from the Government of British Columbia a belt of land 20 miles wide on each side of the line, or in all, a belt forty miles wide along the entire line running through British Columbia, and for all the lands which were alienated from that belt previous to its being reserved, they are to receive other lands contiguous thereto. Now, it has been stated by the Minister of Railways that there are 800,000 acres of land alienated, but I think the hon. gentleman is under the mark. I think I am nearer correct when I say, that there are nearly 1,000,000 acres of land alienated, previous to the reserve being placed upon it, so that, as I contend, they are receiving 2,500,000 acres more than they were entitled to under the terms of the Union, thereby enabling them to subsidize this company with $750,000. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government really do not insist on pressing these resolutions, and thereby placing the country in a position which, before five years, will be found to be a most disastrous one to our interests. I move in amendment thereto, that all the words after "that" in the said proposed motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

"Considering the changes that have taken place within the last twelve years in the commerce of British Columbia, the increased developments in the coal, lumber and fishing interests, and the final location of the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Port Moody, and having in view the future importance and safety of the Maritime interests of the Dominion of Canada on the Pacific Coast, a Commission be appointed to examine the harbours of Esquimalt, Nanaimo and Burrard's Inlet, and report to the Government as to the best location for a Graving Dock.

"And that a Committee be appointed to take evidence for the purpose of ascertaining more definitely the extent and value of the coal, iron and other minerals, also the timber within the limits of the railway reservation, proposed to be ceded to Messrs. Dunsmuir, Huntington, and others, in aid of the construction of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, and that the said Committee have power to send for persons and papers, and report to this House on the earliest possible date. and that the said Committee be composed of Messrs. Beaty, Dodd, Weldon, Wood (Westmoreland), Mulock, White (Cardwell), Ross, Woodworth and Amyot."

Mr. GORDON. It is with some regret that I find it incumbent upon me to second the amendment, and when the vote comes, to vote for it. The proposition to convey all the coal within the railway belt on Vancouver Island is one that I know to be decidedly opposed by those whom I have the honour to represent. I can remember twenty years ago, when there was only one coal company on Vancouver Island, how that company domineered over everybody with whom they came in contact, is still fresh in the memory of all the early residents of Nanaimo. I am sure that no one wishes to return to that state of affairs, and if these resolutions are carried, that is the effect that they will have upon the whole coal resources of British Columbia. This Bill, which has been passed by the Local Legislature, unless carefully examined by those conversant with the character of the country, will appear very innocent in itself. Unless you look at the geological reports of the Dominion, which I believe to be true and correct, you cannot imagine the value of the property which is being given to a company largely composed of aliens. I regretted, Sir, to hear the hon. Minister of Railways state that these lands had lain so many years undeveloped, when to his own knowledge a reservation was proclaimed by the Canadian Government, preventing any person from obtaining those lands. Mr. Dunsmuir had secured the lands he was mining, prior to the reservation being proclaimed. It is not proper to claim that it requires a large amount of capital to develop these lands. We know that gentlemen have entered into coal mining there with comparatively small amounts of capital, but they had the facility of obtaining Crown grants of their land. The statement that lands are being applied for now outside of this belt, taken in connection with the geological reports, is the highest proof of the correctness of the position we have taken on the question. It will be observed, on reading the geological reports, that from all that was known of the lands outside of this belt, they are considered to be far inferior to the lands lying within the district of Comox. Only a few months ago the Local Legislature—I do not think they did it to prevent development—on the eve of this contract, placed a royalty of 5 cents a ton on all the coal taken outside of this railway belt by any one who endeavoured to open up the inferior measures, thereby making this company a complete monopoly. In order that hon. gentlemen may have some notion of the value of this coal area, which it is proposed to give, I will quote from the report of Mr. Richardson, Geological Surveyor of the Dominion. He states that in the district of Comox the productive coal measures amount to 300 square miles, containing 4,800,000,000 tons; and there are about 10 square miles already alienated, which would leave 290 square miles in that district alone for this company. Then, from the boundaries of Comox southward, there are coal measures extending down to Saanich Inlet, according to the same authority; and it is safe to assume that within that district there are 200 square miles which are going to this company absolutely, forever, without taxation, carrying not the coal alone, and not confined within the boundaries of the shores. But let me read what they are to get:

"All coal, coal oil, ores, stones, clay, marble, slate, mines, minerals and substances whatsoever in or under the lands so agreed to be granted to the said contractors as aforesaid, and the foreshore rights in respect of all such lands as aforesaid, which are hereby agreed to be granted to the said contractors as aforesaid, and border on the sea, together with the privilege of mining under the foreshore and sea opposite any such land, and of mining and keeping for their own use all coal and minerals (herein mentioned) under the foreshore or sea opposite any such lands, in so far as such coal, coal oil, ores, stones, clay, marble, slate, mines, minerals and substances whatsoever, and foreshore rights, are owned by the Dominion Government, for which subsidies the construction of the railway and telegraph line from Esquimalt to Nanaimo shall be completed, and the same shall be equipped, maintained and operated."

It struck me, after reading that clause, that their modesty prevented them from asking the Dominion Government for all the fish that swim in the Gulf of Georgia, and all the fowl that gather there in the winter season. They even followed the geologist under the sea, because it is well known that the gentleman who described that country, referred to the strata of coal that underline the sea to the east of Vancouver, and it is well known that the beds of coal do extend under the sea. It may be said that it would be impossible for this Company to become a monopoly, from the fact that there is another company independent of it. Any one acquainted with the character of some of these men, as developed in the courts of the United States, will know that the fact of their controlling San Franscisco, will enable them to squeeze any company to the wall, and get absolute power. This subject is one, the importance of which is so keenly felt by those I have the honour to represent, that a succession of public meetings were held, at which they denounced the measure as soon as they heard of it. We had no opportunity of forming any conclusion up to the time the Local Legislature met, as to the character of the negotiations going on between the two Governments, and it was only within the last four days that a return was brought down to this House, a return asked for by myself last year, in the month of March, giving us any information as to the manner in which these negotiations were conducted, so that it was not possible for us to understand the nature or the extent of the land given away to this company. I certainly understood the right hon. leader of the Government, at the close of last Session, to state that money and lands would be given to this company as the work progressed on the same terms and conditions as had been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, if I recollect aright, Sir, there would have been no objections to such an arrangement, because it would have provided for alternate sections along the length of the line where the land was suitable. I do not think the people would have felt at all displeased with such an arrangement. There is another phase of this question to which I must refer, and that is the fact that the contract had been given to a private company by the Local Legislature, and that company had failed. If we look into this transaction, we find that Mr. Clemens, the head of the organization, was no more nor less than the chief of construction under Mr. Huntington, on the Southern Pacific Railway, and the general impression on the Pacific Coast is that he forfeited his $10,000 in order that his companions might get a contract that would enable them to build 80 miles less of railway and get a bonus of $750,000 from the Dominion Government. Whether that be true or not, it is not for me to say, but I think there is some truth in it, and I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is a most dangerous thing to place in the hands of these great rival companies the whole coal resources of British Columbia, so far as is known at present. As to the objects these gentlemen have in view, I will read an article from a San Francisco paper, published after this contract was made known:

"The managers of the Central Pacific have completed their preliminary arrangements for building the Vancover Island Railway. The Dominion Government has given them a subsidy of $750,000 cash and the provincial Legislature 2,000,000 acres of land. The road will be 70 miles in length, connecting Nanaimo and Esquimalt. These lands will embrace immense forests of pine, cedar and hemlock, and a vast amount of coal lands not hitherto taken up by speculators. Their expectation is to become coal merchants and supply the San Francisco and other markets on the Pacific Coast, and to such an extent do some think this will be carried, that it is feared our shipping interests will be seriously affected, by making it unprofitable for English wheat ships to bring coal in ballast. Should this occur, the number of wheat ships might be greatly diminished and ocean freights rise so high that the farmers might be compelled to send their crops to Europe by way of New Orleans. Another motive is attributed to the builders of the short road on British territory.'

Now let me call the attention of the House particularly to this threat or proclamation. It is to this effect:

"The straits are so narrow at Nanaimo that they may be crossed by easy ferriage, which would make Victoria the proper terminus of the Canadian Pacific. If, however, the Vancouver Island road were made a link in that scheme, the terminus more properly being fixed at the southern end of the island, the Central Pacific would be in a position to dictate to the Canadian Pacific in respect either to its Asiatic trade or any advantages it might hope to have from trade with San Francisco or other ports of California. The Vancouver line, though so far off and so brief, may therefore, by shrewd management, be made to seriously affect our local interests."—*S. F. Chronicle.*

I will also read another extract from a New York paper with reference to one of the individuals interested in this contract:

"People who have read the Huntington letters attentively, have made the acquaintance of a shrewd, energetic and cheerful character, totally deficient in the moral sense. There is nothing sham about Mr. C. P. Huntington; not a trace of hypocrisy in his organization. His business was to buy votes in Congress, to bribe public officials, to put up jobs against the Government, to deceive and mislead public opinion, to get money out of the public Treasury for the benefit of himself and his associates. And he went about that business directly and cheerfully, and with as little sense of degradation as if it had been the most honourable business in the world. If he refrained from proclaiming his theories and methods to everybody, as frankly as he confided them to General Colton, it was because that would have defeated his plans, not because he was ashamed of himself. He was not ashamed of himself, and probably he is not to-day. Railroad ties were for sale, and he bought them; Senators and representatives were for sale, and why should he not buy them, too? He paid cash to engineers and surveyors for running a line; why should he not pay cash to legislators for voting him the right of way?"—*New York Sun.*

These are the opinions held of one of those great railway contractors who, for building a small section of railway on our Island are to get all these millions of tons of coal. According to the estimate of Mr. Richardson, before alluded to, assuming that there are 400 square miles of coal land within the whole belt conceded to that Company and assuming that the geologist is only correct to one-tenth of his statement, it would leave that Company 640,000,000 tons; we can easily make the computation of 16,000,000 tons to the square mile. Ten per cent. of that would be 640,000,000 tons, assuming that the geologist was correct only to the extent of one-tenth of his statement. I do not know that I can add any more to my remarks on this question. It is one that is likely to seriously affect the district that I have the honour to represent; it is likely to place every coal miner in that district under the domination of one company; it is likely to place all the coal mines in that distict under the domination of one company; it is likely to place every burner of coal in that Province, every domestic fireside, under the domination of one company; it is likely to place the commerce, not only of British Columbia, but of the Dominion under the domination of one company, so far as that one product is concerned; and so far as the combination of such great monied men is concerned, it is likely to affect our great trans-continental railway terminus. I would consider it a dereliction of duty if I did not enter my most solemn protest against any such contract.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I am sure, after the very eloquent and full description of the case given by the Minister of Railways, it will not be necessary for me to offer any lengthened remarks, because I take the same view as the Minister does himself, and I might say at the commencement, that the glowing description which he gave of the Province of British Columbia was not at all exaggerated. With regard to one or two remarks made by my hon

friend from New Westminster (Mr. Homer), in regard to the Graving Dock, I have no doubt that if it was decided by the Government to remove the Graving Dock from Esquimalt, which is on Vancouver Island, to the Mainland, my hon. friend would support the balance of the Bill. That has been the great difficulty with the Province of British Columbia, and with its representatives coming to this Parliament. In almost every instance, when any large question has come before this Parliament, if it has been on the Island, the Mainland has opposed it; if it has been on the Mainland the Island has opposed it; and hence I sincerely trust that hon. members of this House will not take notice of any remarks from any member coming from British Columbia, with regard to matters of this kind, but will simply weigh the question upon its own merits. He also spoke in reference to the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway as being "the terminus." Well, I readily admit that at the present time it is known as the terminus, but the general opinion is that it will not eventually be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and I feel certain that, when the Manager of that great work pays a visit to Port Moody and sees the location, he will readily come to the conclusion that it is not the place for the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, with regard to this measure, it is well understood by hon. members of this House that between the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government there have been differences. The contract, as we are aware, was entered into by the Provincial and the Dominion Governments. On the part of the Provinical Government, their obligations were carried out to the letter, but not so on the part of the Dominion Government, and hence these differences have existed, and, as time has passed along, they have increased. A change of Government took place in the Province of British Columbia a year ago. The new Government, immediately after assuming power, took steps to have these difficulties, as far as possible, rectified. The result of that is this Settlement Bill which is before this Parliament to-day. All I can say is, that it is not for me, as a solitary individual, to oppose this Bill simply from a personal standpoint. However much I may be opposed to it, I am here as the representative of the people, and I am prepared to state that nine-tenths of the people of British Columbia are in favour of this proposition.

Mr. HOMER. Not a third of them.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The district I represent in this Parliament is represented in the Local Parliament by eight members. Six out of the eight voted in the Local Parliament for this proposition. I think then, so far as I am concerned, my course is clear to vote for this measure. The people wish a settlement of these differences, and I maintain that the people should rule. If they require that their differences sould be settled, even if it be at a large sacrifice, I say that the wishes of the people should be carried out. A great deal has been said with regard to certain persons forming this company, a portion of them being Americans. I wish to remark on this point that, but for the American capitalists coming into our Province, we would not have been in the prosperous condition that we are to-day. Nearly every one of our industries has been started and maintained by American capital, not because we have not men in the Province with money, but I am sorry to say they have not the enterprise. They prefer putting it in the Savings Bank and drawing 4 per cent. to putting it into prosperous enterprises which would bring them ten. That is the character of some of our capitalists in British Columbia; I am sorry to say it.

Mr. HOMER. Name the Americans, please.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Opposition also comes for other reasons. In the year 1882, there was a proposition to give the building of this road to a company—Mr. Dunsmuir was, I believe, at the head of it. That was in 1882, when the hon. Mr. DeCosmos was a member of this House. The grant which it was proposed to give to Mr. Dunsmuir and his associates at that time was much larger than what is proposed in the present Bill, and yet we find that Mr. DeCosmos, who at present is opposed to this settlement Bill, then said with regard to the proposition of that date, and with regard to the men who formed this company:—

"The associates of Dunsmuir, Diggle, Crocker and Stanford, are a guarantee that the Island Railway will be built, if the Dominion Government agree to the subsidies they may ask. The Central and Southern Pacific Railway can provide a market for coal that will annually increase, and at the same time not diminish the supply for the Canadian Pacific Railway by railway ferry to Burrard Inlet. I know of no combination that can do so much for the development of Island interests and industries as the one proposed, nor do so much for the general interest of the Province."

Now, that is the opinion of that gentleman at that date, but still, strange to say, though there is not so much given in the present proposition as there was at that time, he is opposed to the present one, probably because he did not have a hand in it. We are told that there are 2,000,000 acres of land given to this Company. I think that is a mistake. All there is within the belt, I believe, is 1,500,000 acres. There was in the contract which was given to the Clements Company 2,000,000 acres, reaching from Esquimalt to Seymour Narrows. In the present arrangement, the land does not go to Seymour Narrows, but half way between Comox and Seymour Narrows. There is about 500,000 acres less than there was in the Clements proposition, and yet there was no objection whatever on the part of the people of British Columbia to accept this individual of whom I have just read, and who wanted Mr. Dunsmuir to have it at the time; I say there was no objection whatever on the part of the people of that Province to the Clements Company building the Nanaimo Railway, and who were getting more than this Bill before the House gives to the Dunsmuir Company.

Mr. GORDON. I would merely interpolate the remark that they were also to build 80 miles more railway, and were not getting $750,000 from the Dominion.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Yes; but 80 miles is but a very small matter compared with the extra amount of land and subsidies that they were to get, beyond what the present Company are to get from the Dominion Government. Now, Sir, objection is made to giving this coal land to the Company. I, for one, am opposed to monopolies, I presume, as much as any hon. gentleman in this House, but I know that no large undertaking can be successfully carried out without men of capital being offered inducements to undertake it; and it is only by having men of this character to take hold of it that work of this kind can be successfully accomplished. Now, Sir, it is easy to say that there are all these millions of tons of coal within this belt. Why has no company been found to develope these mines? It has been known for years that this coal existed there; and how is it that some individual of enterprise has not taken hold of it? Sir, since the reserve was lifted, not a man nor a company have come forward for that purpose.

Mr. HOMER. The reserve was not lifted.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I beg your pardon, the reserve was lifted; the reserve was lifted by the Provincial Government, and from that day up to the time this arrangement was made, not a man nor a company of men came forward and offered to build the railway. During all these years no one has come forward who was ready to develop these vast beds of coal. Why, we might live there till doomsday, and unless we manifested sufficient enterprise to develop the resources of the country, we would still be as poor as Job's turkey at last.

Mr. BLAKE. You would not want any fuel at doomsday.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Sir, outside of this belt, there are vast beds of coal on Vancouver Island. At Potsina, on the west coast of Vancouver Island, there is at the present an organized company engaged in developing a coal mine there. Also on Queen Charlotte Island we have large seams of anthracite coal, and on Graham Island, there are at least 400,000 acres of the best kind of land fit for settlement, beneath which it is known that an immense coal field exists. On the west coast, in addition to the region I have referred to, there are applications in the land office in Victoria for over 50,000 acres of coal lands, so that to say we are giving all our coal lands to one company is to say that which is not correct. We have large quantities of it there, and I am sorry to see hon. members from that Province rising here in their seats and intimating that the only coal we have is contained within this narrow strip of land. We have large seams on the Island, and we have plenty of it also on the Mainland. Thence we have no cause to fear that we shall ever be in want of coal. In addition to this, one of the greatest advantages we could have for the development of our resources there, is to have American capitalists come in and put their money into enterprises of this nature—especially the men who are associated with Mr. Dunsmuir, who are the largest consumers of coal on the Pacific Coast. Why, Sir, they require themselves, every month, at least 32,000 tons of coal. Now, these gentlemen have to get coal somewhere, and there is no coal on the Pacific coast as good as the coal which we have on Vancouver Island. The coal which we are shipping to San Francisco is bringing $2 a ton more than any other coal brought to that market, either from any portion of the United States, from England, or from Australia; and apart altogether from steamboat purposes, the people of San Francisco would prefer to give $5 a ton more for Wellington coal for household purposes, if they could get it, than for coal which comes from any portion of the United States. Therefore, I say that these gentlemen associated with Mr. Dunsmuir are not at all likely to purchase their coal from any other Companies so long as they have a vast coal field of their own. The result, Mr. Speaker, of this Company getting control of this coal land, would be that they would open up their mines so as to supply the large demand of their own. Why, Sir, the quantity which they require for themselves is sufficient to warrant them in opening up at least three other mines, in order to supply their wants, to say nothing of the local demand. I think, therefore, it is of a very great advantage for us to have foreign capital come in there, much more so than if a Company was formed of men residing in British Columbia altogether, because these foreign capitalists have interests outside of the Province which they make tributary to the development of our Province. Now, Sir, with regard to the character of Mr. Huntington—I contend that we have nothing at all to do with that question. It matters naught to me whether Mr. Huntington's character is good or not; all I want, as a British Columbian, is to get men to come forward who will put down a sufficient guarantee for the building of that road—no matter whether it is Mr. Huntington or another man, an American or a Britisher. Hence, I think it is no part of my business to throw any slur, or any insinuation, upon any gentleman outside this House. The Government at the present time have numerous applications for prospecting for coal above Nanaimo, outside of the belt which is to be given to this Company. It is well known that coal exists beyond the belt as far as Seymour Narrows, in large quantities. That is the report, and hence the applications which are filed at the present time, and applications were coming in up to the time the Premier left the Province, which is proof—I care not what books may say to the contrary—that the people are satisfied, from their own observations and discoveries, that coal does exist in that part of the country. The settlement of this question not only will develop our coal industry, but by bringing in foreign capital, it will be the means of encouraging other industries. It will bring a large immigration—(Mr. Gordon: Yes, of Chinese)—to our Province; it will open our agricultural lands, which up to the present time have been locked up, and also our mountains. I am happy to say that we have mountains in that wealth in some of them than the whole agricultural land in one of the old Provinces. By bringing in this foreign capital, and building the railway, which will necessitate branch lines, we shall have a chance to develop our resources—not only our coal, but our gold and our silver, and our forests, which are enormous; and we shall be given an opportunity of bringing those products to market Province, and we would not part with some of them for thousands of acres of Ontario farming land. We have more at a cheaper rate than it is possible to do at the present time. The fact is, that for want of roads, British Columbia is undeveloped, and with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Island Railway, I am satisfied there is a bright future for the Province. There will be employment for thousands of men. I expect, within five years from the time the Canadian Pacific Railway is finished, to see blast furnaces and rolling mills established. Under these circumstances, it is not my business, as a resident of that Province, to interfere with, or put a stumbling block in the way of any project which has for its object the development of the resources of that Province. I am in favour of this measure. The people are in favour of it; I am one of their representatives; I am here to-day representing a portion of that Province, and in voting in favour of this measure, I am carrying out the wishes of my constituents.

Mr. HESSON. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to read a telegram which has been sent to me from Victoria, B.C. It is as follows:—

"VICTORIA, B.C., 15th.

"S. R. HESSON, M.P.:

"Support Settlement Bill. Nine-tenths of people here in favour.

(Signed) "JAMES ORR."

That gentleman left my own town twenty-seven years ago, and I think he speaks as representing the people of that Province. He is a very intimate friend of mine, and is an intelligent and clever man. I think it is proper to lay this telegram on the Table of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to vote for the motion in amendment made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Homer), though I think some of the observations of the mover require some little attention at our hands, and I dare say they will receive consideration in some further observations from the Minister of Railways. I do not intend to vote for that motion, because I can see that, unless there is the very clearest case, it would be a very unfortunate business to postpone, certainly for a year, and perhaps indefinitely, a settlement, which so far as the interests of British Columbia are concerned, must, I think, be deemed to be satisfactory to the people of that Province. I have always taken the view that, in disputes between the Dominion Government and any of the Provincial Governments, the proper exponents of the views of the Province were the Provincial authorities. I do not believe that the mission of members of Parliament is to settle disputes between the Provinces and the Dominion. We are here, from particular Provinces, it is true, but to act in the interests of the whole country, and it is in that sense we speak, and in negotiations respecting differences, I am always prepared to accept—more particularly when the decision is arrived at by such a preponderating majority as in this case—the decision of the Provincial Legislature as conclusive as to what the wishes of the Province are in that particular. But, consistent with that rule of decision, there are one or two points which have been suggested by the observations made from the

other side, and one or two to which I alluded before, which I think it will be reasonable that the Minister of Railways, before the question is resolved, should deal with further. Upon the financial question, upon the general results to the Dominion, we are not in a position at this moment to speak intelligently. I moved for correspondence with respect to the dry dock, and also for a statement as to what the cost to the Dominion would be under the new arrangement. I made those motions early in the Session. I pointed out that they were essential to an intelligent decision of what the real merits of the financial terms were. They were promised, as hon. gentlemen opposite always do, generously and courteously enough, but they have not been brought down; and therefore that element in the discussion remains unsettled at this moment. I do not propose, therefore, to touch the financial question; we do not really know what the cost will be without that information. The points to which I think a little attention might properly be directed, are principally two. The question which has attracted so much attention during this Session is that of the country undertaking such enormous obligations as they have undertaken this Session, in order to establish the through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from ocean to ocean, at a very early day. We have been told that a principal reason for establishing that through line at a very early date, was to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at the earliest practicable moment, and before the trade would be fixed in other channels and grooves, to enter into competition with the Northern Pacific particularly, and of course with other Pacific railway companies. Then the trans-continental trade, the Pacific trade and the Atlantic trade to be land-borne by the Pacific Railway Company has thus, in the view of the Government, a very large and important significance. The one reason for our entering upon those obligations was that that trade might be enjoyed by this country some years earlier than it would be if the original contract were carried out; and that the danger to which the Canadian portion of that trade was to be exposed, from the fixing of the trade in other channels for those three or five years, might be averted. Now, connected with that question of permanence to which some hon. gentlemen have alluded, the hon. member who spoke last gave us very positively a series of negative information. He told us most positively that as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities went over there and looked at the country, they would decide that Port Moody would not be the terminus. He did not tells us where it would be fixed, and I do not know whether he meant Esquimalt or Victoria or some other point, but he was satisfied that Port Moody was not to be the terminus. We know that that opinion is shared by the Minister of Public Works—or at least was shared by him when he was responsible for the conduct of that Department, and at a later date when he was in Opposition, and was discussing this subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the Parliament of which my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was First Minister, was drawing to its close. He has consistently declared, up to the latest utterance I recollect him making, that the practical terminus of the trade to which I have been referring was Esquimalt. If that be so, —I do not express an opinion—but if it be so, I maintain it is of the greatest consequence that the Island Railway should not be in the control of hostile hands—should not be in the control of those who are identified, not indeed with the Northern, but with the other Pacific Railway, the one which has its terminus at San Francisco. I think some observation on that subject from the Minister of Railways, who has doubtless considered this question in all its bearings, would be appropriate on this occasion. What is to be the effect, assuming the views of the Minister of Public Works, which I have referred to, and which were also originally the views of the whole Government, led by the First Minister at that time, of fixing the terminus at Esquimalt. Of course for contract purposes it was not a point, nor to implement our obligations to British Columbia, for I have always contended that the obligations so to do was implemented when we got to the Pacific coast. But, in considering how the Canadian Pacific Railway is to pay, how the trans-continental trade is to be taken, it is of great consequence to the Dominion, irrespective of the contract altogether, that nothing should be done by us to prevent that being the practical means of obtaining the trade. If those views which the hon. gentleman held up to a comparatively late period as to the proper terminus be true, it is enough to say, as has been said from the other side, that as the main corporators in the new Company are the chief proprietors of the American Pacific Railway, that it is not at all likely that anything which would facilitate the trans-continental trade arriving *vid* Esquimalt, would be agreed to by them. One of their objects would be to utilize their possession of the Vancouver coal and timber lands, and the Vancouver railways, with a view of diverting the trade towards San Francisco, and at any rate, throw obstacles in the way of its going to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now the next point which I think is of importance, from a general standpoint is the question of the coal supply. This question did not fail to attract the attention of the Minister of Justice when he was acting for the Government in the negotiations which resulted in the present arrangement, because you find that the 24th clause of the Bill which was agreed to by the Minister of Justice, on behalf of the Government of Canada, and Mr. Smith, the First Minister of British Columbia, is as follows:—

"The Company shall, at all times, sell coals gotten from the lands that may be acquired by them from the Dominion Government to any Canadian railway company having the terminus of its railway on the seaboard of British Columbia, and to the Imperial, Dominion and Provincial authorities, at the same rates as may be charged to any railway company owning or operating any railway in the United States, or to any foreign customer whatsoever."

Therefore you see, that this question attracted the attention of these two parties. If so, there was a danger of the power over the coal lands of Vancouver Island to be acquired by this railway company being established to the prejudice of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Imperial or Provincial authorities. There was that danger, and they proceeded to make an effort to guard against it. Now, the circumstance that these two Governments, who have surveyed the whole situation, who have considered of the whole matter, decided that there was a danger to be guarded against, leads me strongly to the belief that there must have been some danger to be guarded against; and the observation which was made by the hon. gentleman who spoke last, that there was no danger at all to be apprehended in this matter, not because of the 24th clause, but because coal is so abundant everywhere that it is of no consequence, and that in that respect there is no monopoly—I say that observation is not borne out. That observation is not borne out by the circumstance that the two Governments have felt it necessary to try and take care lest there should be a detriment from too high a price being charged for this particular coal. If it were the fact that coal was not nearly so plenty, but was to be found in such available localities that there would be no danger at all of any injurious result from handing over these lands to this corporation, we would not, I think, have found this clause in the Bill. There may be a great deal of coal in Vancouver Island; I have no doubt there is, but that is only half the question to decide. What is important with reference to a commodity so great, a proportion of the cost of which is due to the facility in getting it transported to the market, is not merely—is there coal there? but is it in localities where it can be got cheaply on board the railway or ships, so as to be cheaply transported? If you had not those conditions, then practically and for the

present purpose there might as well be no coal. Having pointed out that there is reason to believe that there was a danger to be guarded against in this respect, I simply say—repeating the observation I made in the debate on the Address—that the condition imposed does not furnish such a precaution, and that, for the reason to which the hon. gentleman who last spoke alluded. These American corporators are practically proprietors of the Pacific Railway. We know that there is a method of obtaining what is supposed in some corporations a legitimate profit out of these railways, and that is by selling goods at a very high rate to the company which they also control, and if there is an identity of interests between the corporators of the Vancouver Island Coal Company and the proprietors of the Southern Pacific, it is quite clear that the coal may and probably will be sold at a very high rate by the owners of the coal, who are also the owners of the American railway, to the American railway. Such events have happened in the past and they are not at all unlikely to happen in the future It is of no practical consequence at what price they sell the coal, because they sell it to themselves, and the price goes into their own pockets; and therefore it is of little practical good to this country to obtain this restriction, that they shall charge no more for the coal they sell to the Canadian Pacific Railway or to the Dominion than they do to any railway owned and operated by themselves in the United States. There is no guarantee that they will charge only reasonable rates to their own railway in the United States, so that there is no practical protection, so far as I can see, under this precaution. I do not know whether the paper from which one of the hon. gentlemen read was the San Francisco *Chronicle*.

Mr. GORDON. Yes; the *Chronicle*.

Mr. BLAKE. I have a later issue of that paper, which speaks of the present condition of things, and the operations of Mr. Huntington in this connection. It is as late as the 12th of this month, and it says:

"For a good many months it has been common report here that the California railway monopoly had secured from the Government of British Columbia certain concessions to aid them in the construction of a railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, on Vancouver Island. A large land grant is named as a part of the scheme, and this grant is known to contain the most extensive coal deposits on the Pacific coast, the coal being of a superior quality. The uses to which the California monopoly intended to turn these coal mines, were explained by C. P. Huntington, in connection with his boast that the Southern Pacific intends to rob the Cape Horn route of the grain trade between the coast and Europe and drive all sailing vessels employed in that business from this port. Mr. Huntington said these vessels have been able to freight wheat to Liverpool, Brest, &c, at low rates hitherto, because very many of them came here loaded with coal from England. But this coal freight the Southern Pacific would put a stop to, as soon as that Company could purchase collier steamers to supply San Francisco with coal from the mines it had secured on Vancouver Island. The supply, he said, is unlimited, and the Company he represents can deliver at our wharves all the coal required here at lower rates than sailing vessels can bring it from England *via* Cape Horn. Cut off from this resource, the Cape Horn vessels must come here in ballast and therefore cannot compete on even terms with the railway in the transportation of grain.

"The *Chronicle* called the attention of the public to this boast at the time it was made, with the remark that it was evidently a part of the Huntington programme to monopolize the coal as well as the grain transportation of this coast; and that when the Cape Horn and Australian coal ships had been driven out of the trade, the Huntington monopoly would have the coast at the disadvantage which always results from a want of competition, and be able to fix the price of coal here at their own will, as well as the rates of transportation on grain for the European market This warning appears to have reached the directory of the Canadian Pacific Railway who take the same view of Mr. Huntington's boast. And now comes the news by way of Montreal that the great Dominion monopoly is exerting its all-powerful influence in the Ottawa Parliament to have the British Columbia concession to Huntington & Co. upset and invalidated. The Canadians have made the important discovery that the Huntington Company is identical with a coal landing that has possession or control of all the valuable coal lands in Washington Territory and that this Vancouver Island concession means the handing over to this ring of a monopoly of the whole coal business of the Pacific slope.

"This is doubtless an exaggeration, but we hope the Canadian company will succeed in its endeavors to keep the Huntington monopoly out of Vancouver Island, for if it gets the footing there which it is aiming at, the consumers of coal in this city will be at its mercy as much as the producers of wheat, in the event of the breaking down of the Cape Horn route."

Therefore, some interest, from a local point of view, appears to be excited in San Francisco as to these large operations by which Mr. Huntington, as the President of the American Pacific Railway, proposes to divert across the continent a very large amount of the traffic which has heretofore been sea-borne from the Pacific coast to the old world. The hon. gentleman said, and said rightly—at least I sympathize with his views—that, at this time, and under the circumstances in which we are placed, there is no objection to American capital being employed in Canada. I remember when the Government made the very strongest protestations against the employment of American capital in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That has all gone past, however, and the complaint now is, not that Americans get control, but that they won't buy the stock, which we are endeavouring to supplement from our own limited exchequer. Under these circumstances, it would appear to be ridiculous to apply one line of measure to the Vancouver Island Railway and another to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I think one may fairly speak of the position these corporators occupy with reference to other railways; and it is not because these gentlemen are Americans, but because, as I have pointed out, they must be supposed, in this, to them, very small transaction, to be acting in the interest of a very large enterprise of which they are the controllers and the chief proprietors, that I thought it fitting that the Minister of Railways should make some explanations on this subject. I do not know whether I need say anything further, as to the methods which these gentlemen have adopted in carrying on their enterprises in the country to which they belong, beyond what I said in the debate on the Address, except to repeat the hope that, whatever they obtain for their legitimate enterprises, they will not carry into Canadian Legislatures the same methods of success which they have become notorious for in the Congress of their own country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will not require very much time, I think, to reply to the observations and criticisms that have been offered. I quite agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that, in a matter of this kind, it is very important that we should know what are the sentiments of the Province. When I was in British Columbia, three years ago, the Government of Mr. Walkem and Mr. Beaven was in power. I took up this question with them, and practically this very area of land, only a considerably larger area, was settled upon as what the then Government of British Columbia were prepared to give for the purpose of securing the construction of the Vancouver Island Railway. That Government has been defeated, and their opponents, who have taken their places, have agreed to this measure by a very large majority, so that the House will see that this land, with the coal measures, is being given to secure the construction of that railway, not by the Dominion Government, but by the Government of British Columbia, because both parties when in power have been only too ready to offer these terms in order to secure that road. I think that fact disposes effectually of the question whether the public sentiment of British Columbia is in favour of this measure or not. Now, there can be no doubt that there are very large and very important coal measures lying altogether outside of the large coal area which is to be given by these resolutions to the Company. The fact that at this moment the Government of British Columbia have applications for no less than 50,000 acres of coal lands; the fact alluded to already, that on the west coast of British Columbia, at this moment, another company are in successful operation upon a very valuable coal area, and the fact that outside of Vancouver Island altogether, on Queen Charlotte Island, there are coal mea-

sures probably not inferior to those on Vancouver Island itself, afford the best evidence that there are very large coal fields outside of the field proposed to be given to this Company. In Queen Charlotte Island, there are coal measures not inferior to those of Vancouver Island itself, so that there is really no danger of a monopoly. But I would ask what possible good is it to Canada or to British Columbia to have the most inexhaustible coal fields if they are not operated, if they are to remain for the next fifty years as they have remained for the last fifty years, practically without being operated. They are of no value to any person if they are not operated, and the statement of my hon. friend from New Westminster, that they have not been operated because they have been kept under reservation by the Dominion Government, falls completely to the ground when we remember how long a period it was before there was any such reservation. The Government of British Columbia removed that reservation altogether, and yet, with the offer of all these advantages, of all this area—and it is not a very large area of valuable land, except as regards minerals, although large in extent, because its character is so rocky and mountainous as to prevent its having anything like the value that would likely attach to such a large territorial area. The very fact that when that reservation was removed, not only all the land here offered, but a larger quantity, went begging and no person could be induced to take it up; the fact that all these capitalists of San Francisco, all these gentlemen connected with other railways, who were perfectly aware of the advantages offered, would not undertake the construction of the road: the fact that the Government of British Columbia were incapable of constructing it, is the best evidence that there is not much strength in the objections offered to these resolutions. Mr. Clements who had undertaken this work, was obliged to forfeit his deposit because, with a still larger area of land than this, he could not obtain capitalists to go with him into the work. I do not accept the very ingenious suggestion of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Gordon), who intimates that was done in the interest of Mr. Huntington. Had it been so done, there would have been somebody else, not in the interests of Mr. Huntington, who would have only been too glad to take Mr. Clements' place, because it was a matter of notoriety that the British Columbia Government were offering all these advantages, and offering them in vain. I quite agree with the opinion expressed, that it is important to know where the capital is to come from, and who are the parties that are going to control the work; and what is the result? The fact that Mr. Crocker is connected with the Southern Pacific Railways, and is in a position to require a large amount of coal for the consumption of those roads, is the greatest possible advantage in our having him interested in the development of these mines. What takes place at present? Mr. Dunsmuir furnishes Mr. Crocker now 4,000 tons of coal per month, from Vancouver Island. Mr. Crocker's consumption is 33,000 tons per month, over 1,000 tons per day, and nothing will tend more to the development of our coal industry, than to have a man who requires this great quantity, and has to look elsewhere to get the greater part of it, who has to look to Australia, to England, and has even to take the inferior coal of Seattle, from the adjoining territory of the United States. It is of the greatest advantage to us to have him interested in obtaining his whole supply from our territory, and thus giving employment to miners and expending capital in the development of our coal industry. So far from regarding that as an objection, I regard it as an advantage. I entirely agree in the observation of my hon. friend, that it would have been better if the Canadian Pacific Railway had constructed this line. When I was in British Columbia, three years ago, I took every means to collect all the information I could and to use all the influence I had with the Canadian Pacific Railway, to get them to take this offer of all this land and all this coal, and go into the work of constructing the road. Having examined it most carefully and attentively, they refused to take up this line from Nanaimo to Esquimalt. They did not consider it necessary for their enterprise, for the reason that the Burrard Inlet terminus, whatever may be said by hon. gentlemen in this House, is known, on the most undoubted authority, to be a most admirable terminus and admirable harbour, suitable for the largest ships that cross the ocean from China and Japan, and a terminus that will, in every way, answer the purposes of the road. No doubt, a great many of the passengers coming over the Canadan Pacific Raiway will go down to Nanaimo and avail themselves of that road, and I believe, whoever may have capital invested in its construction will be only too glad to invite all the traffic they can get over the Canadian Pacific Railway, or from any other place, to make their venture a profitable one. The House will hardly believe that the hon. member for New Westminster was serious when he proposed a change in the site of the Graving Dock. I am glad to be able to give to my hon. friend who has taken his seat the information he required as to the expenditure on the Graving Dock, to the 31st December last. It amounted to $187,136.66, and I hardly think any person will seriously propose that, after having made that expenditure upon the site selected by the Government of British Columbia, and after that site has been approved by the Imperial authorities—and the best evidence that they approved of the site was that they agreed to give £50,000 sterling to complete the work on that site—we will hardly be disposed to tear up that Graving Dock and carry it away, even for the purpose of securing such an admirable site as would be found at Burrard Inlet. The whole cost is estimated, as nearly as can be ascertained, at about $665,000.

Mr. BLAKE. And the Imperial expenditure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, from that you deduct the £50,000 to be received from the Imperial Government, or $243,000 in round numbers, and you have about $422,000 as the cost to us of the work, from the beginning to the end. I may say that, as regards the ingenious theory by which Mr. Huntington is going to stop all the traffic from Australia and all the traffic from England, for the purpose of carrying wheat by a trans-continental line of railway from San Francisco to New York, there cannot be any very great danger of that enterprise being undertaken. Why, at this moment the difficulty the coal mining measure of Vancouver Island has had, is the fact that in San Francisco they buy no coal from Vancouver Island; because it is an enormous wheat growing country, the wheat fields require a large amount of shipping from England, and the ships which carry away the wheat bring out coal as ballast and throw it into the market at a very cheap rate. They have there the coal from Australia as well, and I think that the only means by which they can shut out that opposition is to get possession of the coal measures of Vancouver Island, which will furnish so much coal that they will stop all the trade by the Cape and Australia, and will involve the putting down of coal at a sufficiently reasonable rate to suit the Canadian Pacific Railway or anybody else for anything they require. I am glad to know the Canadian Pacific Railway will not be dependent on even Vancouver Island for their coal; that, during the past seasons, every day's exploration of the country has proved the existence of enormous coal measures of the most valuable description, lying in the neighbourhood of the base of the Rocky Mountains, for the operation of railways. I do not think, therefore, that more could have been done, or that more is required, in regard to the protection, than the clause which provides that, whatever they sell coal, for from the coal mines of Vancouver Island to parties outside, they are compelled to sell to the Dominion Government, and to

the local Government, and to the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the same terms. I will not take up the time of the House longer than to say that I am very glad, after listening to hon. gentlemen, to find that the measure so commends itself to the approval and judgment of the House as to elicit no more severe or serious criticisms than have been expressed.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman, in supposing that I referred to the plan of Mr. Huntington as being to carry this traffic down to San Francisco and to New York. It is a much more dangerous one than that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the plan?

Mr. BLAKE. It takes a much more southern port than New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Minister if this clause means the cost at which they sell coal in San Francisco, with the transportation added, or less the transportation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The cost at the mine.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I wish to make a few remarks upon this subject more particularly in reference to the expressions which fell from the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Homer). He says the Graving Dock is in a very insecure place. I would remind him of the fact that the Graving Dock is right in the rear of Her Majesty's dockyard. In clause 12 of the Terms of Union, it is provided that:—

"The Dominion Government shall guarantee the interest for ten years from the date of the completion of the works at the rate of 5 per centum per annum, on such sum not exceeding £100,000 sterling, as may be required for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock at Esquimalt."

Now, that being in the Terms of Union, I apprehend that it is not within the power of this Parliament to remove the Graving Dock, however much the hon. member for New Westminster might desire it—and I equally apprehend that he is speaking rather from a sectional than a Dominion point of view in this matter—that he could not induce this Dominion Parliament to remove the Esquimalt Graving Dock to Burrard Inlet without its previously receiving the approbation of the people, and having been sanctioned by the Government of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman also quoted from General Laurie's report. I have also General Laurie's report here, and I would only say, as far as that report goes, that it is simply an individual opinion. I have the very highest respect for General Laurie and for his opinion, but, at the same time, the very best men in this world are liable to err, and I think he has erred in his opinion on that particular point. But, whether he has erred or not, the fact remains the same, that the Esquimalt Graving Dock has been commenced at Esquimalt, in keeping with the Terms of Union, and the construction will be continued by the Dominion Government (to which Government it has now been transferred) until it is brought to a successful completion. As regards the railway lands that are given to this Company, that is a matter, like many other matters that are embodied in this Bill, which has gone before our Local Legislature, and which is composed of twenty-five members; out of those twenty-five members, fifteen voted for the Bill and seven against it. I was present on this occasion and saw the vote taken. There were two gentlemen who did not vote, and very rightly, too. One was Mr. Dunsmuir himself, who thought possibly it would not be the correct thing to vote in a matter in which he had either a direct or an indirect interest, although it was in connection with the Dominion Government, more particularly than with the Local. The other gentleman was the member for Cassiar, who held, to a slight extent, different views upon the measure as a whole, and for these slight differences of opinion he also abstained from voting. The twenty-fifth member was, like your honourable self, the Speaker in the Chair. Now, fifteen out of twenty-two having carried this measure in British Columbia, and in my constituency six out of the eight members having voted in favour of the measure, and three out of the four members for the city of Victoria having voted for it, I think, Mr. Speaker, it leaves me very little option in the matter, even supposing I held views diametrically opposed to the members in the Local Legislature. I am sent here, not to speak my views individually, not to vote from my own individual standpoint, but to vote in keeping with, and to express the opinions of the people who sent me here. These people have evinced to the whole of this Parliament exactly what their opinion is upon this particular matter; and, as has already been stated, nine-tenths, certainly in the city of Victoria and its surroundings—and that is the district I represent—are in favour of this measure. The majority of British Columbians are also in favour of this settlement, as has been shown by the vote taken in the House which has been already referred to, and I think, if I felt ever so much disposed to vote against the Bill, it would be my bounden duty, considering that those people who have already given their opinion in the Local Legislature, represent collectively the same number of inhabitants of a Province which we six here represent, at all hazards to vote for the measure brought in by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I think the principal matter that we have to consider, as a Dominion House of Commons, is whether we are making a good bargain with British Columbia or not. The matter has already been maturely considered over there, and the arguments of the hon. member for New Westminster, as also those of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), go to show that unquestionably the Dominion Government has (as it usually does) made a good bargain with British Columbia. The 3,500,000 acres of land in the Peace River country are of themselves sufficient compensation to the Dominion Government for the small amount of $750,000 embodied in this Bill. In fact, the value of that land is more than that. I have every reason to know that the value of those lands in the Peace River country is at least $1 an acre. I am also in a position to know that there are people at this moment who are willing to make an offer to the Government, in any case, of 50 cents an acre to purchase these lands upon five years' time, paying 10 cents in the first year, 10 cents in the second year, 10 cents in the third year, 10 cents in the fourth year, and so on until the whole amount is paid, upon a colonization scheme; that they will undertake to take lands in alternate sections and further to put so many persons upon these sections. Then, taking the value of those lands at 50 cents an acre for 3,500,000 acres, that will be considerably over the amount $1,750,000—in fact, more than double the amount—of $750,000 which this Parliament is asked to vote for the Island Railway. There is another point which we have to consider, and that is the compensation for delays. I remember, long before I had any idea of entering the political arena, the predecessor of my colleague, Mr. DeCosmos, estimated some three or four years ago, that the Dominion of Canada was indebted to British Columbia in a sum certainly not less than $2,250,000, as compensation for the delays in railway construction. Now, in this Settlement Bill, we are getting rid of that amount, with accrued interest, and possibly an accumulation of testimony, as to whether that amount should be augmented or not. We are getting 3,500,000 acres in the Peace River country. The matter of $2,250,000 and the amount to be added to it is to be lost sight of and buried in oblivion, and, in addition to this, we are to get a settlement in full, as I understand, of all existing differences, whatsoever they may be. These differences, of course, are well known to the Government. They are equally well known, I think, to a good many members of this House. The former hon. members for Vancouver and Victoria (Messrs Bunster and DeCosmos) have repeatedly pressed our

claims upon the Government in this regard. These two gentlemen, I am perfectly convinced, have spared no pains in promoting the interests of British Columbia, and in laying all matters connected with that Province before this Government in the way which they judged best. Although, individually, they may not have left behind them what might be termed a pleasant or a very gratifying record of themselves, still they left no stone unturned to let the Dominion at large know that there was such a Province as British Columbia, and what its people considered to be their rights. Now, these questions have been pending for a long time. In 1871, when British Columbia came into the Confederation, it was agreed, as has already been stated, that this railway should be commenced in 1873 and finished in 1881; I contend that the Island Railway referred to is a portion (or should be) of the Canadian Pacific Railway, more generally spoken of as the Trans-Continental Railway, although the balance of opinion is against me; certainly the opinion of the Government is against me in that matter. However, it was then agreed that this railway should be commenced within two years, and completed in ten. Now, Sir, we know very well that it not only was not commenced within two years, but cannot be completed under 15, at best.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Real Estate and Loan Company of Canada, limited.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Quebec Railway Bridge Company.—(M. Bossé.)

Bill (No. 54) relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company, and to the Railways leased to the said Company.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.)

Bill (No 72) to incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Innes.)

AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER. When the House rose at six o'clock, I had arrived at that portion of the history of the railway which was embodied in the Terms of Union. I think it would be well for the House, that inasmuch as there are many new members in it, I should read some portions of those Terms of Union, so that hon. members may understand exactly the position of the Dominion in regard to its obligations to the Province of British Columbia:

"The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement, simultaneously, within two years from the date of Union, of the construction of railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains, towards the Pacific, to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada; and further, to secure the completion of such railway within ten years of the date of the Union. And the Government of British Columbia agree to convey to the Dominion Government, in trust, to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government may deem advisable, in furtherance of the construction of the said railway, a similar extent of public lands along the line of railway throughout its entire length in British Columbia, not to exceed, however, 20 miles on each side of said line, as may be appropriated for the same purpose by the Dominion Government from the public lands in the North-West Territories and the Province of Manitoba. Provided, that the quantity of land which may be held under pre-emption right or by Crown grant within the limits of the tract of land in British Columbia to be so conveyed to the Dominion Government, shall be made good to the Dominion from contiguous public lands; and provided further, that until the commencement, within two years, as aforesaid, from the date of the Union, of the construction of the said railway, the Government of British Columbia shall not sell or alienate any further portions of the public lands of British Columbia in any other way than under right of pre-emption, requiring actual residence of the pre-emptor on the land claimed by him. In consideration of the land so conveyed in aid of the construction of the said railway, the Dominion Government agree to pay to British Columbia, from the date of the Union, the sum of $100,000 per annum, in half-yearly payments, in advance."

Now, emanating out of these Terms, there are two or three facts to which I desire to call the attention of the House. In furtherance of this agreement, the Dominion Government, on the 7th day of June, 1873, fixed the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Esquimalt, and applied for and obtained from the British Columbian Government, the reservation of a 20-mile belt of land along the eastern coast of Vancouver Island, following the sinuosities of the coast line for railway purposes. Later on, the Dominion Government claimed that a commencement of railway construction was made at Esquimalt, within the term of two years agreed upon in Terms of Union. In the following year, 8th May, 1874, the Dominion Government, that is to say, the Mackenzie Government, through its Agent, Mr. Edgar, proposed to the Government of British Columbia "to proceed with the construction from Esquimalt to Nanaimo immediately," and "to push that portion of the railway on to completion with the utmost vigour and in the shortest practicable time," coupled, however, with conditions relating to the Mainland portion of the railway, which were not entertained by the Government of British Columbia, as they conflicted with the Terms of Union, and postponed indefinitely the consolidation of British North America, which was the primary object of Confederation. I refer to these facts principally to show that certain hon. members from British Columbia should not offer any very active opposition to the passing of the Bill which we are now considering. They have railway construction already commenced, and when we have the opportunity which is now presented, we should not look at the matter from a sectional point of view, or to secure sectional objects but should sink every thing of a sectional kind in the main object of securing the true interests of British Columbia. In consequence of the facts I have stated, serious differences arose between the Dominion of Canada and British Columbia, which were referred to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Earl of Carnarvon—and after protracted negotiations, the conditions contained in the despatch of Lord Carnarvon of the 17th November, 1874, to the Governor General of Canada, were accepted as a settlement by the Governments of the Dominion and of British Columbia, the first condition being "that the section of the railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo shall be commenced as soon as possible, and completed with all practicable dispatch." The Privy Council of the Dominion of Canada, on the 25th of March, 1875, decided that "prior to the commencement of any work of construction on the proposed railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, the Province of British Columbia should convey by legislation to the Dominion Government a 20-mile belt of land along the line of railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo," which demand upon British Columbia was immediately complied with, by the Legislative Assembly of the Province passing an Act, 22nd April, 1875, No. 13, entitled: "An Act to authorize the grant of certain public lands to the Government of the Dominion of Canada for railway purposes." On the 5th March, 1875, the Dominion House of Commons, in Committee of Supply, appropriated $6,250,000 for the Pacific Railway, part of which appropriation was expended in the purchase of steel rails for the railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, and the rails were accordingly purchased and conveyed to Esquimalt and Nanaimo, ready for use. I ask if anything could be plainer than the very fact that money belonging to the Dominion of Canada was expended for the purchase of steel rails and that those steel rails were brought in vessels from the Old Country, and landed at Esquimalt and Nanaimo, I believe, with every intention of constructing that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo. Those rails were subsequently taken away; but still the fact remains that the intention of the Government at that time was

to build that section as part and parcel of the so-called Trans-Continental Railway. Besides, in the years 1874-75, a construction survey was made of the line between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, but no further step was taken towards its construction. A feeling of intense and widespread dissatisfaction with the Dominion of Canada was created in the Province, which resulted, in 1878, in the election of a Provincial Legislature, the majority of the members of which were pledged to support the construction of that Island Railway, and urged upon the Dominion Government the carrying out of the Carnarvon Terms, or separation. That dissatisfaction has now almost died out; but the fact still remains that there was either a legal, an expressed, or an implied obligation on the part of the Dominion of Canada to build that section of railway. Now, the point I am arriving at is, that the matter of the construction of a railway between Esquimalt and Nanaimo is not a consideration of to-day. The belief has existed, not only in the minds of the Dominion Government, but in the hearts of the people of British Columbia, that the Dominion Government would, as soon as practicable, build that railway as part of the Terms of Confederation. The Legislature of British Columbia, before the close of the year 1878, in the full belief that the Carnarvon settlement would be carried out, adjourned without taking any more definite action. All that has transpired lately between the Dominion Government and the Province of British Columbia is embodied in the Report of the Minister of Justice, and the Resolutions now before us, which have been placed in the hands of every member; and, therefore, I need not occupy the time of the House in recapitulating it now. The lands which were to be conveyed by the Settlement Bill to the Company for building this railway are described as:

"Commencing at the southern boundary, and extending to a line running east and west, half way between Comox and Seymour Narrows; and also a further portion of the lands conveyed by the said Act to the northward of, and contiguous to, that portion of the said lands last hereinbefore specified, equal in extent to the lands within the limits thereof which may have been alienated from the Crown by Crown grants, pre-emption, or otherwise."

Now, the Minister of Justice, in his Report, with reference to the railway belt on the Mainland, says:

"The change in the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the more southerly pass, which it is now intended to occupy, rendered it expedient to effect a change of the location of the railway belt. The Government of British Columbia had not admitted that there was any obligation on their part to assent to such a change, and had contended that they had performed their whole obligation in granting the belt along the line as originally proposed. We were happily able, however, in view of what we were mutually ready to concede in respect of other parts of the general arrangement, to arrive at an understanding by which the railway belt was transferred to the new line and the grant made absolute in its terms, the Government of the Dominion undertaking, through me, to place the land thus acquired in the market, for sale to actual settlers at an early day."

Now, in view of all these facts, I do not think the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Homer), or the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), has really any ground of complaint. These lands have remained idle for a very long time, and nobody has offered to build the railway, notwithstanding that the desire to have it built has been pretty well known, although I must say I should have preferred to have seen the Island Railway built by previously calling for tenders. However, the two Governments, in their wisdom, thought that to be unnecessary. Now, there are a few points in this Bill that I do not exactly understand. It says:

"The Government of British Columbia shall obtain the authority of the Legislature to convey to the Government of Canada 3,500,000 acres of land in the Peace River district of British Columbia, in one rectangular block, east of the Rocky Mountains and adjoining the North-West Territory of Canada."

Now, I think it will be very difficult to find out exactly where that rectangular block is going to be. The boundaries of British Columbia are, to say the least, badly undefined; and I should like to know from the hon. Minister of Railways what kind of rectangular block this is going to be. It may be a

square, which is a figure having all its sides equal and all its angles right-angles; it may be a parallelogram, with only its opposite sides equal and parallel, and all its angles right angles; or it may be made up of a series of rectangles. I should therefore like to know which of these kinds of rectangular blocks the two Governments have agreed upon, also who has the right of selection, and where is this rectangular block to be? I mention these facts because they may not have occurred to the Government in the light in which I have put them. The eastern boundary of British Columbia is understood to follow the summit or watershed line of the Rocky Mountains from the 49th parallel north-westward till it strikes the 120th meridian; then runs north on this meridian to the 60th parallel; then west to the Alaska Line. There is a contention also, and, I believe, a very just one, that the eastern boundary of the Province is, or ought to be, the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains. The northern and western boundary is defined, by the original Treaty with Russia, I believe, to follow the outer or coast range of mountains where this range is not more than 30 nautical miles from the coast, to follow a line parallel to the coast at 30 miles inland. As a matter of fact, the boundary has been assumed at 30 miles from the coast, or thereabouts, being the worst possible interpretation for British Columbia; while, if strictly defined, it might follow the western range to the coast, never more than a mile or two from the shore, in view of these facts, it appears to me that it is rather a puzzle for both Governments to hit upon that eastern boundary line, and incident to that decision the precise location of the block, and it is consequently very desirable this should be settled before disputes arise. I will not take up the attention of the House further upon the point, although I have plenty of material here. I think it is desirable that other members from British Columbia—there are two of them yet to speak—should have an opportunity of expressing their opinions on this most important matter to our Province. There are one or two subjects, however, to which I would like to refer before sitting down. In regard to the value of our coal lands, Mr. Richardson, of the Geological Survey, calculated the workable coal underlying a square mile near the Union mining location, at Comox, at 16,000,000 tons. This, of course, was not meant to apply to the whole district, but gives some idea of what its best parts may be worth. The value, I believe, of Comox coal lands, estimating them at $10 an acre, is $1,920,000, and of Nanaimo coal lands, estimating them at the same figure, $960,000; making a total of $2,880,000. Deducting 25 per cent. from this for the land already granted, would leave a net value of $2,160,000. The value of 2,800 square miles, or 1,794,800 acres of railway settlement grant, as timber lands, at $1 per acre, would amount to $1,794,800, deducting from which 25 per cent. for alienated lands, leaves a net value, as timber lands, of $1,346,100. The value of say 300,000 acres agricultural lands in the settlement belt, at $5 per acre, would amount to $1,500,000; deducting, as before, 25 per cent. for the alienated land, you have a net value of $1,125,000. This, when analysed, gives the following synopsis of the value of land granted to the Railway Company:

Net value of coal lands	$2,160,000
" " timber lands	1,346,100
" " agricultural lands	1,125,000
Total	$4,631,100

Estimating the proposed railway at 70 miles long, that gives 40 square miles of territory per mile, or 25,600 acres, included in which, however, is the alienated lands; so that the Railway Company are really getting something in the neighbourhood of $61,000 per mile for building that railway, taking it from their point of view. But it remains to be seen whether the coal which will come out of these very

valuable coal lands—I do not wish to undervalue the coal lands, but it remains to be seen whether they will really turn out to be as valuable as those which are now being worked at the East and West Wellington collieries and the Nanaimo collieries. Of course, in estimating the value of coal, we have to take into consideration quality as well as quantity, and also facilities for working, &c. Now, several mines have been opened, but only those previously mentioned, the Wellington and Nanaimo collieries, have proved successful, so that notwithstanding the figures I have just given as to the value of these coal lands, and the apparent high price that the Railway Company building that section are going to get, it may, after all, prove very fallacious. With regard to the position of hon. members from British Columbia in this House, I wish to state a few words. I have previously said this matter has received the sanction of the Local House by two to one majority, and I think there is very little option for any hon. member for British Columbia but to accept the situation. As far as British Columbia is concerned, relying implicitly, as we have done in other matters (when we have been voting millions) on the Government of the day, inasmuch as it is a Government measure, and a measure which is to the advantage of our Province, particularly that section which has been debarred from the enjoyment of those advantages possessed by other sections of the Dominion, I think, after considering it "all in all," in the interest of British Columbia, we should not only vote for this measure, but speak in favour of it.

Mr. READ. I was under the impression that British Columbia had a claim against the Dominion Government for compensation, but looking over these Resolutions, it seems to me that the Dominion have a claim against British Columbia, or rather that those Resolutions would have the tendency to show that we are paying, in place of the Dominion Government granting us any compensation whatever. In fact, it is the other way. The compensation is coming from British Columbia to the Dominion. We cede 2,500,000 acres of land in the Peace River district, which are very valuable lands, as valuable as any in the North-West or in British Columbia. We cede this to the Dominion, and we also cede all the lands on the Island to the Dominion, for the purpose of building this railroad, and all we get specially is $750,000. It has been said that the Local House have passed these Resolutions by a large majority. That is very true, but I cannot see why this Government have not dealt directly with the Provincial Government in this matter, and offered this $750,000 to the Government, as they have all along strenuously opposed having any responsibility for building the Island Railway at all; and I contend that if this $750,000 had been offered to the Provincial Government and that had been brought before the House there, a different vote altogether would have been taken on this matter to what has been. If they had had that amount of money to expend on works that are needed throughout the country, they would have voted altogether in a different way. Certainly they would not have locked up their valuable mining lands in the manner which is likely to be done now. I do not think that I need expatiate much on this question, as those who have spoken before have said about all that is necessary to be said in regard to it. At the same time, I object to these Resolutions, for one reason, because my district is paying for it all. Therefore, I shall be obliged to vote against these Resolutions.

Mr. HOMER. If I am in order, I would like to reply to one or two remarks that have been made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is not strictly in order, but I dare say the House will allow him to do so.

Mr. HOMER. I desire to refer to the remarks of the member for Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare). He speaks of other coal lands besides those that are included in this belt. It is a well-known fact that all the mines on Vancouver Island, outside of this belt, contain coal which is supposed to be of a very inferior quality. It is in very detached pieces, and the mines, up to this time, have not shipped one ton of coal. But the hon. gentleman intended to convey the impression to this House that there were other productive mines besides those which are included in this belt granted to the railway. That is not so. That is the only coal which is productive at the present time. Then he says those mines would have been opened long ago if British Columbia had any enterprise, and that the only enterprise in British Columbia is due to the Americans resident in that Province. I deny that *in toto*. So far as the Americans are concerned, I give them credit for all that is due to them. They are undoubtedly an enterprising people; but, when he says that all the enterprise in British Columbia is due to the Americans residing there, he makes a very serious mistake. Take the tanneries which are established in British Columbia at the present time. There are seventeen, and only two conducted by Americans. There are three coal mines there, all worked by Englishmen. Then you take the lumbering interests there, which does the foreign trade in lumber. That is conducted by English capital and English houses. Then, when he speaks of the lack of enterprise of the people, in a country containing a population of 25,000 whites, and a population of Indians and Chinese bringing the total up to something like 60,000, let me point out that we exported last year $4,000,000 worth of the produce of that country, and contributed to the revenue of the Dominion, within a fraction of $1,000,000, more than one-half of that from the whole Province of Nova Scotia. Does that show that there is no enterprise in the Province of British Columbia? I say it shows more enterprise in proportion to the population than any Province in the Union. So I think the best thing the hon. gentleman can do is to apologize for that statement. The senior member for Victoria (Mr. Baker), has stated that this dry dock cannot be moved because it is included in the Terms of Union. What are we doing to-night with the Terms of Union? Are we not changing the whole thing?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). No.

Mr. HOMER. Cannot we change the dry dock as well as anything else? We are handing it over to the Dominion Government; that is breaking the Terms of Union; and, if we go back to the Terms of Union, they have been broken long ago, they have not been fulfilled in any one point by the Dominion Government; but, I believe, that they intend to do the best they can with regard to that now. Another statement the hon. member for Victoria has made, is that the dry dock is in the rear of the dockyard. The dockyard and the dry dock are both on the same strip of land; the dockyard lies west of the dry dock, and there is nothing but this narrow strip of land lying between the dry dock and the Straits of Fuca, and there is nothing to prevent a foreign ship from taking up a position half a mile from that dock, and destroying it at any time. The Minister of Railways says we are not dependent upon the mines in this belt of land, because there are many mines in the Bow River district. That is very true, and I believe there are many between the Bow River and the Kamloops district, but they are hundreds of miles from the sea coast, and the coal cannot be transported as the coal can from those which are included in the belt on Vancouver Island, where a ship can lie alongside the mine at any point and take the coal on board. With regard to the value of this coal, as the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon) stated some time ago, they gave away nine-tenths, reducing it to one-tenth, which makes the value of those mines $32,000,000. That is at 5 cents a ton only. Take the whole belt at 5 cents a ton, and you have $320,000,000. We gave away nine-tenths, so there remains one-tenth, or

$32,000,000, putting it at the very lowest estimate—the lands, mines, timber and all. The hon. gentleman, the member for Victoria, is entirely mistaken in his calculation. As I said before, when I introduced this subject first, the Government should hesitate before they give away all this valuable property, as they will find in five or ten years that the Local Government will have to come back to them for assistance, instead of being able to open up the various resources of the country.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I think I am entitled to a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; not without the consent of the House.

Amendment (Mr. Homer), negatived on a division.

Mr. REID moved, that all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following inserted:—

In the opinion of this House the proper course to take in the proposed settlement with British Columbia is to pay over to the Government of that Province the sum of $750,000 as proposed by the Resolution, and to leave the Government of the Province to deal with the construction of the Island Railway.

Mr. GORDON. I am sorry to have to trouble the House again for a few minutes, with regard to the value of coal and its present development. I certainly understood from the hon. Minister of Railways that coal was being shipped from the west coast of Vancouver Island. I think that he must have been misinformed on that point. I am satisfied that no coal has yet been shipped from Quatsino Sound, and that is the only point in which prospecting is going on at present, and it has been carried on for several years. As far back as twenty-seven years ago, they were prospecting for coal at Quatsino Sound, and having followed it for a number of years, finally abandoned it. A year and a-half ago an American company came in and have been prospecting ever since, but up to the latest account that I had from that locality, they had not discovered sufficient to enable them to float their stock on the money market. Now, with regard to the 50,000 acres applied for, it only goes to prove the value of the belt that has been closed up from application for ten or twelve years. Those who are applying for these lands outside the belt hope that coal may be discovered beyond the limits of the country which the geologists have explored. But, judging from the early prospecting done by the Hudson Bay Company, it is not at all probable that north of the 50th parallel, on Vancouver Island, coal measures will be met with yielding coal in such paying quantities as has been found within the railway belt now being ceded to this Company. The Hudson Bay Company, twenty or thirty years ago, prospected very extensively at Fort Rupert. They finally abandoned their operations there and removed to Nanaimo, and had been carrying on coal mining up to the time they transferred their interests to the Vancouver Coal Company. Reference has also been made to the failure of coal mining in the Harwood Mine. Now, on this point, I can speak with some knowledge. The Harwood Coal Mine was opened by a gentleman named Buckley, who had very limited means, who began with building an aerial tramway, which did not prove successful, and he became financially embarrassed. Since then the Harwood Mine has not been worked, but I defy any one here to say that it does not contain productive coal measures. An opening of a temporary character was made, and they followed the crop out of the coal for a considerable distance into the mine. I know this, because I have travelled through the mine again and again. Mr. Buckley's experience is no proof whatever that coal mining is not profitable in that section. I have also heard it stated that prospecting had been carried on at Comox, and that the result was not sufficient to justify any one in believing that coal existed. Now, any one who is familiar with the geological map furnished by the Department, and who has a knowledge of the country in that section, would never expect to find coal within 900 feet of the surface where they bored. They bored 600 feet, but as the tenure f theoir land was uncertain, and they failed to get a renewal of the privileges they had from the farmers, they abandoned the enterprise. In the district north of Comox, prospecting has been carried on at different points and the result was such, that upon my own, advice it was kept from the public, because I felt sure that other parties with more capital would get the advantage of the hard labour of these men. There is another point to which I have not alluded, and that is the large quantities of iron ore existing in that region. Only this last summer a gentleman was prospecting nearly the whole season in the northern part of the Comox district, and he assures me that he found in close proximity hematite and magnetic iron ore, and coal at a short distance from the coast. He also found marble in that neighbourhood, and in that northern section he found timber as fine as any on the coast of British Columbia, timber which cannot be excelled in any other part of the Dominion. I would scarcely like to venture on an estimation of the value of the timber within this belt. It certainly surpasses the best timber ou any other part of Vancouver Island. It might be roughly estimated to be worth at least $2,000,000. But with regard to the coal, iron and marble, and all these natural products, we are not to estimate their present value alone, in discussing this question. I disagree with my hon. friends from Victoria in the opinion that because the Legislature of British Columbia sees fit to part with these public lands—doubtless in the best interests of the Province, as they think—it is our duty here to sanction everything that is done in that and every other Local Legislature in the Dominion of Canada. We may find it our duty to disagree with the legislation of some of the Provincial Legislatures during the term that we are sitting here.

Mr. BAKER. I did not say every Province.

Mr. GORDON. If it applies to one it applies to all the Provinces, and if it is understood that the Local Legislatures and the Dominion Government must work in accord, we may find ourselves obliged to sanction everything that is done in all the Provinces. I disagree with the proposition. I am here to judge of the case on its merits. I do not intend to go back even to the long correspondence with respect to the non-fulfilment of the Terms of Union. A great amount of friction, no doubt, did exist from that cause, but as the completion of the railway approached, that feeling began to die away. The people saw that the present Government were determined to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am glad we have had experience this Session to prove that they are resolved to build it, and deducting the five years from the fifteen which were occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite, it will now be completed by the present Government within the time originally agreed upon, namely, ten years. I know, as the causes of the friction are passing away, and as the feeling of disquietude throughout the Province that arose out of the non-fulfilment of the Terms is dying out, I think there was no occasion, in order to revive that feeling, to introduce Resolutions of this character and give away those valuable resources which should be of permanent value to the Province and the Dominion in the future. I am sorry I have little hope of seeing the Government modify the position they have taken; I wish I could have induced them to do so. I know they will feel annoyed that I have thus declared my sentiments, which are my true and honest opinions, and which are, I believe, in the best interests of Canada and British Columbia; I can only hope that the bright anticipations of the Minister of Railways in regard to the Province may be more than realized. I know that one of those connected with the Company is a persevering gentleman who has made coal mining in British Columbia what it is to-day; and he did not start with a large capital, but as a poor man, and yet he

is able to-day to command his millions. There is, however, a strong feeling throughout British Columbia that poor men are not to have the same privileges which they formerly enjoyed. The senior member for Victoria seems well satisfied with the arrangement. But Victoria district does not contribute one foot of land to the Island Railway. The whole land is taken from the Vancouver district and may be described as follows: — Bounded on the south side by a straight line drawn from the head of Saanich Inlet to Muir Creek, on the Straits of Fuca; on the west, by a straight line drawn from Muir Creek, aforesaid, to Crown Mountain; on the north, by astraight line drawn from Crown Mountain to Seymour Narrows; and on the east, by the coast line of Vancouver Island to the point of commencement; and including all coal, coal oil, ores, stones, clay, marble, slate, mines, minerals and substances whatsoever thereupon, therein, and thereunder. There is excepted out of the tract of land granted by the preceding section all that portion thereof lying to the northward of a line running east and west half-way between the mouth of the Courtney River (Comox district) and Seymour Narrows an amount of land equal to the quantity alienated by Crown grant within the belt. The hon. members from Victoria would have changed their tone very much if the Government had come before the House with a proposition to build a railway from Nanaimo to Alberni, which would have saved 180 miles of navigation, and enabled Canadian commerce, in case of necessity, to have gone right out into the Pacific without passing the American shore. It must be remembered that there are 126 squatters on the railway belt. When some of these poor men took up their land, it was with the distinct understanding that they were to have, not only surface rights, but mineral rights. Believing that if the railway was finally located where it has been, that they would have had secured to them their full rights, an appeal was made to the Local Government, but that Government did not acknowledge any equitable right in their case. I remember seeing the correspondence with Sir Alexander Campbell on the subject, and he referred them to the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works in the Local Government, but the equity of their claims was not allowed. I think great dissatisfaction will grow out of that fact. Twenty, forty, or 150 dissatisfied settlers will not conduce to the prosperity and harmony of the community, nor yet of the Province in which they live. They feel they have been unjustly dealt with, and that the agricultural portions of their holdings by themselves would scarcely have induced them to have settled there, but it was in the hope that the mining land and agricultural land together would eventually enable them to provide for themselves and their families, which led them to settle there. This hope has been utterly destroyed by the present Resolutions now under consideration. They can have their agricultural land at $1 an acre, with payments spread over four years, but they are entirely deprived of the minerals. The proposal is so plain and distinct that it is useless to ask the Government to modify the terms of the Resolution, and to the two Governments I will attribute any injustice that may happen to those poor men. Sir, I will not sanction such injustive, I will vote against the Resolutions of the Government.

Mr. BAKER. I desire to offer a word of explanation. The hon. member for New Westminster, in speaking about the dock and dockyard said they were entirely unprotected. The hon. gentleman forgets entirely that we generally have a navy there, and that in these days of modern warfare, a place has not got to be protected by batteries, though even if it had, we have two batteries, thanks to the Minister of Militia; but there are such weapons as torpedoes. I advise the hon. gentleman to make himself acquainted with the nature of the torpedo. As regards the removal of the dry dock from Esquimault, I adhere to my statement that it could not be removed without legislation being passed in the Local Legislature.

Amendment (Mr. Reid) negatived.

Main motion agreed to; and Resolutions considered in Committee, and ordered to be reported.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I wish to make a correction. The hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Homer) has denied my statement that there were 50,000 acres of coal lands. Now, Sir, I am prepared to prove that 50,000 acres of land where coal has been discovered, has been secured by companies on the west coast of Vancouver Island, and I can prove that in less than one hour, if necessary, in writing. With regard, Sir, to the question of American capital, what I said or what I intended to say, was, that the principal portion of our industries had been encouraged by American capital, and that statement was quite right. With regard to the lumbering interest, to which the hon. gentleman referred, one of the largest lumbering mills in British Columbia was commenced with American capital, two of the owners being American citizens. Another lumbering mill is owned by an American citizen, and has been owned by him from the time it started. Other interests in the Province have also been commenced and carried on partially by American capital. With regard to the failures in coal mines, there have been three companies, to my knowledge, who have undertaken to discover and work coal mines, and have failed in the undertaking, so that the enterprises have not been very profitable after all.

Mr. HOMER. With regard to the coal mines, the impression which was sought to be conveyed was, that they were being worked ——

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No; I did not say that.

Mr. HOMER. I have only to say that none have been worked, except the one I referred to.

Resolutions reported read the second time and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 126) respecting the arrangement with British Columbia.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE HIGH COMMISSIONER TO ENGLAND.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS. Before that motion is put, I desire to submit a proposition for the consideration of the House, relating to the appointment of the hon. Minister of Railways, as High Commissioner to England. We all remember, Sir, when the measure was introduced for the consideration of the late Parliament, upon the subject of the appointment of the High Commissioner, was being discussed, the First Minister informed us of the great importance of that office. The right hon. gentleman pointed out to Parliament at that time that the office was one of great consequence, that as Canadians, commercial relations became greatly extended, it was of great consequence to this country to have a representative residing in England, who could speak on behalf of the Government, and speak at once. He said that important negotiations were taking place with a view to establishing more intimate commercial relations with France and Spain, and that it would not be in the interest of this country that the English Government should be called upon to delay the considerations of these important matters until a representative could be sent from Canada; and it was therefore of great consequence that we should have a permanent resident in England, one who would be on the spot, always ready to express the sentiments of the Government and protect the interests of the country. The hon. gentleman pointed out

that this officer should not only reside there permanently but should have a *quasi*-diplomatic position; that, it was of great consequence that he should not be an ordinary official such as those who had previously been charged with the affairs of the country, but he should be one holding a very high position—that he should be a dignified and influential officer, one whose rank should be next to that of a Foreign Ambassador. The hon. gentleman told us that it was very important that Canada should secure a fair share of the immigration from the United Kingdom, and that however active, however industrious, those who had previously been the Agents of Canada in Great Britain, they were not able to accomplish, on behalf of the country what might be accomplished by an officer having a higher position. The hon. gentleman declared that Canada had become an auxiliary kingdom, that it was not in the position of an ordinary colony, and for this reason it was of consequence that the representative or agent of the country at the capital of the Empire should be one occupying a high and influential position in the country. The hon. gentleman said:

"It can be well understood that the statements of a mere Agent, with a limited and local jurisdiction, to a certain extent not known or recognized as holding an office for the purpose of expediting and assisting in giving information to intending emigrants—it is found that he is placed at a disadvantage when he is confronted by the active, ceaseless, and energetic exertions of the various agents of the railway companies in the United States, whose prosperity and future depend altogether in the seduction of the emigrants from Europe—and especially from the United Kingdom—to the United States, and diverting them from Canada. It is believed that by having an officer holding a *quasi*-diplomatic position, in fact holding a diplomatic position, so far as is consistent with our position of a dependency of the Empire, his statements, and actions, and prestige, will be generally accepted by the public, and will assist in giving a direction to emigration from the United Kingdom, and from Europe generally."

The hon. gentleman informed us that this officer was to occupy a position of general utility. He was to be the Agent of the Finance Minister; he was to assist in the negotiation of loans, and in dealing with the financial affairs of the Dominion. The Finance Minister informed the House at that time that such an officer might more than save his salary in negotiating the loans and transaction of the financial business of the country. On that occasion, the Finance Minister said:

"I have received very great assistance from them—"

That is to say, from our old agents—

"especially when floating the last loan. They were the Agents for Canada for many years before the Union. Messrs. Baring Bros. were also the Agents of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick before the Union, and the natural feeling will be, if they will undertake any duty of that kind on as favourable terms as any other party similarly situated, that it would be highly desirable that they should have it. In the negotiation of the loan of $10,000,000, our representative there will, I trust, be able to save something like $50,000. I am satisfied that, by the appointment of this official, as now proposed, the sum that will be expended in the maintenance of that official, and the assistance it may be necessary to give him in order to perform the work, will be a small expenditure compared with the large saving that may result from it in a financial point of view, apart from the commercial, political and other considerations to which the hon. leader of the Government has referred."

The hon. leader of the Government also informed the House that it was of very great consequence that this official should be always on the spot; and that our interests had grown to such an extent, and were so varied and important, that it would never do that the country should longer remain without a permanent representative in London. It is true, Sir, he informed us that it might occasionally be necessary that this officer should go to Paris or Madrid, or some other capital on the continent, for the purpose of carrying on negotiations on behalf of Canada, that he might occasionally require to return to Canada in order to become more thoroughly conversant with the views of the Administration for the time being; but that these visits to the continent and Canada were to be of a most temporary character; and it was of the utmost consequence that his residence should be in London, and that he should always be ready to act on behalf of the country. Then, Sir, we also learn from the observations which were then made by the First Minister and by the Minister of Finance, that this officer was also to promote immigration and to be subordinate to the Minister of Agriculture. It is also stated in the Act that was passed on that occasion that this officer is to be responsible on the subject of immigration and other cognate matters, to the Minister of Agriculture, and that he is from time to time to report to him. It is certain that the High Commissioner has regarded himself as the subordinate of the Minister of Agriculture, and that he has acted as such. Now, Sir, I am not going to discuss the utility of this office. Parliament has already decided that such an officer is necessary, as well as, in a large degree, what his duties are. It has also decided that he shall be a permanent resident in England, and the representative of Canada there, as well as a subordinate, in some respects, of the Department of Finance, and in other respects of the Department of Agriculture. Whether it was necessary that we should have such a representative or not, is not now the question. We must assume that such an officer is necessary, so long as this law remains on the Statute Book, and so long as the policy of Parliament, upon this particular subject, is unchanged. The First Minister, at the time he provided for the appointment of this officer, declared that he should be appointed at a salary of not less, although the Act says not more, than $10,000 a year; that he had consulted many parties in reference to the subject, and the general opinion was that the sum of $10,000 was too small; but that he would begin economically with that amount, and if it was found inadequate, there would be no difficulty in Parliament increasing it. The First Minister, on that occasion, also declared that it was necessary that this officer should be one of very high rank, in order to secure that influence which was necessary to enable him to efficiently serve the country. The hon. gentleman is now, and has been for several months, in this country, having left those duties, which the First Minister said could only be efficiently discharged by an officer of high rank, to be discharged by his Private Secretary or Clerk. We know, Sir, that this is the season of the year when the great political lights of the Empire are assembled in London, when the hon. gentleman would be brought most intimately in contact with the leading statesmen of the Empire; yet, now he is away from there, while in the season of the year when London is deserted, and when the hon. gentleman would be required to put on his shooting coat and go to the Highlands in order to find any English statesmen, he will be domiciled in London. In other words, when he can be most useful as High Commissioner in London, he is here, and when he can be of little service, he proposes to be on the other side of the Atlantic. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman's appointment as High Commissioner, while still holding the position of Minister of Railways, renders it impossible for him to carry out that policy which the First Minister announced, and which is delineated in the Act creating the office. The position he occupies as Minister of Railways is also incompatible with his position as High Commissioner. How is it possible that the Minister of Railways, the head of an important Department, can act properly as the subordinate of another Minister of the Crown. The Department of which the hon. gentleman is the official head, is a very important one. It has been especially important during the period that he has held it, that is, during the past five years. We have been carrying on extensive railway enterprises in this country under the charge and direction of the Government; upon these enterprises the Government has a policy involving a large expenditure of money; and if there is any office connected with the Government to which it is necessary that a Minister of

the Crown should devote his attention carefully, I may say exclusively, it is that of Minister of Railways, at the present time. Now, Sir, what is the hon. gentleman's position? He was appointed on the 1st of June last to the office of High Commissioner; he left during the month for London, and he remained until December. All this time he was a Minister of the Crown. Who discharged his duties as Minister of Railways? It is as Minister of Railways that he holds a statutory office, just as he does in the other case; and in that office there are certain duties devolving upon him. He has received from the Governor General a patent for the discharge of the duties of that office. Under the law, no one else can take charge of those duties. We know, as a matter of practice, however, that one Minister does, in a perfunctory way, undertake the duties of another Minister; but it is impossible to suppose that a Minister having his own duties to discharge can attend to the duties of another Minister, and discharge the duties of his own office at the same time. The Minister of Railways placed the Minister of Agriculture in charge of his office while he was away. I maintain that he alone could not perform those duties which he was called on to perform under his patent as Minister of Railways. But the hon. gentleman who acted in his place had other duties devolving upon him as Minister of Agriculture—duties quite adequate to his ability as a Minister, duties that will require all his time in order that they may be discharged efficiently. There are the subjects of immigration and agriculture and statistics; we know that the volumes of statistics that ought to have been in the possession of the country months ago, are not yet in its possession, and we know that the hon. gentleman has so divided his attention between the duties of his own Department and those of the Minister of Railways, that volumes are submitted to this House, to which I shall call attention on another occasion, which are utterly worthless, which show that the duties have not been properly discharged, and that the subjects have not fairly occupied the attention of the hon. Minister. For if they had, they would not have been presented to Parliament in the way they have. No matter how that may be, it is obvious that the hon. Minister of Agriculture was not in a position properly to discharge the work of the hon. Minister of Railways. Look at the important questions that came up in the absence of the Minister of Railways. One question came up relating to a railway in the Eastern Townships, upon which the acting Minister was called on to make a report, and he did make a report; it was a matter in which he was personally interested. Was he in a position fairly to present that subject to his colleagues? Was he in a position to give his colleagues an impartial report on the subject? Was he in the position in which the hon. Minister of Railways would have been, had he been in the country at the time? Then there was the subject of the railway guarantee. We know how that was bungled. I am not going to enter into a discussion now on that matter, as that was fully discussed at an earlier period, but it is perfectly obvious that it could not have fully occupied the mind of, or have been carefully considered by, the acting Minister of Railways. It is perfectly clear to everyone who has looked at what was done, that if the Minister himself, who is responsible for that Department, had been here, what was done would probably not have been done, under the circumstances. Then there is the question of the general oversight of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows he is responsible to the country, he knows that the country holds him responsible for the general oversight of the Canadian Pacific Railway; he knows that he asked Parliament to grant that Company a large amount of money, and a large extent of territory, and it is part of his duty, as a Minister, to see that that subsidy is not misapplied, to see that it is not wasted, to see that the purpose for which it was granted has been fully carried out. Has the hon. Minister been here for the purpose of looking after the affairs of his Department? Has he undertaken to discharge those duties that Parliament requires at his hands, and that the country looks to him to perform? Not at all; the hon. gentleman has been elsewhere; he has been looking after affairs connected with the Department of Agriculture; he has been looking after the condition of cattle that were landed at Liverpool, discharging the work that devolves upon an an ordinary veterinary officer and seeking to take credit to himself for duties that could quite as well, perhaps better, have been performed by some cattle doctor occupying a very subordinate position. When we look at the facts, we will see that the hon. Minister of Railways has not discharged his duties. In the first place, he is not a resident High Commissioner; he has not become a permanent resident of London; he has not carried out the policy of the Act providing for a permanent Agent of the Government of Canada at the Capital of the Empire. The hon. gentleman also knows that in taking that position he took an office wholly incompatible with his office as Minister of Railways. He knows that as Minister of Railways he stands on a footing of equality with his colleagues, the Ministers of Agriculture and Finance; he knows that as High Commissioner he is subordinate to both—in regard to some matters with one, and in regard to other matters with the other. He knows that in withdrawing from Canada he has been half his year in London—the half year in which it was of least consequence to the country that he should be there, and during that time he neglected his duty as Minister of Railways. He has not exercised that supervision over the office it was necessary he should exercise, especially when so large an amount of money has been placed by the country at the disposal of the Canadian Pacific Railway and over which he is bound to exercise an official oversight. It is true we are told the whole Government are responsible for the work of each Department, but as a matter of fact that is not the case. We know that each Minister is responsible for the work of his own Department; we do not hold one Minister responsible for the failures and incapacity or negligence of another. In order that we may have a proper and efficient responsibility in this country, where our administrative work is to so large a degree departmental, it is necessary each Minister should be held individually responsible for the work of his own Department; and it is perfectly obvious that the business of the Department during an important part of the year has not been under the supervision of the Minister who was placed in charge—who has received a patent from the Crown for the purpose of discharging the duties of that office. The hon. gentleman knows that during the six months or more that he was in London, it was utterly impossible that he should exercise over the Department that control it required, and this being the case, I hold that the position which the hon. gentleman has occupied as Minister of Railways is one that is wholly incompatible with the position which he holds as High Commissioner to the United Kingdom. Such being the case, I beg leave to move the following Resolution—to leave out all the words after "That," and insert the following:—

"The Act creating the office of a resident Commissioner and Agent for Canada in the United Kingdom, recites that it is expedient that Canada should have a resident representative Agent in the United Kingdom, to watch over her interests, to be duly accredited to the Imperial Government, and it enacts that such officer shall hold office during pleasure, shall act as representative and resident Agent of the Dominion in the United Kingdom, and shall, in that capacity discharge such duties as shall be assigned to him, and shall carry out such instructions as shall be given by the Governor in Council, and shall take charge of the immigration offices and agencies in the United Kingdom, under the Minister of Agriculture; that in June, 1883, Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals and member for Cumberland, was appointed High Commissioner, retaining his office of Minister of Railways and Canals and the salary of $7,000 a year, and receiving the allowance of $4,000 a year voted in respect of the office of High Commissioner; that in June, 1883, Sir

Charles Tupper went to England as High Commissioner, and he returned to Canada to act as Minister of Railways in December, 1883, and since that time has been in Canada; that the tenure of the offices of Minister of Railways and Canals and High Commissioner, simultaneously, is not fitting, and this House disapproves of the continuance of the arrangement."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the subject of Sir Charles Tupper's appointment has been so fully ventilated already during this Session that, even were I able to discuss it, I do not think there would be any great necessity for occupying the time of the House. I have lost my voice, but I will say a few words, and perhaps I can make myself heard, in regard to it. I think, after the explanations that were made to the House, after the state of affairs that was spread upon the Order in Council appointing my hon. friend, this motion might very well have been spared; but I suppose it is moved as a censure on the Government, or as a censure on my hon. friend as High Commissioner, or both. I wish the hon. gentleman joy of his motion; I do not think he will, either in this House or in the country, take anything by it. The circumstances have been mentioned before, but I shall shortly recapitulate them. Sir Charles Tupper's health—I can speak of him as Sir Charles Tupper, as High Commissioner, if not as a member of the House—it is known, and his friends and the country regretted it, that his health broke down near the end of last Session. His health was so much affected that we feared he might be compelled prematurely to withdraw from his usefulness in the office he performed so well, so faithfully and so satisfactorily to the country. He was desirous to do so himself, but his colleagues, and myself as First Minister, were exceedingly unwilling to lose the advantages of his services, to lose the advantage of his great ability, to lose the advantage of the great power he exhibits in this House, as a member of the Government and as a member of Parliament, and to lose the advantage of his services as Minister of Railways. Then, it so happened that Sir Alexander Galt had, for personal reasons, found it inconvenient to remain longer in England, but with some pressure he remained until the 1st June. The Order in Council explains that that being the case Sir Charles Tupper had kindly consented for the present to accept the office of High Commissioner and to go to England. There was a two fold reason for his doing so. We knew, first, that he would perform the duties in England satisfactorily; and, secondly, we felt that, from the change of scene, and from the every-day work of his duties we might hope to see him restored to his pristine health and vigour; and we are all proud and happy to know that, to a great extent, the effort which was made to get him to go to England has produced that satisfactory result, and I think my hon. friends and the country will acknowledge that this House and the country have been great gainers by the presence of the ability and health and vigour of the hon. gentleman in this House. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not go for his own profit or emolument. The salary of the High Commissioner is $10,000 a year. The salary of the Minister is $7,000 a year. My hon. friend preferred, as it was an experiment, a successful experiment, as I have just stated, to draw the modest salary—we are all modest men, Mr. Speaker, we Ministers—of $7,000 rather than the higher, the larger, the more remunerating salary attached to the office of High Commissioner. During his absence in England we are proud of the success which attended his exertions, both as a diplomatist, and as an immigration agent general, and in his capacity as watching over the best interests of the country. In all these several capacities my hon. friend was happily successful, and he has laid, as a diplomatist, the basis of arrangements which I hope will be successful, and in his hands too—they cannot be in better hands—both in France and in Spain; and we all know what he did in the way of saving and rescuing, as he alone could rescue, from the combination of qualities he possesses, and the vigour of his character carrying those qualities into effect, the live cattle trade of Canada from utter and absolute ruin and loss. If it had not been, Mr. Speaker, for his acquaintance with the pathology of animals, if he had not taken up the case with vigour, within a few days these cargoes of Canadian cattle would have been destroyed as being affected with Texas fever; Canada would have been scheduled as an infected country by the Privy Council, and it would take more power than Canada can exercise, more power than the United States had been able to exercise in England, to get that verdict altered; because, as it was stated the other day, they are very slow in England on these matters, and the Canadian cattle trade would have been permanently ruined, perhaps, if it had not been for these fortunate circumstances. Providence always helps the Conservatives, it is said, and certainly there was never a more providential incident in the history of Canada than the fact that my hon. friend, with his peculiar knowledge, happened to be in England at that time. The hon. gentleman, however, says that the offices are quite inconsistent, that they are incompatible. I do not admit the incompatibility; I do not see that there is anything incompatible in the two positions. The hon. gentleman says: "Oh, but if he is High Commissioner he should reside in England." So he has. So resident Ambassadors reside in England, but we find that resident Ambassadors, if they happen to be members of either House of Parliament, return on special occasions. If they happen to be Peers, they return, continually, to perform their duties in the House of Lords. Lord Lyons, Lord Cowper, and every other Lord who happens to be an Ambassador, during the Session of Parliament, returns to vote for and with his party. And the hon. gentleman said: "Oh, it is quite inconsistent, because, as High Commissioner, he is subordinate to the Minister of Agriculture, and at the same time he is equal with him as being a colleague and a fellow Minister." The same position is held by Lord Spencer at this moment. He is Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; he is a member of the Government, he is a member of the Cabinet this moment in England. They never found out in England this new doctrine which the hon. gentleman, with his usual ingenuity has sprung upon us. It is unknown in England, unknown to the English Parliament, unknown to English practice. Lord Spencer is Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, and he is subordinate to the Secretary of State for Ireland; and yet, as Lord Lieutenant for Ireland, he represents the Queen directly. He is more than Governor General, he is Deputy Sovereign and Viceroy. And yet the point was never raised, even by Mr. Parnell, and he does not like Lord Spencer. And yet we find that even Mr. Parnell has not brought up any such objection, an objection I must say, unknown in England, and unknown here until the hon. gentleman started this hare, and found this mare's nest. But the hon. gentleman said that, at all events, the duties of Minister of Railways ought to have been performed by himself. Well, I fancy that the hon. gentleman, when he was a Minister, found that occasionally some of his colleagues were absent. Some went to England, and their duties were performed by a brother colleague. But he says it is quite wrong; that a commission under the Great Seal of the Dominion was actually issued for Sir Charles Tupper, declaring him Minister of Railways, and no other man, woman, or child, could perform the duties under that commission but Sir Charles Tupper! Why didn't the hon. gentleman find it out before? I dare say that when the hon. gentleman was Minister, the Finance Minister in the Cabinet went home to England and somebody performed his duties. And there were most important duties to be performed; they had to issue, perhaps, debentures, make a large conversion of securities, and have large dealings with the finances of the country. And yet the hon. gentleman allowed that to go on in his time, and only now finds out

that it was wrong—that he was wrong, that the Premier was wrong, that every gentleman in that Government was wrong, and every Government has been wrong, since 1867; and now the accumulated wrongs, the accumulated breaches of the Constitution, committed by all the Governments since 1867, must be heaped on the devoted head of my hon. friend, who is to be made the scapegoat. That is the argument. However, any stake will do to break a man's head if you want to break his head, and the hon. gentleman has taken a stake, but I am afraid the stake was rotten, and it has broken in his own hands. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I would say. The hon. gentleman made rather an insinuation against the Minister of Agriculture, who performed, and well performed, the duties of the Department of Railways and Canals during the temporary absence of my hon. friend. All those who know that gentleman, know his capacity for business; all those who know him, know that he is perfectly disinterested, and a more disinterested, a more unselfish man I never met than that hon. gentleman. I am proud to bear this testimony in his favour, that a more disinterested, a more unselfish man never existed; and the very insinuation, that because he might or might not have been interested in any way whatever in any railway, would actuate him in the performance of those duties, would be considered by those who know him well as a wanton insult. That hon. gentleman is superior to any suspicion of that kind, and I resent it as a taunt thrown out, in the course of the hon. gentleman's speech, that will not in any way injure or diminish the respect that the House and the country have for John Henry Pope. Mr. Speaker, I say this was simply an attempt to attack my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and the Government through him. The motion, as I understood it from hearing it read, is rather peculiar. It not only passes censure on this temporary arrangement, but it passes censure on what the hon. gentleman supposes is going to happen. You may pass censure on the Government for what has happened, but it is reserved to the hon. gentleman for the first time to pass censure on the Government for what he says is going to happen. He says: "This continuance in such a course." How does he know there is to be a continuance in such a course? He should have ascertained that first, before he offered his resolution.

Mr. MILLS. It is continuing now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Merely a further continuance of this arrangement. Mr. Speaker, the continuance must be established, the continuance must be known, the continuance must be permanent, before there can be a censure. But the hon. gentleman resolves to censure my hon. friend, and I wish him joy of the motion. I do not think that it will take a very long time for the House to dispose of it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman meets this motion and the important questions which it raises in a manner which was not to be expected, having regard for his own statements when, at an early period of the Session, the subject was first broached. I broached the subject at an early period, and the hon. gentleman stated in the debate on the Address, if I remember aright, that no doubt it would be brought up later on. I broached it on a motion for papers. The hon. gentleman said the subject would be discussed, and no doubt, fully discussed, when the papers were brought down, and stated that he would be prepared then to discuss it. I cannot say that the papers have been brought down yet, because I have tired myself and wearied the House with iterated and reiterated demands for them—some came this evening, but even yet we have not got the commission laid on the Table. It is true an hon. gentleman has read portions of it; it is true that his supporters have had access to it; it is true then that the Minister of the Interior and the Secretary of State have been able to see it from time to time and to read from it; but although the House, two months ago, lacking four days, ordered that that commission should be brought down, we have not got it into our hands to read it or to have the benefit of seeing what it contains. Now, Sir, even in advance of the production of that document, and not a very long period after the papers were laid upon the Table which the hon. gentleman said would be laid upon the Table, and upon which he supposed a formal discussion would be raised, a discussion is raised, and then the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, there is nothing in it; it is a very inopportune motion to have made." The hon. gentleman's excuses are various. First of all, he pleads *ad misericordiam*. He says this was an arrangement made, not in the interests of the public so much as in the interest of the health of the incumbent of the two offices. He says Sir Charles Tupper's health, as we regretted to learn, failed considerably and he was desirous of withdrawing from office, but the hon. gentleman prescribed for him, instead of withdrawal from the cares of office, a duplication of those cares. He prescribed that the office of Minister of Railways being too much, Sir Charles Tupper should add to the cares and worry, the care and worry of the office of High Commissioner for Canada, and this tonic, this prescription of the hon. gentleman, has had a wonderful effect—it has produced the result which was expected and hoped for. It was a very strange experiment to try, to tell a broken-down man that the proper mode to get well, was to add to duties which had been found too severe for him, other heavy and important duties. But it seems to me that no one would have objected, any more than they did when the First Minister himself was seized with a very serious illness and took a long and deserved recess—no one would have objected, I say, to such a course, for it is a perfectly proper course to take. If the Minister of Railways, or any other Minister, had broken down in health, no one would object to his obtaining such leave of absence as was necessary for the restoration of his health, and to necessary temporary arrangements being made for the discharge of his duties—not so satisfactory a discharge as if the work were done by the Minister himself, if in perfect health. These are exigencies which, we understand, are to be met, and in regard to which it was no impropriety to meet them in the manner to which I have alluded. But to say it is an excuse which is valid for the creation, and, as far we can learn, the permanent creation, of an arrangement and conjunction of offices which we believe uncalled for and unconstitutional, is not a statement which I can accept. I can perfectly understand the appeal *ad misericordiam* which the hon. gentleman makes; but I cannot accept it as an answer to a criticism of that arrangement. I have shown that precedents existed that the hon. gentleman's own case existed as a precedent, for granting to any Minister whose health had broken down such a period of ease and retirement from the cares of office, without adverse criticism from the other side, as might be necessary for the restoration of that health. That was the proper remedy in this case, and that being the proper remedy, the circumstance to which the hon. gentleman has alluded is no justification of this particular arrangement. It is not a secret that the arrangements which were made on that occasion were not the primary arrangements. It is very well known that, in the first instance, the intention was that the High Commissioner and the Minister of Railways should not be the same person; that Sir Charles Tupper was appointed to occupy the office of High Commissioner and would retire from the office of Minister of Railways. In anticipation of that event, even during the Session of Parliament, a very long account of the past services of Sir Charles Tupper was given to a correspondent of a Conservative newspaper, and produced at very great length, and it was his valedictory,

Then there was a gathering here—a dinner I think, to the then First Minister of Quebec, who is now a Judge in one of the districts of that Province—Mr. Mousseau—at which Sir Charles Tupper said all that could be said during a Session of Parliament when he was still a Minister and had not accepted the office of High Commissioner—he said all that could possibly be said, in view of his existing relations to the Government, to indicate that he was changing entirely his relations to the party. He used words something like what I have now used as to the expected change in his relations to the party and the new sphere which he was about to occupy. This was common talk; it was the subject of discussion in the Ministerial organs, and at about the close of the Session—I think it was after the close of the Session—it was announced that Sir Charles Tupper was about to hold the office of Minister of Railways concurrently with the office of High Commissioner. Why that change? I could understand all that the First Minister has said consistently with his carrying out the first plan—the plan to relieve the hon. gentleman from the worry and care of the position of Minister of Railways, and remove to a country whose climate was considered more salutary for him, and fill the post of High Commissioner, an honourable, I will not say retirement, but change in public service, suitable to the condition of his health, and a position in which he might discharge important public duties, though of a different character from those he had discharged up to that time. But why that change? If it had been arranged that he should occupy the position of High Commissioner and no longer occupy that of Minister of Railways, that would have been another arrangement different from what I conceive to be the highly objectionable arrangement made by which Sir Charles Tupper became High Commissioner and retained the post of Minister of Railways. The hon. First Minister has repeatedly observed that the statement in the Order in Council indicates a temporary character to that arrangement. One might have supposed that some indication would be given as to what that meant, and the hon. gentleman, in his earlier speech on this matter, said the Minister of Railways might expect to hold the office of Minister of Railways permanently, but that the office of High Commissioner was much more temporary; but he gave no indication as to the termination of the arrangement. On the contrary, on various occasions during the Session, on no less than two occasions, has the Minister of Finance alluded to the circumstance that diplomatic negotiations had been entered upon to some extent by the High Commissioner during his residence in England, which were to be renewed by him on his return to that country; and I observe by the papers brought down and laid on the Table, that even he himself speaks of arrangements for his return to England, and the preparation of the mansion, which I presume is to be acquired for the use of the High Commissioner on his return to England. So everything indicates an arrangement intended to be as continuous as the arrangements of offices which are all held during pleasure, and which are dependent on various political contingencies. The hon. First Minister says that during the absence of the Minister of Railways as High Commissioner, he discharged his duties well. He says he has done great things as diplomatist. Of course, we have to take that upon trust. We have asked for papers, but they have not been brought down. We are told negotiations are in progress in certain instances, and that we may expect to hear something about them. But we get no report from the High Commissioner on the subject of negotiations. We hear a great deal about his success. The appointment of Sir Alexander Galt was heralded with a great flourish of trumpets, and we were told he was going to do great things for us in the negotiations of commercial treaties. There was on that occasion much cry and little wool. On this occasion, also—I must confess it is for the first time—the cry is loud, the pœans of triumph are sounded; we hear of the great triumphs of this diplomatist. But we have to take the First Minister's word for it. The hon. First Minister also says that Sir Charles Tupper has done great things as an immigration agent; but we do no know what those great things are. I have read the Report of the Minister of Agriculture. I am not now going to criticise what precisely he has done, what good fortune has attended his efforts, what success has attended them up to this time, or whether they are in the future. I do not conceive that any of these points are material. Lastly, it is said that he saved the cattle trade of Canada, that by a peculiar conjunction of the qualities of vigour, energy, and special knowledge, he did what probably no other man could have done—saved the cattle trade of Canada. Well, he was not sent there for that particular purpose. He did not conjecture, I presume, that there would be danger of the trade being suspended, or of some mistake being made on the part of the health officers who were in charge of this subject, in England, or of the hon. gentleman being able to point out, with the assistance of other veterinary surgeons, that they were wrong; nor do I understand any particular merit in these transactions, of which we have heard such great laudations. I cannot conceive that it was anything less than a plain and obvious duty of the High Commissioner, when he learned that there were three cargoes of Canadian cattle in danger, that he should go to the point in the country where the question was in issue, and there call for the assistance of such veterinary surgeons as might be necessary, and take the most vigorous steps. I agree that he did so, but I say that he did neither more nor less than his duty, and I presume that another gentleman in the position that Sir Alexander Galt himself, with his assistance of those veterinary surgeons whom he might have employed—would have been able to accomplish these results. Although the hon. gentleman has renewed the boast, that Providence always favours the Conservative party, still Providence does not grant the hon. gentleman power to absolutely foreknow its decrees; and the hon. gentleman will not pretend that he foreknew that these cargoes were to be landed, that they were to be condemned, and that it was required that a medical man should act as High Commissioner in order to save them. The hon. gentleman in this part of his argument resorted to a common fallacy—a common mode of making good a bad case. It is not because of this success or the non-success of the mission of Sir Charles Tupper, that his appointment is to be either praised or blamed. This motion is not based on any consideration of what his qualifications for the office of High Commissioner are. It is not based on any proposition that he is not fit to be High Commissioner; it is not based on any proposition that he is not fit to be Minister of Railways. It is based on the proposition that the same person should not be at the same time both Minister of Railways and High Commissioner to England. That is the proposition, and no matter how surpassing the qualifications of the man are, as he cannot be in the two places at once, he cannot discharge the divided and incompatible duties of the two offices at the same time. The hon. gentleman says the duties of the office of the Minister of Railways were wearing and worrying, and that the constant wear and worry affected the health of the incumbent. Nobody can doubt that during the anxious period between June and December, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, there would have been a good deal of wear and tear. There was the question of the route through the Rocky Mountains; there was the serious question of the financial condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; there was the question of the appeal of the Government for aid by granting their guarantee. There was the whole of that very important question to be considered, to be maturely and fully considered, as to the railway operation and as to the

financial policy. All these things in turn had to be done, and it is not necessary to point out, if under ordinary circumstances, as the hon. gentleman has said, the duties of the Minister of Railways involve constant worry and work, that during this half year they involved exceptional worry and exceptional work. All the more necessary was it that there should be a responsible Minister in charge of the Department, who had not other things to do. The hon. gentleman has said that those duties were discharged by a Minister who had himself an important Department to take charge of—the Minister of Agriculture, who was in charge of a Department, two branches of which were very active, or should have been in very active operation during those six months. There was the question of immigration, in respect of which our expenditure is so enormous—a vote, if I remember aright, of something like $550,000 being asked—a great portion of which is expended in ways which required constant supervision and closeness of attention on the part of the Minister. The practical result of the operations connected with the vote, the mode in which immigrants are brought out, the class of immigrants who are brought out, the arrangements for their being distributed through the country, are generally, and were last year, of particular importance, involving as they did, the coming out of a new class of immigrants, the dealing with the question, not merely of the Manitoba immigration, but the question of the Irish immigration into the country, and other points of that kind. Another branch was the Census Branch, one volume of which we have not received, which has been delayed very unreasonably, as it seems to me, and which should have been attended to much earlier. These things required and demanded the attention of the Minister, and the Minister whose attention they demand and require is charged, in addition to these duties, not for a temporary period, but for a period of six months, with those duties which had been too much for the undivided attention of the Minister of Railways. It was not possible that they should be thoroughly attended to; for I attribute to the want of the attendance of the Minister who had the undivided responsibility and the sole charge of the Department of Railways and Canals, the fiasco in reference to the guarantee and the accession of the Government to that plan which turned out so absurd and abortive a failure, and which necessarily led the country into the great entanglements and enormous engagements into which it has been plunged, by the succession of events which followed the agreement of the Government to endorse the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the extent they did. Now I maintain that there is an incompatibility between the holding of these offices, in point of residence. The hon. gentleman says that the resident Ambassador continually crosses from Paris to London to vote with his party in the House of Lords. He says Lord Lyons and Lord Cowper did so. But I would ask him how long does it take to cross from Paris to London and back again? I do not remember how often, on great party divisions, the English Ambassador does cross, but I know that he has a residence in Paris, that he is generally there, and that if he crosses, it is very exceptional for him to do so; just as the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland may cross once or twice when there is a discussion of Irish affairs in the House, and when he, as a member of the Government, goes over to give the weight of his presence and information to the great council of the country, with reference to the particular functions he has to discharge. But to draw an analogy between the Minister at Paris going over once or twice during the Session to the House of Lords for a particular occasion, and being absent three, or four, or five days from his duties at Paris, and the Minister of Railways going from Canada to England, being away six months, and then going back four or five, or six, months, and then returning six months to England, seems to me perfectly absurd—I do not think another word is suitable for such an argument as that. The hon. gentleman says that I did not maintain that these offices are incompatible by the same person. I said when the arrangement was made, you want a person with reference to commercial negotiations, to see how the treaties are going on, and it is important that we should have an Agent there. Well, I said, appoint your agent *pro hac officio*. Oh, no, that would never do; the negotiations are always going on, the hon. gentleman said. It is impossible to tell at any moment when they may not commence; it is a question of moment, a question of hours; it would be quite impossible to assume that the wheels of the negotiations should stop in order that we may send a man over; we require a resident representative agent, and we are choosing a resident agent, who is to reside half the year in Canada and the other half in England—and that, the the less important half. That is the proposal of the hon. gentleman. The office is that of resident representative agent in London, and the duties of the office require him to be there. The arrangements, for instance, at this moment, with reference to the immigration of the approaching season, do not require him to be there; he is residing in Canada just now. These important negotiations, to which reference has been made—the hon. gentleman's diplomatic triumphs still in the bud—must stand; the blossoming of this century plant is deferred because he is out here in the chilly Canadian winter; and we must wait for it until he goes back. The hon. Minister of Finance says the negotiations will be resumed when the representative resident agent becomes the resident agent once more; but how far might they have proceeded if the resident had remained resident? What is the sense of creating an office with a resident agent, so that the negotiations may go on constantly, instead of sending a member of the Government over from time to time? What is the sense of deciding that you must have a man on the spot, and then appointing one whose duties require him to be absent from the spot half the time, leaving behind him your negotiations, the beggarly amount of which, ever since this Government assumed office, may be summed up in the one word—nothing, absolutely nothing. Not one single thing has been accomplished up to this time, in order that the hon. gentleman's plan may be carried out, of having a resident agent in London residing one-half of the year in Canada. But the hon. gentleman says it is quite consistent that he should be Minister of Railways, because some one else can discharge his duties: and he says this has been done in the past. Of course it has been done in the past, temporarily. When illness or some other temporary exigency called a Minister away, his duties have been discharged by a colleague. That is of necessity, not of choice. Illness requires a Minister to leave, and nobody says that because he requires to leave for a month, or for two or three months, he should resign. Then what are you to do? Necessity calls for some temporary arrangement, however inadequate, for the discharge of the duties of his office in his absence. So if some public necessity calls a Minister as a Minister, as a member of the Government, as having the discharge of a great Department in the discharge of a portion of the duties of his office, to go abroad—say to British Columbia, say to Washington, say to England—he is still discharging one part of his duties as Minister and as a member of the Cabinet. The hon. First Minister went to England as First Minister on more than one occasion. While absent, he was discharging a portion of his Ministerial duties. A portion of his Ministerial duties in Ottawa could not be discharged while he was away, and therefore some one else discharged that portion. The hon. Minister of Railways went abroad as Minister of Railways; there was a portion of his duties to be discharged while he was away, and some one else discharged those duties which remained to be discharged at home. But these arrangements cannot be compared with the arrangement, not

of necessity, in the slightest degree, but of choice, in which you conjoin the office of a Minister whose duties call him to be in Ottawa, with the office of High Commissioner, whose duties call him to be in London. That is an arrangement, not of a necessary and temporary character, but of choice—the permanent conjunction of two inconsistent and incompatible offices. Then, the hon. gentleman says there is nothing at all in the objection that the High Commissioner is under the control of the Minister of Agriculture, *quoad* his duties in regard to immigration. Why, he says Lord Spencer is under the control of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Well, we know there has been considerable discussion upon that subject. We know that the Chief Secretary for Ireland has not been, until late years, a member of the Cabinet, and therefore the Lord Lieutenant has been the chief Executive officer. We know that, in consequence of the extraordinary condition of affairs in Ireland, the Chief Secretary for Ireland was made a member of the Cabinet when Mr. Forster was made Chief Secretary; and we know that that condition of things, under which there was something like a co-ordinate authority between the Lord Lieutenant having a seat in the Cabinet as well as the Chief Secretary, has been the subject of considerable criticism. Some people have said that the divided authority was not quite the thing, and that there has been a considerable weakening of the Lord Lieutenant's authority. The experiment has been regarded as not altogether successful. But I do not think the analogy bears out. Here we have a statutory arrangement, under which the High Commissioner is under the control of the Minister of Agriculture. That is an entirely different thing from the arrangement, indefinite and elastic as it is, between the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The High Commissioner is an officer of the Minister of Agriculture. He is bound to obey that Minister's instructions; he is not a Cabinet Minister at all; but he reports to one of the Ministers. I say that the argument of my hon. friend has not been in the slightest degree attacked in that respect. Then the hon. gentleman says you are complaining that this arrangement is continued; but you ought to find out whether it is going to be continued or not before you express an opinion. How could we find out? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that he would answer the question, if we asked? We know that it is going to be continued; we know that it is continuing to-night; we know that it is to go on to-morrow; we know that it is to go on until the end of the Session; and we know that after the Session is over, the High Commissioner is to return to London, because the hon. Minister of Finance has told us that he is to go and continue his negotiations, and because the papers which have been laid on the Table shows that he is preparing his mansion not a mansion in the skies, of course, but a mansion in the fogs of London. Therefore, all the indices are quite sufficient to show that the arrangement is to be continued. But if the hon. gentleman informs us that it is to be discontinued, I shall advise my hon. friend to withdraw his motion; but if he cannot give us that assurance, I will advise my hon. friend to divide the House on the motion, because this arrangement, which was objectionable from the start, which has been demonstrated from its inception to be a wrong, is a wrong that is about to be continued, and that ought to be discontinued by the vote of this House.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mills,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Platt,
Béchard,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cartwright,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Catudal,	Lister,	Vail,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McIntyre,	Wilson,—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Méthot,
Beaty,	Fortin,	Moffat,
Belleau,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Orton,
Billy,	Gordon,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burnham,	Hay,	Ross,
Burns,	Hesson,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Small,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Smyth,
Caron,	Ives,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Temple,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tilley,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper (Pictou),
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Lesage,	Vanasse.
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Daoust,	McDonald (CapeBreton)	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Widiams,
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wood (West'land).—95.
Dugas,	McDougald,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Bain (Soulanges),	Scriver,
Massue,	Bernier,
Bergeron,	Bourassa,
Benson,	Cockburn,
Gault,	Campbell (Renfrew),
White (Hastings),	Mulock,
Barnard,	Holton,
Abbott,	Yeo.

The House, then again, resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

RAILWAYS.

Canadian Pacific Railway.

68. Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River.... $500,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain to us in detail what he proposes to do with this $500,000. I had supposed that, by his arrangement, this had all been finally handed over to the Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right, but he will understand that it requires the money to be provided to pay all the same, under the contract which has been made with the Company for the construction of the work that remained to be performed, between Prince Arthur's Landing and Red River. There is not only the section "B" to be finished, but there are the works that required to be completed under the previous contracts. This $500,000 is required to settle the section "B" contract, and to provide for the payment to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for completing this section of road, as per the agreement which has been laid upon the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is about 100 miles, I think, is it not? The part that remains—how much is it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This $500,000 is to close with the contractors, to settle finally with the contractors, and also to pay the amount on the other various sections for the work required to be done, in order to place the whole line from Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, in the condition in which the Government were bound, under the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, to hand it over to them.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion is required to settle with Section "B," and what proportion for the Canadian Pacific Railway contract? As I understand it, the hon. gentleman has entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself to do all the work that is necessary to complete the line in the condition in which they conceive it ought to have been handed over to them, and embraced in that lump sum is the amount required to finish the Section "B" contract—$970,000, I think, was the original amount.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; that covered the entire work.

Mr. BLAKE. I say so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was required to put the whole line in the condition it should have been, and also to perform the work required to be done on Section "B."

Mr. BLAKE. I said so. I spoke of $970,000 as the lump sum, and including the 15 per cent. handed over to these gentlemen, I suppose it was raised to a still higher sum. From $900,000 to $1,000,000 is the whole sum which goes to the Canadian Pacific Railway. He is now asking $500,000. What proportion of that is going to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or is it all going to them under this contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not all going to the Canadian Pacific Railway, because a portion of it is to settle finally with the contractors.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion has he assigned in his estimate, in this lump sum, for settlement with the contractors, and what proportion has he assigned to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the amount that was taken before, it is difficult to say how much of this will be applied for the one and how much for the other. I will give the hon. gentleman more minute information on Concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know from the Minister, as far as his information extends, what is the condition at present of that 400 miles, or thereabouts, from Prince Arthur's Landing to the Red River. A good deal has been said in the newspapers and by persons who have travelled over this road, as to the condition of the road. Of course, I am aware that a large quantity of the trestle-work will, in all probability, have to be replaced, in the nature of the case; but I should be glad to know, and I think the House would be glad to learn, generally, if the hon. gentleman possesses the information, what is the condition, and what is likely to be the condition, of the permanent way and what steps are being taken to fill up the trestles. I have heard it stated by parties, not political friends of mine but political friends of the other side, that a great deal of that trestle-work was in an exceedingly dangerous condition; that it was very badly constructed, and that it would not be safe, but on the contrary very dangerous indeed, to run trains at any considerable speed over it; in short, that the whole of that road required very careful overhauling before it could be made very useful for the purpose of carrying heavy freights, at any rate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the result will be that this road will be a first-class road all the way from Port Arthur to the Red River. The trestles, or a considerable portion of the work to which the hon. gentleman alluded, were temporary trestles. They were intended to carry the trains over, to enable communication to be had between these two points in the first instance, but the filling has been going rapidly on, and will be completed, so that the road will be a first-class road in every respect when the work which has been provided for is completed; and the hon. gentleman could not require much better evidence than the fact that under the contract we were bound to hand over the road to the Canadian Pacific Railway as a first-class road and in very complete order, and provision has been made in the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, satisfactory to them, for this amount, to take it over and complete the road. So we have a pretty good assurance that, when this amount is expended, the road will be in a thoroughly good condition, and with the grades maintained as was originally intended—an exceedingly favourable grade, and adapted for the rapid running of trains.

Mr. BLAKE. As soon as I saw the contract, I quite thought that the observation the hon. Minister has just made was the appropriate one. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has said this is what they think is required to put this road into such order as they are entitled to get it in. It is, of course, their interest to get it in at least as good order as their original contract provided. They have themselves proposed to do the work for the sum of money. The question for consideration, therefore, is not whether the road is not in good condition, but whether we are going to put it in too good condition for them, because their interest might lead them to make exorbitant demands. I say they might. I do not say they have done so; but they certainly must have asked—they ought to have asked—to be allowed to expend as much money as would put it in proper condition. We certainly ought to have more information than is vouchsafed. We are asked for half a million dollars more; we do not know whether that is a final vote or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I expect this to complete it.

Mr. BLAKE. If this is to complete the whole thing, we would like to know what the whole is going to cost. Of course it does not bind the hon. gentleman or the House in any way, but we would like to know what the hon. gentleman estimates he will require to pay those unfortunate contractors of section "B," who have been so harassed by the Government for a long time, and are now about to reap a tardy return from the arbitration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has just touched a point which shows how improper it would be for me to make any close statement in reference to this. An arbitration was granted which is not now settled. As it is an unknown quantity that may be assigned to them by the arbitrators it would be very injudicious in me to make any estimate which might be a suggestive indication. In fact it would be impossible for me to state, in the absence of the award, what amount they may likely receive. I do not myself expect it will be very much, if anything, in excess of what they have already received.

Mr. BLAKE. We are in an awkward position. We are asked to vote an unknown quantity. How much we do not know, because it is in the nature of an unknown quantity to be an unknown quantity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know that it is any thing.

Mr. BLAKE. I maintain that if the hon. gentleman is in such a position that he cannot form any estimate whatever, he ought not to ask this House to vote any sum. It will be time enough for the vote after the award has been made, or when the hon. gentleman is in a position to give this House information upon which we can vote more intelligently.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Something will be due to the contractors out of this amount, according to our own estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the only sum the hon. gentleman ought to ask us to vote. If that be so, and the hon. gentleman will state the amount, we will deduct it from the half-million dollars. The balance ought to be the sum he expects to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman intend to take a special vote for anything that may be granted under this award?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If there is anything, I will.

Mr. BLAKE. If we are to understand that none of this money now being voted is to be devoted to the payment of the award, if one be made, that is a different thing, and we have nothing to say to it, as far as that is concerned, whatever we may have to say to it in other respects.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This embraces the amount of money that the Department expects to be required to pay for the work performed by the contractors for section "B;" it is what we expect to find due to them and to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the work that, under our agreement with them, they will be entitled to be paid for.

Mr. CASEY. There has been a statement in the papers that the arbitrators had come to a decision as to a part, at least, of the claim. It was stated that the claim consisted of two classes, one in regard to the classification of the work and the remeasuring of what has been done; the other, in regard to claims for damages caused by delay on the part of other contractors in finishing their part of the work. It was stated the first part had been settled and the arbitrators had made an award.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That statement is quite correct, that the arbitration has been divided into two parts. In the first place, the contractors claimed they were entitled to consideration for the change in the character of the work, and the reduction in the amount of work contained in the specifications when they took their contract. That is the point upon which the arbitrators are now sitting.

Mr. CASEY. Because the quantity was reduced after they took the contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They asked for consideration on the ground that a very great change was made in the contract, as undoubtedly there was. They claimed that the work which they expected to be profitable had been reduced, and work that they considered unprofitable had been increased, just as contractors always make changes a basis for reconsideration. It is a question of consequential damages, if I might use the word; and that is the point now being considered. But the point that was referred to, and has been dealt with by the arbitrators, was the claim that the Chief Engineer had not allowed them what they were entitled to under the contract. An award has been made in their favour unanimously by the arbitrators, Judge Clarke, Mr. Brydges and Mr. Light, giving the contractors $45,000 over and above the amount the Department were willing to pay. I do not anticipate that they will be allowed anything for the portion of the work now being considered.

Mr. BLAKE. I heard the award was $160,000 or $170,000; from the present statement, I presume that embraced a certain sum the Government offered to pay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; $45,000 was paid over what the Chief Engineer was willing to certify to. There was no dispute to pay the $120,000, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. BLAKE. Does this vote include the $120,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It covers the whole amount.

Mr. BLAKE. This is now a final vote. Will the hon. gentleman say what the final cost will be from Prince Arthur's Landing to the Red River should, as he expects, no award be granted against the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A little over $14,000,000. I gave the exact figures on a former occasion.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no variation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under any supposeable condition of things, this contract will be closed, and the work will be executed by these contractors at a sum greatly below that originally estimated.

Mr. CASEY. The Chief Engineer was willing to certify to about $120,000, as I understand, more than he had been willing to certify to in the first instance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. CASEY. The $45,000 is the award of the arbitrators; and what is the $120,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no such sum as $165,000. I said that the amount over and above that which the Department held to be due, was $45,000.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend mentioned that he had seen this sum of $165,000, or thereabouts, mentioned in the newspapers, and I asked if that sum included this $45,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the whole amount that is due is in this.

Mr. CASEY. Is the arbitration now sitting?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand so. There was a long vacation taken. I was extremely anxious to have everything closed up before Parliament rose, and urged it upon the arbitrators in the strongest way. Mr. Brydges was called back to Winnipeg, and as soon as it was possible for him to return he has done so, and I except before the House rises to be able to submit the final result.

Mr. CASEY. I think there was no standard of classification expressed in the contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was a great difficulty about the original terms used in the contract.

69. British Columbia (revote $1,000,000).....$2,000,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This sum is required to pay the staff, salaries of engineers and contractors for work done under contracts 60, 61, 62, 63 and 92, also for lands and damages.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman still of opinion that the estimates he has formerly given, as to the total cost of the British Columbia section, will be verified?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to say, that so far as we have been able to close any of these contracts, the figures are within and not without the estimate formerly submitted. I think the work will be completed within the estimate. Up to the present time, $7,000,000 in round numbers have been spent.

Mr. BLAKE. I received a statement some time ago to the effect that an error had been made with reference to the location of the piers of one of the bridges, I think, across the Fraser River. Has the hon. gentleman heard anything about it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not heard.

Mr. BLAKE. Has he heard of any of the piers being undermined by the high water?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not remember; I will make a note of it.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish the hon. gentleman would, as the information I have received is very specific. It was one of the principal bridges across the Fraser, and it was said it would occasion one year's delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt it was a mistake, but I will see about it.

70. Station accommodation ..... $ 200,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These stations are on the British Columbia portion of the railway, and cover the whole line. This sum is in addition to the $30,000 spent before, and embraces the total cost.

71. Subsidy $6,000,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, explain whether this calculation of $6,000,000 was predicated upon the altered mode of payment prescribed by the Act in force during the present Session, or upon the mode of payment in force prior thereto?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is predicated upon the altered mode of payment, and is assumed to cover the amount that will be necessary to complete the work within the time stated.

Mr. BLAKE. I observed the statement to be that the expenditure of the Company would be $1,250,000 a month, for the first of the two years which practically remained, and $1,000,000 per month for the latter of the two years, thus indicating that there would be a larger portion in the earlier years, which we are now voting for, than in the latter years. But the whole subsidy is, if I remember aright, $12,710,000, and there is a lesser scale of expenditure in the latter years than in the earlier years. It would appear as if a larger sum than $6,000,000 would be falling into the first year. The hon. gentleman will recollect the statement was made, that the $15,000,000 would be spent in the first year, and $12,000,000 in the second, making $27,000,000 in all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. There does not seem to be an allocation of the subsidy proportionate to that half.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the early part of the subsidy.

Mr. BLAKE. But then much more than that $12,710,000 is to be spent in the year we are now voting for. The proportions are 15 to 12; instead of that, the hon. gentleman is putting it the other way, 12 to 15.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This has nothing to do with the line.

Mr. BLAKE. But now we are paying in proportion to the work done. They are going to do more than half this year, therefore, they get more than half the subsidy this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I see the point you are raising.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. Minister would allow me, I would like to ask a question with reference to the station accommodation, an item which is alreay passed. The sum, it strikes me, is a large one for the number of stations to be required on 200 miles. What number of stations do the Government intend to construct?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot say at this moment.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is nearly $1,000 a mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note of that, and give a statement of the number on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman give some further information as to this scale of payment—because I am a little afraid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I will do that also.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps, at the same time, the hon. gentleman would give us some information as to the amount he expects to expend on the line of these works.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The same proportion as 12 to 15.

Intercolonial Railway.

72. Halifax Extension $18,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amount is proposed to be appropriated as follows: $3,000 to rebuild a hay shed torn down in rearranging the tracks for the extension into Halifax; $5,000 for filling in portion of water lot acquired from the Imperial Government, at the west end of the dockyard, this work being required by the Imperial authorities; $10,000 for the purchase of water lots at Richmond wharf, additional accommodation for vessels being required. The sum of $18,000 will entirely complete the work at Halifax.

Mr. BLAKE. The extension is in connection with the elevator. I understood the Minister to say, on a former occasion, that four cargoes had been shipped.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I am told only one cargo was grain and the other peas?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, peas, which were shipped through the elevator. The hon. gentleman is aware that the short crop of wheat in Ontario has entirely changed the position from what was expected if there had been the usual supply of grain in Canada.

73. Increased accommodation at St. John $25,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amount is required to construct a connecting line between the Intercolonial Railway and the St. John Bridge, at St. John. The Company is engaged in constructing a bridge which will connect the Intercolonial with railways on the other side of the harbour, and this amount is required to connect the Intercolonial with the bridge.

74. St. Charles Branch $40,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote is required for the purpose of constructing a coal wharf and making connection at Point Lévis. This branch is expected to be opened in June or July.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been the entire cost of the St. Charles Branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has cost a much larger sum than was anticipated. I am afraid that before completion, the cost will be very little short of $1,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the hon. gentleman's estimate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think about half that amount.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman think if we had had the Minister of Railways in Canada all the time he could have kept the cost down?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I took every possible precaution to ascertain the value of the land and right of way, but those have proved much more costly than I supposed, or the officers in the Department and land valuators estimated, and these charges have swollen the amount out of all proportion to the estimate. The length of the branch is 13 miles.

Mr. CHARLTON. In settling for the right of way, has there been litigation in any case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been, but the claims have been largely settled by arbitration.

Mr. BLAKE. Almost all settled by arbitration?

Sir CHARLES TUPER. To a very large extent. Whenever we considered the claim a reasonable one, we preferred to settle it rather than go to arbitration; for I have been very much dissatisfied with the results of the claims brought before the arbitrators.

Mr. WELDON. What saving of distance is effected?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About 12 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. What are the main headings of this enormous expenditure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman the items before Concurrence.

75. Miscellaneous works, not otherwise provided for $6,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the usual vote.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to enquire whether the arrangement with the Pullman Palace Car Company is being continued?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As the hon. gentleman is aware, that arrangement has not been very satisfactory, and it is of great importance to the Intercolonial Railway to have a Pullman service from Halifax and St. John direct to Montreal without change. The contract between the Pullman Company and the Grand Trunk Railway expires in August, 1885, and we have proposed to continue the contract with the Pullman Company until the same date. In the meantime, they are to supply additional first-class and Pullman cars with all modern improvements; and as they are to allow the Department to put the existing cars in the shops and have them fitted up with the modern improvements, at the cost of the Company, I trust the service will be much better performed.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of the contract with the Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They put the cars on the road for the fares collected. The Company keep the cars in repair unless an accident occurs in consequence of the management of the railway. They pay for all ordinary repairs.

CANALS.

76. Lachine Canal $170,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that of the general canal vote, out of a total vote of $3,200,500, no less than $2,243,100 is for a revote. I think it would be convenient if the hon. gentleman would state the policy of the Government with respect to these works. Are they going on with them? These votes do not look as if it was the intention to have them prosecuted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is true. On the Lachine Canal great difficulty has been experienced in closing some of these contracts and the work has been comparatively slow Of the total vote of $170,000, $370,000 is a revote. The amount asked will be for the final completion of the whole work at an early day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman arranged about the use of machinery on that canal, as to which there was a difficulty for a good many years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that has been satisfactorily arranged.

77. Cornwall Canal..... $174,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All this amount is a revote. The revote is intended to cover several expenditures for final estimates on section No. 1, $28,000, and for the works at the upper entrance, $146,000. This makes $174,000 required to complete the work at the upper entrance, in addition to that of 1884 85, $173,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to give us information as to what the Government have finally concluded to do with reference to the general policy of these canals? Is there any intention to deepen the St. Lawrence navigation for a considerable time to come?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Only so far as provided for last Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth will this give in the Cornwall Canal?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There have been large expenditures there, as the hon. gentleman knows, but we cannot obtain a much greater depth until the completion of the whole of the canals, when they will have the same depth as in the others—from 12 to 15 feet, according to the plans on which these canals have been designed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And you do not attain any considerable depth in the Cornwall Canal?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not throughout. With this expenditure, the work which is being done is being done by the enlargement of these canals throughout.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the locks been enlarged?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the Administration of which the hon. gentleman was a member, there was a contract involving an expenditure of some $600,000 for a portion of the Cornwall Canal, for putting it in the same position with the canals which were deepened throughout -the same depth as the Welland Canal. The probable cost of enlarging the Cornwall Canal for a draught of 14 feet is $3,400,000. For the present scheme of enlargement for deepening to 13 feet, the amount is $500,000; and the estimated cost of the present scheme is $2,900,000. The expenditure up to 30th June, 1882, was $545,309; for the year 1882-83, $21,728; and from 1st July to 31st December, 1883, $6,300. The total expenditures up to the 31st December, being $573,338. The probable expenditure for December, 1883, to 30th June, $49,700, making the total expenditure $623,038, required to complete; from the 1st July, 1884, $2,286,520, by which the Cornwall Canal will be completed throughout, on the scheme upon which the present work is being conducted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, the hon. gentleman does not propose to go on with?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; that is all until the whole question with regard to the deepening of the St. Lawrence is taken up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many locks have been made at Cornwall?

Mr. BERGIN. Two.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it exceptional that we find that nearly all these votes are revotes, or will the bulk be really spent?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These canal estimates are furnished by the Department; but we find that the work on the canals is very much smaller than was anticipated. Difficulties arise which prevent the work from being pushed in the same way as railway work. I am inclined to think that these estimates are all very large.

Mr. BLAKE. What I mean is, that, finding that last year three times as much money was asked as has been spent——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are over $2,000,000 of revotes on these canals.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; it looks as if there had been an over estimate all through. I suppose that in preparing the Estimates for next year, the hon. gentleman will call the attention of his officers to the desirability of estimating with a

greater degree of accuracy, what the requirements will be In estimating what our financial engagements are for the year, a million or two is not an unimportant item after all.

78. Williamsburgh—for the construction of an entrance and lock at the head of Rapide Plat Canal $100,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the nature of this work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is for the construction of locks. The estimated cost of the work is $200,000. Some $75,000 will be required, in addition to the vote for 1884-85, to complete the works.

79. Williamsburg—towards the enlargement of the upper entrance, Galops Canal $80,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These works not being under contract, there will probably be little or no expenditure during the current fiscal year. A difficulty arose in connection with the contract, and new tenders were invited, and the work is just now being put under contract. Therefore, the total vote is a revote. The total estimated cost of the work is $260,000; $180,000 will be required in addition to this vote.

80. St. Lawrence River and Canals $110,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a revote to cover the expenditure required in improving the channel in the Galops Rapids.

81. Murray Canal. $300,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a revote to be expended towards the construction of the Murray Canal, now under contract to Mr. J. E. Wilcox. The length to be 6⅛ miles, width 80 feet and depth 11 feet. A total of $765,000 will be required to complete that work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. $1,065,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is 11 feet the total depth?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, at low water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would hardly meet the wants of a great many crafts that are beginning to navigate Lake Ontario. The majority of grain vessels draw more than 11 feet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would involve very great expense to make any material increase, not from the nature of the bottom but from the position of the approaches to the canal.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. Minister stated last year the total cost was to be $1,165,000. What is the reason of the decrease?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total amount is $1,265,000. The vote taken for this year, and what will be required to do the work, will be $1,065,000.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the meaning of the phrase, low water.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I believe that in a certain condition of the wind, the depth is greater than at other times. In the most adverse condition, the canal will have a depth of 11 feet.

Mr. BLAKE. It is well known that there is a very great variation in the depth of Lake Ontario, irrespective of the questions of wind; at zero point, Toronto, we have a series of observations from which a very curious calculation is shown, entirely irrespective of the wind. Will this 11 feet be obtained, irrespective of the wind, when the wind is adverse, and when the water is at its lowest stage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There will never be less than 11 feet of water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When will it be completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The date of the completion of the contract is July 1st, 1885. I do not expect, from the progress the contractors have made up to the present, it will be found to be very close to that date.

Mr. PLATT. What does the wall consist of?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot give much information about the wall, but I presume every precaution will be taken to have it properly built.

82. Welland Canal $500,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a revote of $270,000 and a new vote of $130,000. Both amounts are to be expended as follows:—Towards the completion of Section 27, H. J. Beemer, contractor, $200,000; Section 42, Mr. Dunbar, contractor, $37,500; facing banks, $106,000; contingencies, $66,500. An additional sum of $188,000 will be required to complete the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is the supply of water in the canal?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very good; there is no difficulty about the water.

83. Welland—Construction of a raceway between the feeder and Chippewa River $17,400 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is work provided for last year, and this amount is required to complete it. There is no change in the total cost from last year.

84 Trent River Navigation—For construction of locks and the improvement of navigation between Lakefield and Balsam Lake. $185,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The revote is $185,000 to be expended on the Fenelon Falls, Buckhorn and Burley works, and in the construction of a dam at Young's Point bridge and Lakefield. $105,000 will be required to complete the work. The work at Fenelon Falls was estimated to cost $120,254; at Buckhorn, $79,030; at Burleigh, $176,720, that is $376,007 in all. The works at Lakefield, New Dam, Young's Point, &c., $67,993, making a total estimated cost for these works of $444,000 in all. The expenditure up to July, 1883, was $41,328; from July 1st to December 31st, $62,200, making a total of $103,528, to the end of the year. The estimated expenditure to June is $30,600, making $134,138 required to complete from January 1st, 1884, $309,000.

Mr. MILLS. What I want to know is whether the hon. gentleman has not an estimate of the cost of the Trent Valley Canal, of which this, of course, will be but a very small portion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am happy to be able to state to the House that the survey and examination of that work, which has been going forward for the last two or three years, has been brought to a close, so far as the survey is concerned, and Mr. Rubridge, the engineer, who has been in charge of that work, is engaged in making up his report, which I hope to be able to lay upon the Table of the House before Parliament rises I pressed him very strongly to lose no time in giving me the final report and estimate. As soon as I have it I will lay it before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many miles are covered by these works, from Lakefield to Balsam Lake?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They open up a very large extent of navigation through that section of country.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). There is about 100 miles from Cobokonk to Lakefield, which will be all made navigable as soon as these works are completed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The completion will give a stretch of navigation between Lakefield, 9½ miles from Peterboro' and Balsam Lake, opening up about 150 miles of direct and lateral navigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What might be the distance as the crow flies?

Sir CHAREES TUPPER. I should say the direct navigation would be about 100 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In all these cases there is a considerable curvature, and you go in and out a good deal from one lake to another. I should think the distance from Lakefield to Balsam Lake could not be, in a straight line, as much as 100 miles.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It is about 100 miles by the course of navigation. It is a devious route, following the waters.

Mr. BLAKE. May we hope that before Concurrence the hon. gentleman will be able to get Mr. Rubridge's report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so.

Mr. BLAKE. Because I was sorry to hear a statement that the cost would be about $6,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it will be over that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is not taking any vote for that this year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the depth of water over it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The depth on the sill is 5 feet. Dimensions of locks, 134 feet; breadth, 33 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be about the dimensions of the present Rideau canal navigation, I think?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose so.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is not intended to utilize the canal then, for communication between Lakes Huron and Ontario for lake-going vessels, ultimately?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Simply for internal communication?

85. Ste. Anne Canal $241,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that cover the whole?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a revote, and completes the work of enlarging the Ste. Anne's Canal and improvement of the approaches.

85½. Carillon Canal, Dam and approaches $191,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. About this dam, a good deal has happened since last Session. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us something about that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Carillon Canal, dam and slide, a revote of $191,000. This is required to complete the dam and settle with the contractors for the canal, dam and slide; also the improvement of the channel leading to the canal: no additional vote is required. It is not expected that anything will be required beyond the vote taken for this purpose last year. The hon. gentleman no doubt refers to an accident which occurred in connection with this work during the past season, in which considerable damage was done through the carrying away of certain works, and I am glad to be able to state that there was no defect in the plan. Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer, having gone exhaustively into this question, has satisfied himself that the plan was perfectly correct, and it was in the execution of the work, in consequence of there being a failure to fasten a portion of this work at the bottom, in the way designed in the plan, that there was this loss of a portion of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. Who pays?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I am afraid that we will have to pay.

Mr. BLAKE. How much do we pay?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will not be so large as was supposed; the original estimate will not be very much exceeded in the completion of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. One would like to know what contractors it was that worked so defectively. The engineer says the plan was all right and the execution was wrong, and some work that was required to be done was not done. What contractors was it who made this failure? Are they contractors in the employment of the Government now, in this work or in any other work? Who was the officer who should have supervised this, and under whose supervision the work was so defective? What will be the cost to the country, consequent upon the defective execution of the work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The late Mr. Merrill was in direct charge and overseer of this work, and, I am afraid, was responsible for the failure at this particular point. It was extremely difficult work, I suppose one of the most difficult works that was ever undertaken in this part of the country, or in almost any other. It was the construction of a work which had baffled the efforts of engineers, to a very large extent. It was dealing with the stoppage of a great volume of water at a place where there was a very rapid current, and it was extremely difficult work to do. I believe there is no fault chargeable upon the contractors. They carried out the work as they were directed; but there was unfortunately an oversight on the part of the person who was immediately in charge of the execution of this work, and who was a man of great ability and experience. He had been engaged originally in designing this work, and there was no doubt on the part of the Department of his vigilance in carrying it forward. Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Page satisfied themselves there was an oversight at this particular spot. As I say, they were dealing with a bottom that was supposed to be solid rock; but I believe at this particular part there was some *débris* that had been overlooked.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot say that the hon. gentleman's explanation satisfies my mind. He says it was a very difficult work; that no plan was altered; that no system was altered, though he says that his engineer reports that the altered system was all right. Now, in dealing with an exceptionally difficult work of this kind, under an altered system, presumably, the detailed mode of construction would be stated in the contract, the specification or arrangement. There must have been, necessarily, some plan laid down. The hon. gentleman says there was no fault in the engineer who made the plan, no fault on the part of the contractors, but a default on the part of the dead man—pretty hard on the dead man. We would like to ascertain how it is that the contractors could not have been at fault. If the contractors were not at fault it must have been in the terms of the contract, because I should think the preparation of the contract would have included the necessary elements for the successful prosecution of the work—would have indicated what the contractors had to do; and the engineer in charge ought to have seen that the contractors carried out the contract. The hon. gentleman stated, in the first place, as I understood him, that there was some defect in certain connections; that probably a connection had not been made between parts

of the work as contracted for. Just now he says that the difficulty was that some portion that had been supposed to be solid rock was really *débris*. Now, it was known that there was great inequality in the bottom of the river, and one of the main difficulties of the original contractors was in making a somewhat level bottom on which to build. That was known before 1878. There were disputes and trouble about that. The working in of the timbers to make a level was a subject of great difficulty, and change, and trouble. That was thoroughly known before this alteration of the plan took place. Now, if the plan was all right, if the contract was all right, if the specifications were all right, what was the defect in the execution which has created this difficulty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I will have to ask my hon. friend to be good enough to visit my office, or any gentleman in the House who takes an interest in the question, and Mr. Trudeau or Mr. Page will show the plan and point out exactly the given place, and all the particulars as to what led to this very unexpected and untoward accident, which was not so serious, I am happy to say, as it was at first supposed to have been, but which led to the carrying away of a portion of the work. It is nothing very new in the construction of difficult public works of this kind to meet with these accidents. There is nothing extraordinary about it. I am glad to know that the impression which went abroad at the time was exaggerated, and after the fullest examination on the part of Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Page, and an investigation of the whole question, they have stated to me in the most explicit terms, that there was nothing defective in the plan, that it was not to an alteration in the plan that the accident was due, but to the manner in which the work was done. I hope my hon. friend does not insinuate that I would attempt to take refuge from the consequences behind other officers of the Department. But he pressed me very much to know who was primarily responsible, and the only answer I could give him is the answer I got from the Deputy Minister, who is immediately in charge, along with the Chief Engineer.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, the hon. gentleman is not in a position to answer me to-night, and I do not think it would be satisfactory to adopt his method of reaching a solution. We are here to obtain information, in Parliament, for the country. But instead of going to the office I would ask the hon. gentleman to furnish us, at a later stage, with full information with regard to the plan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note of that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say, in respect to all these items, that we desire to have the right of discussing them tolerably fully on Concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. In so far as the information is defective, I understand the hon. gentleman will supplement it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I will bring in a special report on the case.

86. Grenville Canal.....$179,000 00
87. For construction of works on the Tay Canal... 100,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total estimated cost is $240,000. There is a re-vote of $44,000, and an additional sum of $96,000 will be required to complete the work.

88. St. Peter's Canal..... $14,500 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This work is for the protection of the north entrance on the east side—the construction of a pier 330 feet in length, its top to be 6 feet above the level of the Bras d'Or Lake.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

CANALS.

91. Cornwall Canal—Construction of a drain between town and canal... ..... $20,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. This is a revote. How is it that the work has not been done?

Mr. BERGIN. I can state the reason to the hon. gentleman. Mr. Page explained to me that brick of a particular shape was required, and that it could not be obtained at Cornwall, unless arrangements were made the previous year, as the clay required to be turned out the year before, and if such bricks were obtained from Montreal or elsewhere the estimate would be very largely exceeded. He had placed himself in communication with brick manufacturers at Cornwall, for the purpose of having such bricks made, in order that the work might be done within the estimate.

93. Miscellaneous..... $30,000 00

Mr. THOMPSON. Is any portion of this money devoted to increasing the depth of water in the Burlington Bay Canal? I understand a deputation has waited on the Government in respect to this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject is not dealt with in this vote.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and at (1:05 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 24th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT—ANNUNCIATION DAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when the House adjourns to-day, it stand adjourned until three p.m. Wednesday next.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in introducing Bill (No. 127) to further amend the Criminal Law, said: The object of the Bill is to prevent the publication of immoral newspapers and other immoral public prints. I cannot do more than have it printed and distributed to parties who have interest in matters of that kind with the view to legislation next Session.

Bill read the first time.

POSTMASTER AT DUART.

Mr. CASEY enquired, Whether the Postmaster General has received a petition from residents of Duart and vicinity complaining of the appointment of *Ephraim Britton* as postmaster of Duart, for reasons therein set forth, and asking that his appointment be cancelled and T. C. Macdonald be appointed in his stead; and whether the Government have taken, or intend to take, any action in consequence of said petition?

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman is aware that we have received a petition, as it has been acknowledged to him from the Department. It is not the present intention to cancel Mr. Britton's appointment, and appoint Mr. Macdonald instead.

Mr. CASEY. As to the last part of the question?

Mr. CARLING. I stated that it is not the intention to cancel Mr. Britton's appointment and appoint Mr. Macdonald,

Mr. BLAKE. The last part of the question is not answered.

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention to take any action.

WHARF AT LOTBINIÈRE.

Mr. RINFRET enquired, Whether a petition addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, signed by a large number of citizens of the parish of Lotbinière and the adjoining parishes, respecting the construction of a wharf in the said parish of Lotbinière, has received the attention of the Government? If so, what do the Government propose to do in relation to the prayer of the said Petition?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). I must inform the hon. member that the petitions to which he refers have only reached me this morning, consequently it has been impossible as yet to take the matter into consideration, but I shall see to it.

Mr. RINFRET. Will the answer be given by Wednesday next?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). I cannot promise that to the hon. member. When the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, he will see if there is an amount appropriated for that purpose. That is all I can tell him for the present, as the matter has not yet come before me.

POLICE FOR THE SOUTH-WESTERN FRONTIER OF ONTARIO.

Mr. HAGGART, in the absence of Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a police force on our south-western frontier, upon the Detroit River, either in conjunction with the Provincial Government or with the municipalities directly interested, or with both, for the protection of the lives and property of Her Majesty's subjects on that frontier?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the duty of the Provincial Government to afford protection to the lives and property of Her Majesty's subjects on the frontier, and the Government here have had no communication from the Provincial Government, asking for any assistance in regard to that matter.

TAXATION OF OFFICIAL INCOMES.

Mr. WELDON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to obtain such alteration or amendment in the law so as to permit Dominion official incomes to become subject to municipal taxation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention this Session.

LANDS AND TIMBER LIMITS ON HUNTER'S ISLAND.

Mr. BAIN, in the absence of Mr. COCKBURN, enquired, Whether there have been any applications, or negotiations, or arrangements or understandings, or promises, in reference to the sale or licensing of lands or timber limits, or otherwise, on Hunter's Island, and how far the matter has proceeded, and what are the names of the applicants?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This question in fact calls for a rather voluminous return. If the hon. gentleman will move for a return, the papers will be brought down.

Mr. CARLING.

MORPETH HARBOUR.

Mr. CASEY, in the absence of Mr. MCCRANEY, enquired, Has the Government, during the last six months, entered into a contract for the construction of works at Morpeth harbour? If so, who is the contractor? Where does he live? What is the contract price? The details and nature of said works? Who is superintending their construction? Where does the superintendent reside?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A contract has been awarded, but, I am sorry to say I have mislaid the notes I had about this, but this evening, or on Thursday, the item of Morpeth harbour will come up in the Estimates, and I will be glad to give the information to the hon. gentleman.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND PIERS.

Mr. DAVIES enquired, Whether the Government have determined to take over any and which of the piers of Prince Edward Island? Whether they have agreed to pay the Province of Prince Edward Island any sum of money for these piers or the repairs laid out upon them by the Province; and if so, what amount have they agreed to pay?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter has been considered by the Government, and, most likely, the Supplementary Estimates, when they come down, will give all the information the hon. gentleman desires to have now.

PROMISE OF APPOINTMENT TO JOHN A. WILKINSON.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Was any promise or assurance given by any member of the Government to John A. Wilkinson that he would be recommended for, or might have the registrarship at Calgary? If so, by whom and when? Was any promise or assurance given by any member of the Government to John A. Wilkinson that he would be recommended for, or might have the registrarship at Edmonton? If so, by whom and when? Will the Government lay on the Table forthwith any correspondence or papers on the subject of either office? Is any such promise or assurance still in force? If not, at what date and by whom was it cancelled or withdrawn?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No promise or assurance was given by any member of the Government to John A. Wilkinson that he would be recommended for or might have the registrarship of Calgary. More than a year ago, a promise was given to Mr. John A. Wilkinson that, when the registrarship at Edmonton would be established, he would be recommended for the appointment. It was, in the first place, by myself that the promise was made, and it was repeated by my successor. There is no correspondence or papers on the subject of either office, except a letter of Mr. Macpherson which has appeared in the papers, of which he has no copy. "Is any such promise or assurance still in force?" That, I think, it would be improper to answer under the present circumstances. No such promise has been cancelled or withdrawn.

PAYMENT TO THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR FLOATING DEBT.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any sum has been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under the Act of this Session in respect of their floating debt? If so, when and how much? Were detailed statements, vouchers and evidence furnished and reports made to the Government on the subject? Will these be laid on the Table forthwith?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. $7,500,000 was paid on the 12th March, 1884. Vouchers and evidence were submitted

by the Company. These papers will be laid upon the Table as soon as the hon. gentleman will move for them, and I have no doubt the House will allow the hon. gentleman to do so without notice, as I am very anxious to bring the papers down.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY SUBSIDY ACCOUNT.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any sum has been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on construction contract account, since the payments already communicated to the House? If so, when? And how much separately in respect to the loan recently authorized and in respect of the subsidy? Has any land been awarded on subsidy account? On what part, and how many miles, and at what rate per mile for each section were such payments and awards made? Will the vouchers, estimates and reports on which they were made be laid on the Table forthwith?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to the hon. gentleman that $3,298,627 were paid from the 18th to the 24th of March, 1884; $1,222,627 on account of subsidy, and $2,076,000 on account of loan. No land was awarded on subsidy account. Payments are made in proportion to the work done, and are no longer made on the mileage basis. The reports, estimates and vouchers will be laid on the Table as soon as the hon. gentleman will move for them.

MAILS IN THE COUNTY OF LOTBINIÈRE.

Mr. RINFRET enquired, Whether the Government have considered the petitions or claims of whatsoever nature, respecting the transport of the mails and the granting of daily mails for the parishes of St. Agathe, St. Giles, St. Patrick and St. Sylvestre, in the county of Lotbinière? If so, whether it is their intention to accede to the said requests?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

EXCHANGE BANK NOTES.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any of the station masters or officers on the Intercolonial Railway were at any time, and if so when, instructed not to take Exchange Bank notes when offered in payment of fares or freights? Will the Government lay on the Table a copy of any communication on the subject?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The station masters were instructed on the 17th of September last not to accept Exchange Bank notes in payment of fares and freights. I have no correspondence here, but I presume communications were sent from the superintendent's office here to the office at Moncton. If it is desired I will ascertain.

PAYMENTS MADE TO J. A. WILKINSON.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, What sums of money; at what dates; and for what services; were received by J. A. Wilkinson in respect of the Census?

Mr. McLELAN. On May 2nd, 1882, for services, $50; July 5th, same year, for services, $75; July 5th, same year, for services, $75, a total of $200. The services rendered in May were for the investigation of industrial establishments.

REPORT.

The following Report was laid on the Table:—

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ending June 30th, 1883.—(Mr. McLelan.)

PAYMENTS MADE TO THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for all Orders in Council containing statements, vouchers, evidence, reports, estimates, and other papers in connection with the payments or advances made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on any account whatever, not including statements already brought down, with detailed statements of the dates and amounts of such payments and advances.

Motion agreed to.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend "The General Inspection Act, 1874," by providing:—
1. That inspectors who have obtained certificates in other districts, may be appointed for districts in which there are no qualified applicants for the office; Inspectors so appointed to have power to appoint deputies after examination by them; 2. That a deputy inspector having an interest in an article inspected by him shall incur a penalty; 3. That fishermen may be appointed deputy inspectors of fish and fish oils under certain restrictions; 4. That no barrel or package for the reception of fish shall be sold without inspection under a penalty for each package so sold; 5. That the several qualities of mackerel or herrings shall be more precisely defined; 6. That masters of vessels entering or clearing at a Custom House, shall report all packages of pickled or smoked fish uninspected, on board such vessels; 7. That the fee for the inspection of each barrel of herring shall be 7 cents, and for each half barrel 4 cents.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee)

Mr. COSTIGAN. The object of the amendments of this Bill is in the first place to change the old Act in regard to the appointment of inspectors; and, secondly, to make the inspection more efficient. We provide that the inspectors shall be appointed as usual. An inspector holding a certificate of qualification may himself examine candidates for the post of deputy inspectors, the latter to hold their appointments subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. As regards the second clause "that a deputy inspector having an interest in an article inspected by him shall incur a penalty,"—that is a change in the present law which does not provide a penalty. With respect to clause 3 "that fishermen may be appointed deputy inspectors of fish and fish oils, under certain restrictions"—I find, after consulting members on both sides of the House, acquainted with the working of the present law, that this proposal is not desirable; and I therefore propose to strike it out. Clause 4 "that no barrel or package for the reception of fish shall be sold without inspection under a penalty for each package so sold," I also propose to strike out. In clause 5, I propose to make a slight change with respect to the classification of herring.

Mr. GILLMOR. What is the reason for debarring fishermen, except under certain restrictions, from being appointed inspectors?

Mr. COSTIGAN. One of the strongest objections urged against the admission of Newfoundland herring is that they are inspected by fishermen; and having condemned the Newfoundland system, I do not think it is proper to introduce it here.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is very difficult to find persons qualified to inspect fish unless they have a practical knowledge of the business. Almost the only qualified inspectors are fishermen.

On motion to strike out clause 3,

Mr. DAVIES. What class of men does the hon. gentleman intend to appoint, if he excludes fishermen from being inspectors? It is absolutely essential that the inspector should have some practical knowledge of the business. If you appoint a trader, or a shop-keeper, or a farmer, to inspect fish; unless he has a practical knowledge of fishing and fish-curing, the whole thing will be a farce.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is labouring under a mistake as to the effect of striking out this clause. We have a board of examiners to examine candidates for these officers, and we must suppose that they will appoint competent men. I do not think that the fact of a man being a fisherman excludes him from being appointed an inspector though there is a clause in the present Act which forbids him examining his own fish, or any that he is interested in.

Mr. BLAKE. Presumably when the hon. gentleman first introduced this clause, finding it necessary to appoint fishermen as inspectors, it would indicate that that was not the law at the present time, or else the clause would not be necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend says he finds it unnecessary.

Mr. BLAKE. No, but having regard to the objection made as to the results of fishermen being inspectors in Newfoundland, he has thought it bad policy to allow them to be inspectors here, and therefore he asks the House not to assent to the law to that effect. Now that may be a good reason, but certainly when the hon. gentleman deliberately proposed that fishermen might be appointed he must have thought it required a law that they might be appointed, or that it was expedient to appoint them; and hon. gentlemen around me say, when he proposes to strike out this clause, that they are a class of persons who should be appointed.

Mr. FORTIN. The proper persons to inspect fish and oil are fishermen—that is, men who pack, split, and salt fish and know better than any others how to cure fish well. But the understanding is that a fisherman who is actually fishing and engaged in the trade should not be an inspector because he should be perfectly independent. We objected to the inspection system as carried on in Newfoundland, because the Government of that Island allowed the fishermen themselves to inspect their own fish, or the fish of their neighbours, or fish in which they were interested, and thus to commit a fraud by marking number two, or three, or four, not fit to be eaten, number one, in order to deceive the merchants of this country. The law should say that none but fishermen or other competent people should be appointed inspectors, or deputy inspectors, but that they should not be appointed unless they were out of the trade and perfectly independent of the fishermen whose fish came under their inspection.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me that the effect of striking this out, will be that fishermen, the only really competent men, will be excluded.

Mr. KIRK. I think the practice has been to appoint fishermen inspectors, but they are not allowed to inspect their own fish, and I do not see why that law should not continue with the exception.

Mr. FORTIN. They certainly should not be allowed to inspect their own fish, or the fish of their neighbours, or of traders with whom they do business. They should be perfectly independent or else they will not do their duty. Unless they are independent how can you believe the inspector will grade the fish in the proper manner?

Mr. KIRK. To carry out the views of the hon. gentleman would simply have the effect of requiring fishermen in the outlying districts to send their fish to the cities to be inspected, which would cost much more than if they were inspected at home. If you prevent those who are engaged in fishing from being inspectors in the small districts, you will have no inspector at all, because there would not be a sufficient amount of work for an inspector to make it pay without some other business, and fishing is the only business to be done in such case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that the General Inspection Act of 1874 does not exclude fishermen at all from being inspectors or deputy inspectors. This clause, then, is not required for the purpose of founding a Bill, and my hon. friend desires that it be struck out. When his Bill comes up, unless it alters the law of 1874, the fishermen would still have the right to inspect; and if there be such an exclusion in the Bill, then would be the time to discuss the point. I quite agree with what has been said, generally, at all events, that men accustomed to the curing of fish—perhaps not to the manual labour—but men engaged in fishing, would be the best class of men to appoint as inspectors.

Mr. KIRK. I do not pretend to be familiar with the law, I was only speaking of the practice.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not think there would be any difficulty in finding plenty of men who are fishermen and yet who are not engaged in the business—men who from their age or circumstances do not fish themselves, but who are practically acquainted with the work. There will be no difficulty in getting competent men.

Mr. FORTIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and I will give an instance. I refer to a case in Montreal, where a man, who has been a fisherman for thirty years, and is the son of a fisherman, retired from the business and has been appointed Deputy Inspector for Montreal. Every one who has fish inspected by him must be satisfied by his inspection, because he has no interest to do anything wrong

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. Minister believe he has power to appoint fishermen inspectors without the permissive clause?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think so. In that respect I do not propose to interfere with the law of 1874 which simply provides that no inspector shall have any interest by himself, or by any one else in the matter inspected by him.

Clauses 3, 4, 6 and 7 struck out.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN introduced Bill (No. 128) further to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874.

Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF GAS ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 108) to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some brief explanations, as nothing has yet been said about this Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The changes in the Bill are principally with the view, in the first place, of providing greater security than the law at present provides for the purity of gas, and in the next place, to establish a standard for gas. It is proposed to make the standard of gas sixteen candle light. In Nova Scotia the standard of gas goes as high as 22. In the United States and in England, the standard is higher than it is in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the United States standard?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think it is 22 or 24.

An hon. MEMBER. 24·68.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the English standard?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think it is 18. I may say that notice has been given of these amendments for some time, and I have received communications from different parts of the country—from gas companies and from some consumers—giving their opinions and making suggestions; and lately I met a large deputation, representing the leading companies of the Dominion, and they were satisfied with the amendments, with some slight modifications, which they proposed to me.

Mr. BLAKE. The companies were satisfied?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I don't think they were quite satisfied with the standard of 16; they would rather have it placed at 14. But there are two interests to serve. The companies have an interest, and the consumers have an interest, and I think the amendments are in the interests of both We should have a law providing for pure gas, and we should impose a penalty for the presence of impurities in gas, except by accident. We propose to make some modifications as to the percentage of sulphuretted hydrogen that may be found in gas, owing to the kind of coal that is used in its manufacture, as well as the quantity of water. I am informed that the Nova Scotia coal enables the companies in that Province to produce a higher standard of gas than the companies in the western part of the Dominion. We also propose that the companies shall have their gas regularly tested by the inspector, and shall post up his certificate in their chief offices, and that they shall keep a list of their consumers in a book, which shall be open to the inspector during office hours. We provide certain penalties for the infraction of these rules.

Mr. WELDON. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the eighth section, which would enable a consumer to resist the payment of his gas bill unless the gas is of full standard quality. That would involve the companies in a great deal of litigation. The president of a gas company, writing to me says that it would be impossible sometimes to prevent air getting into the pipes, the illuminating power thus being reduced by circumstances beyond the control of companies. I would suggest that the average be made 16 to 18. He says:

"You and all of us know that a small portion of air will destroy the strength of the gas This may take place seldom, but even once or twice or a few times in the year would give consumers the power to dispute paying their bills for the quarter. Consumers ought not to have the privilege of disputing our bills because the powers of the gas may have been less than 16 on one or two occasions, but it should read that the average power should not be less than 16 candle during the time it was being supplied."

If any time during a portion of the quarter, it became less than 16, owing to circumstances over which they had no control, the consumer may dispute the bill, and the effect of that section will be to give consumers cause for litigation. With regard to the other section relating to traces of sulphuretted hydrogen, those companies who use the Cape Breton coal, which they are obliged to use in the Lower Provinces on account of the duties, say it is impossible to prevent traces of sulphuretted hydrogen getting into the gas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Our information is that there is no necessity for sulphuretted hydrogen being present at all, if any reasonable care be taken in the manufacture of gas. This point has not been contested in any of the communications I have received, nor by any of the gentlemen who formed part of that delegation. But they did call my attention to this fact, that by an accident, the breakage of a pipe or some other accidental cause, this sulphuretted hydrogen might appear, and the Act was amended so that they would not be liable to a penalty in such cases.

Mr. WELDON. But in the case of Cape Breton coal, they say it is impossible to prevent traces of sulphuretted hydrogen appearing.

Bill read the second time.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 109) to amend and consolidate, as amended, the several Acts relating to the adulteration of food and drugs, be discharged.

Motion agreed to, order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

MASTERS' AND MATES' CERTIFICATES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 116) to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, and the Seamen's Act of 1873, said: As I stated when the Resolutions were moved, this Bill is to modify an existing anomaly in the law. In the Act of 1870, the minimum limit of ships requiring certificated masters and mates was fixed at 150 tons, and in the Act of 1883, coasting vessels of over 100 tons were required to have certificated masters and mates. A ship of between 100 and 150 tons may go to the West Indies without a certificated master and mate, and this is to remedy that by making all vessels over 100 tons, whether coasting or foreign going, subject to the law requiring certificated masters and mates. I also propose in the second clause to provide a penalty for masters and mates who shall use their certificates to get a clearance of the vessel, and after getting a clearance do not proceed on the voyage in the vessel. Cases arise in which the captain procures a mate to go before the shipping master, uses his certificate, enters him on the articles, gets cleared at the Custom house, and then the mate does not go to sea. This clause imposes a penalty on the master or mate who is guilty of this action. In a more careful examination of the Acts of 1870 and 1883, it would be well to have it more clearly defined that the masters and mates at present serving on the vessels between 100 and 150 tons should receive certificates of service, and I propose in the Committee to insert a clause to make that clear. I will read it:

"The Act first cited in the title of this Act is further amended by inserting the following as sub-section 3 of the 5th section thereof:—

"Every person who, before the 1st day of January, 1884, served as master in a seagoing ship registered in Canada, and being over 100 tons and not over 150 tons registered tonnage, and employed in trading elsewhere than between ports or places in Canada, or between Canada and ports and places in the United States of America or Newfoundland, and who has produced satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct, and has passed the colour test, shall be entitled to a certificate as a master or mate (as the case may be) for seagoing ships registered in Canada and being over 100 tons and not over 150 tons registered tonnage, on payment of a fee of $5 for a certificate as master, or $3 for a certificate as mate."

Mr. VAIL. If a mate happened to be taken ill after the vessel cleared, there is no provision for it in regard to the penalty.

Mr. McLELAN. That is a contingency that may possibly arise, and, upon the evidence being produced, the difficulty would be easily got rid of.

Mr. AMYOT. Is it the intention of the Government to exempt from the operation of this law schooners of only one mast navigating between Quebec and Montreal, or the Upper St. Lawrence? We have never seen any accident in connection with these schooners. It is very hard for them to procure masters with these certificates, and it is probable they will find the greatest difficulty in navigating their schooners next season, if that law is enforced upon them. It is the general desire of the navigation there to have those schooners exempt.

Mr. McLELAN. That is a matter which has not been fully considered or decided upon by the Department yet, but that comes more properly under an amendment of the Act of 1882. It is possible that a clause might be inserted in this Bill, however, in Committee, if we so find it necessary. I will consult the hon. gentleman as to how far it affects the vessels he refers to.

Bill read the second time.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 121) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, by reducing the fees payable on renewal of engineers' licenses, said: Having considered this matter of the fees to be paid by second class engineers, I propose to make an amendment to the Bill. The annual fee is now reduced from $5 to $2. I propose to move an amendment to reduce it to $1, as I find the difficulty of getting from the second class to the first class is very great and many will be kept in the second class for a long time.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. STAIRS. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether, in view of what he said just now, that a considerable number of the second class engineers reach that position and stay there, it would not be wiser to amend this Act so as to provide that there shall be no certificate required every year for engineers of the second and third class, but that, when they go up for examination to rise to a higher grade, they should pay the ordinary fee of $5. I throw out this as a suggestion. I think the amendment proposed is a very wise one, as the fee to be charged to these second and third class engineers for a renewal of their certificates was much too high at $5. I think there are a large number of second and third class engineers who take their certificate in those classes, and never intend to, and never can, get any higher, and I do not see why, as long as they conduct themselves properly and are sober men, they should have to pay for the renewal when the first class engineers have nothing of the kind to pay. Of course, when they want to get higher, it would be reasonable to charge a fee.

Mr. McLELAN. The fee has been made as low as possible to work the machinery of examinations. I did not say it was impossible for them to get to the first class, but that there are a good many difficulties in the way, and I think, with this small fee, they will be constantly on the watch to get out of the second and third class into the first, and the fee is so small that it cannot be a serious objection. I move that the first clause be amended by striking out the word "two" and inserting the word "one."

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported; considered as amended, and read the third time and passed.

SALE AND DELIVERY OF COAL.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 110) respecting the sale of coal.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain whether under the existing law this Bill will make any provision with reference to the weight of coal as to the long ton or the short ton?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No. This Bill does not pretend to define that point. The Weights and Measures Act, I presume, defines what that weight shall be, whether it shall be the long ton or the short ton.

Mr. BLAKE. When we are making a change we ought to secure uniformity as far as possible. We ought not to leave the short ton in one part of the country and with respect to certain articles, and the long ton in another part of the country with respect to another class of transactions. I hope before the Bill finally passes the House the hon. gentleman will consider this point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that the next Bill proposes to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

Mr. WELDON. There might be some difficulty in reference to steamers taking in coal. It would be very inconvenient in some of the small mines of New Brunswick where they have not the facilities for weighing coal. The Act is more intended, I think, for the sale of coal by retail than for its purchase in the mines.

Mr. STAIRS. As I have had some little experience in coal the last few years, I would like to have an explanation from the the hon. Minister. I think the custom has been that in the sale of coal by retail the short ton is used, whereas the long ton is used in weighing coal at the mines. Is it not possible to provide that the same ton should be used in both classes of transactions? I think there is great need that some check should be put upon the sale of coal in the mines as regards weight. It is the general opinion among all who purchase coal that the coal purchased in the mines will overrun its weight, but my experience is just contrary to that. I have seen figures, it is true, which show that for the last four or five years coal purchased in the mines in Nova Scotia has largely overrun, but I think this is chiefly due to the system in the Lower Provinces of measuring coal for retail instead of weighing it. I think if you provide that coal should be sold by weight for retail you will soon have a check upon the mines that you will oblige them to give, at least, fair weight in their sales. I think it would be almost impossible to oblige the owners of mines to weigh all the coal. I understand at present when we buy coal from the mines in Cape Breton or Pictou County, we buy by the ton of 2,240 pounds. But I know that in a great many cases coal is sold by the bulk or carload which is supposed to contain a certain weight, and in such case it is easy indeed to allow these cars to go under weight. I do not say that this under weight is general, but it occurs sometimes.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that in so far as this measure regulates contracts between private individuals it is trespassing upon the domain of Provincial Legislatures. What have we to do with saying what the contracts between private parties shall be? We can fix what kind of weights and measures shall be used in the country, but it is well known that at the time the Federal system was adopted the inspection of weights and measures, and every thing relating to contract, were under municipal supervision; and it does seem to me that this Act is beyond our jurisdiction, and is one falling within the purview of our Local Legislatures. We have, of course, the right to fix the kinds of weights and measures that shall be used, but we have no right to deal with the contracts that may be entered into between private parties. If they choose to contract to sell by measure instead of by weight, I think it is their business. It is a civil right, and is not a regulation of trade but an interference with the law of contract.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not see anything inconsistent in this Bill with the British North America Act, in declaring that coal shall be sold by weight. I do not think it is interfering at all with any Provincial rights. We declare under the General Act regulating weights and measures, that wheat, for instance, shall be sold at so many pounds per bushel, that oats shall be at so many pounds per bushel, and

I do not think that a contract for the delivery of 100 bushels of oats at twenty pounds per bushel, would be a legal contract.

Mr. MILLS. That is a question for the courts.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON. A very nice constitutional question is involved in this Bill. Assuming that the Dominion Government have power to regulate weights and measures, the present Bill is not to regulate weights and measures, but to regulate the contract. It is to make a contract illegal unless entered into in a certain way. It has been decided by the Privy Council that laws relating to contracts come within the powers of the Local Legislatures. We are, therefore, in this Bill trenching on the rights of the Provincial Legislatures, and it strikes me that the Privy Council, in the Parsons case, ruled that contracts were within the powers of Local Legislatures.

Mr. MILLS. In the Parson's case, the learned Lord who gave judgment, Sir Barnes Smith, said the law of contract is within the power of the Local Legislatures. A provision of this Bill deals with the subject of contracts, not with that of weights and measures. We may just as well, under the provisions of the law regulating weights and measures, undertake the control of the whole subject of the transfer of real estate. We have the right to say what shall constitute an acre, but we have not the right to deal with real estate, and say on what terms it shall be transferred. In the present case we may state what number of pounds shall constitute a bushel, but we cannot go on and say what the contract shall be in regard to any particular article. That is a matter wholly relating to the provision of the constitution with respect to civil rights.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This constitutional question had better not be taken up in Committee, but the clause may be perhaps allowed to pass without reference to the constitutional question at the present time.

Bill amended and reported.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 120) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, 1879.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first change made by the proposed Bill is in the fourth line of section 24, where instead of a $25 fine, the fine is made not less than $10. In the eighth line the following words are inserted: "shall be forfeited and forthwith seized as being so forfeited." By the second section of the Bill the words "not exceeding" are to be struck out of the fourth line, section 23. I may say that the Bill is composed of a number of small amendments mostly with a view to better enabling the collection of penalties under the present Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This appears to me to be an exceedingly inconvenient mode of amending an Act. The first section of the new Act should repeal the various sections to be reconstructed, and the reconstructed clauses should then appear as they would appear in the Statute. This plan has been followed on several occasions, as for example, the amendment to the Banking Act. I think it would be the best plan in this case, as it is almost impossible to ascertain from the hon. gentleman's explanations what the proposed amendments are.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that I myself would prefer the mode suggested by the hon. gentleman but as the amendments are not very important, and make no change in the principle of the Act, perhaps it may be allowed to pass in the present form, as it is getting well on in the Session.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me that the suggestion is a very good one, as even the legal members of the House have very great difficulty in construing these amendments so as to understand them. This case is worse, because the penalties provided for by this section are to be recovered before a magistrate or justice of the peace. The justice of the peace may not be able to construe the Act, and he may impose a fine or forfeiture, and afterwards discover that under the amended Act he has had no power to do so. It seems to me that Acts which are likely to come before persons who have not a legal education should be made plain, by repealing the old sections and inserting the new sections in the repealing Act, so as to show what the new law is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree that the more convenient mode of repealing is by means of an amended Act; that is to say, when we can do so, the clause should be repealed and the amended clause substituted. I think my hon friend will take that view of the case. The principle of the Bill will be adopted by the second reading, and as objection is only taken to the form of the clauses, my hon. friend will be able to remodel them according to the suggestion of the hon. member for East York before he moves the Committee of the Whole.

Bill read the second time.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 123) to amend the Customs Act, 1883, said: The plan adopted in this Bill is the one suggested by the hon. member for East York, and approved by the leader of the Government; that is, the clauses which are amended are repealed, and others are substituted in lieu thereof. The first clause repeals section 188 of the Customs Act, and the only change it makes is to add the words "or Court of Vice-Admiralty." When I introduced the Bill, I explained that when the Customs Act of last year was before the House, the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal had decided that the Vice-Admiralty Court had no jurisdiction in cases affecting the Customs. The Supreme Court, however, reversed that decision; and as the Vice-Admiralty Court has jurisdiction in matters affecting the inland revenue it has been thought proper to insert these words in this Bill, in order that that court may try offences against the Customs Act. The second clause amends section 153 of the Customs Act by adding these words:

"And such conviction may be had in a summary manner before any two justices of the peace, or before any judge or magistrate having the powers of two justices of the peace."

This merely gives the power under this clause that is given under other clauses, in cases of violation of the Customs Act. The offences provided for are smuggling goods, using false invoices, &c. The 86th clause of the Act is repealed, because in any suit that may be brought for the violation of the Act or for under-valuation, it provides that no evidence shall be adduced to show that an invoice is incorrect or fraudulent. The old law had these words added: "except by the Crown," which prevented a merchant from adducing any evidence to show that his invoice was correct. When this question was under discussion last year, it was suggested that the importer and the Government should be placed on an equal footing, and those words were struck out. But it has been found that the effect was to prevent the introduction of any evidence into court at all; and the repeal of the clause altogether will leave the importer and the Crown on the same footing, to be governed by the law of evidence. The 4th clause simply applies this Act to suits which are now in litigation.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it competent—I am asking for information—for an importer who objects to a decision of the Customs Department to take a matter into court and have it adjudicated upon?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, it must be under limitations and provisions in some way.

Mr. BOWELL. I think not; there are so many cases that arise that perhaps the hon. gentleman would give me more particular information.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not pleasant to do.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not mean to individualize any person; he can give me a hypothetical case if he likes.

Mr. PATERSON. I know of a case in which the importer was, I consider, very harshly dealt with. The representations he made to the Department received no attention, so far as he could judge; he was not made aware of the decision of the Department in time, so that when a communication reached him, if I remember aright, it was merely a statement that the matter having been finally closed could not be reopened. I am told further that he asked permission to enter the matter in court or sue the Government, in other words, but he could not get permission to do so, although he felt positive that if he could get the matter into the courts there was no jury in the world but what would declare that the action of the Customs Department was wrong and that he was right. He was debarred, however, from taking action, and it would be well for the information of the general public that the Minister should state clearly what is the general course adopted by the Department in such cases. He will have no objection, I am sure, to say what rights and remedies importers who have their goods seized have in the way of taking their cases into court. The seizure is made by the Customs officer, the matter is referred to the Customs Department, the importers are confident of their innocence and of their well meaning intentions, they are fortified by proofs from the parties from whom they purchased that the prices are right, and to make an affidavit other than the one they did make would be to make an affidavit not correct. When the matter is referred to the Department, they naturally conclude, their case being just, that the decision of the seizing officer will be reversed, but they do not hear of the decision of the Department—at least that was so in this case, if I am correctly informed—until perhaps some weeks have elapsed, and all the satisfaction they get from the Department is that they hear finally from it that the matter having been disposed of and finally closed, it cannot be reopened, and thus very great hardship and wrong is done to the individual. The impression is they are not at liberty to take the matter into court unless they get permission from the Government to do so. I would like to understand this matter clearly. I would like the hon. Minister to explain how it is that when some parties desired to bring an action into the courts, they were not able to get the sanction of the Department to that end.

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt what the hon. gentleman states is quite correct, as far as his information goes; but the Customs Law provides and has ever since there has been a law, so far as I am aware, that the importer whose goods are seized, has one month after the day of seizure, after notification of the seizure, upon which to put in a defence. If no defence is put in within that month, the decision of the Department is given, and in no case—there have been but one or two within my recollection, in which there was an acknowledgment of the commission of the offence, and a decision given at once—is a decision given until after the expiration of the thirty days. The importer has, under the law, thirty days on which to put in his defence; if he neglects doing so within that time, then the Commissioner makes his report and submits it to the Minister for approval.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the defence to the Department, not the defence to the court.

Mr. BOWELL. If he does not object or declare his intention to reject the decision of the Department, then it is considered final, and he is debarred from going into court. A case occurred in Montreal in which that was the defence of the Government. Notification having been given of the decision and the seizure, the importer was called upon for his defence; no defence was made or objection taken to the seizure, and after the expiration of the thirty days, the importer entered an action. The defence of the collector in Montreal was that a defence had not been put in in time, and of course the court ruled out the action.

Mr. PATERSON. As I understand the hon. Minister, there are thirty days allowed for putting in a defence to the Department. The person puts in his defence to the Department; in the case I have in mind, and I am speaking subject to correction, the defence was put into the Department all right enough within the time, and the person relied upon a decision in his favour. But the time expired before the decision of the Department was communicated to him.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. PATERSON. Suppose a case of that kind, in which the thirty days have elapsed before the decision of the Department which the importer anticipates will be in his favour, is communicated to him, and, when communicated, he finds it is adverse. Has he a remedy?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly within the time specifically the law.

Mr. PATERSON. Thirty days after the decision of the Minister is given.

Mr. BOWELL. The decision of the Minister is not given until thirty days after the importer has been notified of the seizure, and he is asked to put in his defence, at the time of the notification; if he fails to put in any defence within that thirty days, he is debarred from going to the courts.

Mr. PATERSON. Thirty days after the decision of the Minister is communicated to him.

Mr. BOWELL. The seizure is made, the Department in Ottawa is notified of that seizure, the party whose goods have been seized is at once notified, a blank form is sent to him notifying him that he has thirty days in which to put in his defence or make any statement he pleases; if he fails to to that, he is debarred from going into court; if he puts in that defence he has a right to go into court.

Mr. WELDON. That must be within a certain time after seizure. He must take his action within three months.

Mr. BOWELL. That is another point.

Mr. WELDON. Suppose the decision of the Minister was not communicated until the three months had expired, suppose the party anticipating that the decision would be in his favour did not receive a communication from the Department until the three months had elapsed, he would then be debarred from going into court.

Mr. BOWELL. I am quite satisfied the Government would not, under those circumstances, deprive him of that right. In one or two instances where I thought the delay

had been unnecessarily long, I waived the right of the Department and told the parties to go into court. If a case of that kind was brought under the notice of the Government, the Government would waive their right and allow the case to go into court.

Mr. PATERSON. Would the hon. gentleman give me an assurance that he will allow the party I have in my mind to bring the matter into court? I think that in this case the fault was with the Department, that the parties were not notified in time. But however that may be, the decision of the Department was adverse, and the parties consider themselves very unfairly treated; would the hon. gentleman allow the Department to waive its right and allow these parties to take the matter into court?

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt the importer, when the decision is against him, always thinks he is badly used. I am not prepared to say what I will do under the circumstances, but if the hon. gentleman will give me the case, and if the facts connected with it are as he stated, I will have no objection to grant what he asks, but I should be very sorry to pledge myself to say that he should have a right until I know what the facts of the case are.

Mr. PATERSON. I had better do that privately?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will do that privately or in writing, I will give him an answer.

Bill reported.

MAINTENANCE OF FORTIFICATIONS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 124) respecting fortifications and military buildings and their maintenance and repairs.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the reasons for this Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I explained the Bill on moving the first reading. It is purely and simply to transfer to the Department of Militia the control, management and repair of all military buildings, forts and fortifications in Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. I know the hon. gentleman explained the provisions of the Bill; I said the reasons for the Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reasons are that it is considered that these works would be attended to perhaps more economically, or perhaps more scientifically if they were under the Department of Militia, and therefore, as far as I am concerned, I have not the least objection that they should be transferred to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is in fact a confession that the Minister of Public Works is unable to discharge the duties of his office, as they have been understood up to this time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sure that my hon. friend will not suppose that I could not attend to those duties. But I think, under this Bill, the duties will be perhaps performed with more science than they could be by my own officers. They are not military officers, they are not military engineers, and perhaps, when we have to deal with fortifications and those works, it will be better that those officers, with the benefit of their science and knowledge, should have the performance of those duties. Therefore, we thought it would be better that this portion of the duties of my office should be transferred to my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Militia. I need not assure my hon. predecessor that I still have quite work enough to occupy my time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is an attempt practically to create a new department under the Militia Minister, for it will bloom out into a Royal Engineer Department. It is quite sure to be the case. The Government is expanding in all directions, and, while another Minister has not enough work to do at home, but must go to England to perform a portion of it, the Minister of Public Works is quite competent, and his Department is quite competent to do all the work; and it is out of the question that, because the gallant Minister of Militia is a military man and competent to take charge of an army, he should be also competent to take charge of an architect's office. There is nothing of a scientific nature to be done at present. When fortifications have to be erected and great camps are laid out, something will occur which is not in existence at present, and, until something arises which necessitates such a division of labour, I think it better that all public works should be attended to in the Department of Public Works. If I am not mistaken, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given up the attempt which was made some years ago to carry on large works under an officer of that Department. The engineer who was in that Department at that time is not there now, and only trifling works are now constructed by that Department, large lighthouses falling under the Public Works Department, as they ought to do. But now we have a departure in another Department in another direction, in a wrong direction, and I enter my protest against it as totally uncalled for.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to my hon. friend, I may say that he is mistaken about the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That Department has the building of its own lighthouses, and the maintenance and care of those works. They are not under the care of my Department. That existed during the Administration of my hon. friend, and since, under the Administration of the First Minister here. Of course, in the erection of piers and so on, these large works are under the control of my Department, but, when these piers and wharves are built, they are under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; otherwise the business of my Department would be such that I could not perform the duties. In this case, these works will be repaired and maintained by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, and, if large works are to be undertaken, of course the Department of Public Works will have to undertake them, as in the past, but the maintenance of these is considered to be better in the hands of the Department of Militia than the Department of Public Works. For example, at Kingston and Quebec, they have a number of men who could be usefully employed in keeping up these walls, as it is done under the Imperial Government in their fortified towns. I think that altogether it would be better that this system should be adopted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice that this Bill is not printed in French. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works took exception the other night to proceeding with a Bill because, not the Bill, but an amendment to the Bill, was not printed in French. Perhaps he will show the same regard now for his fellow-countrymen who speak French as he did then.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, if the hon. gentleman insists, we will have to postpone the Bill, but I am very much pleased to see that he has gone to study French, and that henceforth the Bills will have to be printed in French as well as English. However, I have no doubt he will not insist on this now, but will allow the Bill to go through.

Mr. CHARLTON. I only speak in the interest of the hon. gentleman's French friends. It shows the difference between *meum* and *tuum*.

Mr. AMYOT. We generally protect ourselves.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the Bill is to go through; but at the same time, I do not think sufficient reasons have been

given for departing from the policy hitherto adopted in this matter. It was, as the hon. Minister of Public Works has stated, the policy of the late Government, and I think it was the policy when the hon. gentleman occupied the position of Minister of Public Works before—that is, practically since Confederation. Whatever has been done in the way of maintenance and repair of these military buildings has been done by the Department of Public Works. I am not going to charge or to insinuate anything against the expenditure of the Militia Department, but I will say that I do not expect that money will be saved by this plan. I believe that more money will be expended. We see it at once. There was a proposal in the Estimates for an architect. That was struck out, but we were shown that it was merely temporary, because Col. Hewitt who had hardly time to give his services, as he and his officers were already too hard-worked, would undertake the duties. But there were also two additions to the vote which passed through Committee the other evening on account of this matter. Now I do not think it can be reasonably contended that the public interest would be served by splitting up the business of the repairs and maintenance of this particular class of buildings. The Public Works Department is charged with the repairs and maintenance of all other public buildings; any specialty there may be in the repairs and maintenance of fortifications—in so far as it is a special thing in construction—is sufficiently indicated by the original construction, and to keep them good one looks at what has been done. But if there is to be any specialty, even in the repairs, it will be as easy for the Department of Public Works to obtain that scientific information from Col. Hewitt, or from whatever person who may be looked upon as the adviser of the Government in that regard, as it is for the Militia Department to obtain that information; but that special scientific information being obtained the practical carrying out of it by the draughtsmen, by the framing of the contract, or by the supervision of the work, will not only be done as well but will probably be done better by that large staff employed in the business of maintaining and repairing public works, than it would be done as an extra or incident of the Department of Militia and Defence. It is a vicious division of labour, not a real division, as it is when work of the same class is performed by the same persons, and this is work of the same class which is not to be performed by the same persons, namely, by persons of the Department of Public Works, but is to be taken away from them and given to a separate staff connected with the Department of Militia and Defence. You will find persons who have the same work to do in the construction of buildings of this particular class, persons who have only to do with contracts in respect to these particular contracts, persons who have only to do with the supervision of works, in respect to these particular works, and these works will be better attended to if they were attended to by persons whose business was of this class, that is, persons who are officers of the Department of Public Works. We find already a swelling of the items of Militia and Defence due to this change, and I do not observe that it is proposed in consequence of this change to reduce the estimates of the Department of Public Works. We will find the expenditure of that Department increased rather than diminished in consequence of the change in the mode in which it is proposed to carry on this work.

Mr. CARON. I cannot agree with the views just expressed by the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the reports of the Department of Militia and Defence for the last seven years he will see that the general officers commanding the Militia force, as well as other officers belonging to the force, have made representations to the Department expressing their opinion that works of a military character should be performed under the supervision of a military engineer who would be in a better position and undertake to keep up the repairs of these very important and very valuable defensive works, which would otherwise have to be done by the Department of Public Works. The hon. gentleman knows that along the seacoast and in several other portions of the Dominion we have batteries of the class of defensive works which are very important. Now I will not go beyond what my hon. friend from East York has looked upon as my duty; I will not go beyond the duty of commanding armies, to express an opinion about works which he, as the late Minister of Public Works, may possibly suppose that he knows more about than I do myself, but I will do as he has probably done invariably in his own Department—I will express the views of practical men upon practical questions. I have the opinions of military officers not only belonging to the Militia force of Canada, but also belonging to the Imperial service, who have sent in reports to the Department complaining of the manner in which these defensive works have been repaired. For instance, there is one battery near Halifax the earthworks of which was removed by the employés of the Public Works Department and, though I do not myself attach any blame to them for it, on account of their being unacquainted with the particular nature of those works they removed a portion which was really the most essential part of that battery. Under those circumstances the hon. gentleman must admit that in view of these reports the Government are justified in making the experiment. I need not say so far as the Minister of Public Works is concerned that we all know how very efficiently he presides over that important Department; and that hon. gentleman coincides altogether in the views which are entertained by the Government upon that question, and in the reports which have been sent in regarding it. I believe I am safe in saying that he is also convinced that the change that is now proposed will be in the public interest. When the Estimates come down I am certain the hon. gentleman will give me credit for the very small increase which is added to the expenditure of the Department of Militia under that head, and I think the change is one that will give satisfaction to the public as well as to the Department of Militia and Department of Public Works.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where was the Battery the hon. gentleman referred to?

Mr. CARON. The Battery was near Halifax, but I cannot now recall the name. I can hand the reports to the hon. gentleman, in which he can obtain the information.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no recollection of any earth battery being undertaken by the Department of Public Works at all.

Mr. CARON. I did not say it was during the time the hon. gentleman presided over the Department; I said the repairs had been carried out by the Public Works Department, and I think it is since the hon. gentleman gave up the control of that Department.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that this is an unwise departure from the former system prevailing in this country. There is no doubt whatever that the moment a new branch in any Department is made, it will undertake to justify its existence by endeavouring to point out how very important it is in the public interest. If we were involved in war with any country and important military works were required, I can understand how it would be necessary to separate works of that kind from the Department of Public Works. But, Sir, under existing circumstances I can see no propriety in this provision. We know that military men have not the same notions of economy in connection with public works that we civilians have, and that if this branch is transferred to the Department of Militia, a military gentleman will be appointed to take charge of it, a military

engineer, and that he will undertake to justify the Department in creating this particular branch by showing how very necessary it is in the public service, and a large expenditure will be incurred which, in my opinion, is wholly unnecessary, because I believe that at the present time, at all events, the best defence is no defence at all.

Bill read the second time, and considered in Committee and reported.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 87) further to amend the Indian Act, 1880, said: The amendments made are of more or less importance; and with the assent of the House we will take the second reading and go into Committee on Wednesday. No doubt the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who has paid much attention to the Indian question, will consider the proposals in the meantime and express his views in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is proposing to give us only one opportunity of expressing our views on this Bill. He now proposes to take the second reading in silence, and the two next stages can be taken on one day. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have found they can get along very well with the Indians, if the Indians are let alone; but we have had on several occasions much trouble in consequence of the acts of whiskey dealers, smugglers and other parties, and in this Bill the first clause makes such persons liable to be punished. The second clause refers to the selling of ammunition to Indians. Formerly there was no difficulty in this regard, because the Mounted Police were able to prevent its introduction; but with the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railway facilities, there is practically no check on it, and this clause provides a punishment. The third clause provides that celebrating the "Potlach" is a misdemeanour. This Indian festival is a debauchery of the worst kind, and the departmental officers and all clergymen unite in affirming that it is absolutely necessary to put this practice down. Last year the late Governor General issued a proclamation on the advice of his Ministers warning Indians against celebrating this festival. At these gatherings they give away their guns and all their property in a species of rivalry, and go so far as to give away their wives; in fact, as I have said, it is a great debauch. Under this Act to celebrate the Potlach is to be guilty of a misdemeanour. There is an amendment for the purpose of enlarging the powers of Indians to devise their property by will. The whole question of the enfranchisement of Indians is dealt with in the 15th section, section 99 of the present Act being repealed. These, in brief, are the main objects of the Bill; of course we shall consider them more fully in Committee of the Whole. With these remarks, I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will allow the Bill to be read the second time and put down for Committee of the Whole on Wednesday, when full opportunity will be given for discussion at that and subsequent stages.

Mr. MILLS. I have not had an opportunity of reading the Bill, but I desire to enquire whether it contains any provision to enable unenfranchised Indians to dispose of their products, but there is no authority to sell or dispose of them, and at the present time when they do sell, purchasers take a risk and the Indians obtain less for the products of their industry than other persons in the community. Some provision should be made with respect to this matter, whether the hon. gentleman has it in his Bill or not. I simply mention the matter, because it is one of very considerable consequence to the Indians, as it places a serious impediment to their industry to find they cannot freely dispose of the fruits of their toil, and have not the same liberty to sell as other persons in the community.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no clause in the Bill to that effect, the Bill having special reference to the North-West. The present law is quite sufficient for the purpose. The Indians have the right to sell under the consent of the local agents. It is of very great importance that that power should still remain in the Local Agents, subject to the higher officers of the Indian Department. We are just getting the Indians to remain on the Reserves; and we can scarcely, for some years, expect them to raise more than enough to feed their own families. If there were a surplus, and the Indians had power of unrestricted sale, they would dispose of their products to the first trader or whiskey dealer who came along, and the consequence would be that the Indians would be pensioners on the Government during the next winter, and Parliament would have to vote, as it has in the past, a considerable sum of money. However, this question can be discussed in Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. The understanding is that the third reading will be taken at a subsequent stage to the Committee of the Whole, and on these terms I have no objection to the second reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly. I want to get a good Bill.

Bill read the second time.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, before this motion is adopted, I desire to offer a few observations to the House on a very important subject upon which I shall ask hon. gentlemen to express an opinion. The subject that I more particularly desire to bring to your attention is that of immigration into, and emigration from, the Dominion of Canada. I would have preferred, as you can readily understand, that in speaking on this subject, the Minister of Agriculture, to whose Department it particularly refers, had been present. Circumstances are such, however, that he is not with us, and all will agree that in the discharge of public duty we cannot allow a circumstance like that to prevent its being attended to, and no doubt one or more of his colleagues will be able to explain some matters which I think require explanation at the hands of the Government, and defend, if they find a defence to be necessary, the actions of the Government, or rather, of that Department of the Government. Sir, I may just say at the outset, that the question looked at from a financial point of view, is a very serious question indeed. For some years past we have gone on appropriating a large and still larger yearly amount of money for this branch of the public service. It will be within the recollection of some members of this House who were members of the last Parliament, that we were told by the Government in very plain terms indeed, that by reason of the contract that we were entering into at that time with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the great burden that had rested on our shoulders in times past, with reference to the question of expenditure in connection with immigration, would be lifted from us and transferred to the shoulders of that Company. I desire in my opening remarks to point out how utterly and grievously the Ministry have failed in fulfilling those promises, and shall ask them, as I think I have the right to ask them—as the House has a right to ask them—to give

some explanation as to how their plans have miscarried, or at any rate how their promises have failed. There may possibly be some members of the present House who were not members of the last Parliament and who are not aware how clear and distinct were the promises which were made to us in reference to this matter; and in order that those gentlemen may understand it, I desire to read a few sentences which were uttered by the Ministers and their supporters, when urging the adoption of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract by the House. I may say, Sir, that there was a great deal of hesitancy manifested by the House in signifying their acceptance of that bargain at that time, that a great many arguments had to be made use of before the House was convinced that it was in the interests of the country that that contract should be entered into; and one of the strong arguments relied upon by the Ministers and those of their supporters who were bold enough to speak out on that occasion, was, that by virtue of entering into that agreement we would be saved, as I said before, a large amount, by way of expenditures in the promotion of immigration. In the Speech from the Throne, which was delivered on December 9th, 1880, the Advisers of his Excellency put these words in his mouth:

"The contract and papers connected therewith will be submitted to you without delay, and I invoke for them your early and earnest consideration. With this view, I have summoned you before the usual period, as no action can be taken by the contractors to prosecute the work, and no permanent arrangements for the organization of a systematic emigration from Europe to the North-West Territories can be satisfactorily made until the policy of Parliament, with respect to the railway, has been decided."

Mr. Beaty, then as now, representing West Toronto, who was honored with the duty of moving the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, made some remarks on the same subject; and it is well known that words uttered on such an occasion are, I might say, inspired, or semi-inspired, by the Ministry:

"There is another feature of a very important character in connection with this matter, and that is the one of immigration." * * *

After speaking of our own young men going into the new country, he says:

"But there is still left the great fact that this policy will do most to make those lands valuable and productive—will do most for the development of our resources, that the hope of gain from them in connection with the railway will induce the Company to bring in settlers who will people our great North-West Territory. If that is done the Government will relieve themselves and the country from a very important task which hitherto has been only moderately successful—that of bringing into this country emigrants from the older countries of Europe."

I shall also quote what was said by Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Government, on December 10th, 1880, in reply to Mr. Mackenzie, who, in the course of his remarks, said:

"I will be glad to give way to him (Sir John) now to tell us whether it is his deliberate purpose to give this House but ten days in which to agree to a measure, upon pain of being punished by not having a holiday."

The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) said, in reply:

"I will tell the hon. gentleman that with the assistance of the majority of this House, such is the intention of the Government. For the reason given in the Speech it is important, if this policy is to be carried out, it should be carried out at once. Immigration very much depends on it. The Company cannot organize nor take any steps to bring out emigrants before the contract is ratified. They have only got January, February and March to prepare the work in. Emigrants will be here in May, and it is of very great importance, if Parliament is going to adopt the arrangement, that it should do so with all convenient speed. We consider it of so much importance that we shall ask the House to take it into early and earnest consideration and to remain here with as short a Christmas interval as possible until it is passed."

Then, Sir, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) who favoured the bargain, made these remarks, with reference to it, in enforcing his views upon that subject. After speaking of the advantages the country would derive from the Canadian Pacific Contract, he said:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

"But over and above all this is the fact that the arrangement proposed would render the Government the very greatest possible assistance in the way of attracting immigrants to this country. If you consider the average cost per capita of inducing immigrants to settle in the older Provinces of the Dominion, and the great additional cost of inducing them to settle in the North-West, and then estimate the number likely to settle there, you will obtain some idea of the several millions of dollars which will be saved to this country in the expense of immigration alone."

Now, Sir, at a later stage I propose to show you, not the several millions of dollars that have been saved to this country in the matter of immigration, but something in the direction of the millions extra that have been expended, over and above our ordinary yearly expenditure in previous years, before this contract was let. But before doing so I desire to bring before the House the evidence furnished by the Government as to the manner in which these grand promises were fulfilled that were made to us at that time. Some time ago I moved for a return of the correspondence which had passed between the Government and the Syndicate on the subject of immigration, and also a statement from the Syndicate showing the moneys they had spent in promoting immigration, and the numbers they had been instrumental in bringing into the North-West. The House ordered that return, and the other day it was brought down. As it occupies only three sheets of foolscap, as it is not likely to be printed by the Printing Committee, and as I think the country ought to have it, I shall take this opportunity of reading it:

"Return to an Address of the House of Commons, dated 31st January, 1884, for copies of all correspondence and agreements between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on the subject of immigration to Manitoba and the North-West, together with a statement showing the amount expended by the Company in promoting such immigration, giving amounts paid, with dates, to whom paid, and nature of service rendered; also, estimate of the Company of number of persons from foreign countries who have actually settled there in each year since date of charter.

"By Command,
"J. A. CHAPLEAU,
"*Secretary of State.*

"Department of the Secretary of State, 8th March, 1884."

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
"OTTAWA, CANADA, 4th March, 1884.

"SIR,—In returning to you the enclosed order of the House of Commons for copies of correspondence and agreements between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and this Department, on the subject of immigration to Manitoba and the North-West, I am to inform you that there are no agreements nor any correspondence.

"The order further asks for a statement showing the amount expended by the Company in promoting such immigration; and in reply, I am to say to you that the Company has not furnished to the Department any statements of its expenditure for that purpose.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"J. LOWE,
"*Secretary Department of Agriculture.*

"GRANT POWELL, Esq.,
"Under Secretary of State."

"OTTAWA, 7th March, 1884.

"SIR,—In returning the enclosed Address from the House of Commons, I have the honour to inform you that no correspondence has passed between this Department and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the subject of immigration, nor is there any information on record bearing on the questions asked in relation thereto.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"A. P. BRADLEY,
"*Secretary.*

"GRANT POWELL, Esq.,
"Under Secretary of State, Ottawa."

Now, Sir, there is the answer to the Order of the House, in which the Government tells us that they have not even had any correspondence with the Company in reference to this matter; that the Company, during the years that it has been in existence, has not furnished the Government with

one single statement, has not favoured them with one single letter, has not given a record of one single dollar expended by it in promoting immigration, although that consideration was urged upon this House asone of the strong reasons why this bargain should be entered into. More than that. I call the attention of the Government and of the House to the fact that the Government themselves have not caused one letter to be written to the Company, soliciting information in regard to this matter; and Sir, if their negligence in this respect was inexcusable in the past, it is more inexcusable now, because though this return was ordered on the 31st of January, it did not come down until the 8th of March, and the Government do not seem to have availed themselves of the opportunity afforded by that interval of time to write to the Company asking for a particle of information on this subject. Sir, I hold that this is a serious matter. I am not dealing in surmises or indulging in probabilities; but I read the official report of the Department made to this House, and I claim that it exhibits a state of affairs demanding explanation from the Government, although satisfactory explanation cannot be expected in the face of the documents I have read. But the Government failing in making that explanation, I think the House will agree with me that in this respect at least the Ministry have sadly neglected their duty. Now let us see what this immigration is costing the country, so that the House may see how negligent the Company have been in bearing share of the work. In 1880 we expended for immigration $183,204; in 1881 we expended $250,812, or an increase of $67,608; in 1882, $253,061, or an increase of $69,857; in 1883, $437,734, or an increase of $254,430; for the current year, we were asked to vote $520,221, or an increase of $337,017; and in the Estimates for 1884-85, we are asked to vote $526,375, or an increase of $343,171. So that, Sir, instead of the several millions of dollars that were to be saved to this country by the adoption of that contract, as the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe told us, I find that from 1879-80 to 1883-84 we have expended $1,072,183 more in the aggregate than we expended before we made the contract with the Company. The total amount expended in promoting immigration during those years is $1,645,032, to which, if we add the $526,375 which we are asked to vote for 1884-85, you will have a sum of over $2,000,000, that has been expended since the contract was entered into. Now, Sir, if we had anything to show for the expenditure of that money, if we had found that the Syndicate were contributing a like amount, then there might be a little relief to the dark picture. But we find that they have done nothing of the kind. And again, if we had succeeded in keeping in the country the people we professed to have brought here as residents, to help us to pay the debt we were heaping up and to help us to bear the burden of our expenditure, there would have been some satisfaction. But it is my duty to place before you some figures—figures that I wish did not exist, because it would please me much better if I could adduce figures to show that we were not only maintaining our ground, but going on rapidly increasing in population; but I can only give you the figures as I find them; and I submit them to the House in order that the House may weigh well the question whether the moneys expended by the Government in promoting immigration in the past have not been misapplied, and whether they have brought to the country the benefits we had a right to expect from that expenditure. Now, Sir, I propose to deal with some figures that are taken from our Census returns. In dealing with them, I am free to confess that I have great doubts as to the accuracy of the figures; and if I would speak the honest sentiments of my mind, I must say that I believe the Department of Agriculture, in the matter of the Census, has also most grievously failed. The delay in the issue of Vol. No. 2 is, I think, proof of that; the many discrepancies and anomalies that are to be found in Vols. 1 and 3 are also evidence of it, but we have to deal with the figures as we find them. I have a comparative statement here, taken from those, figures with reference to our population, which I desire to bring before this House, and to point out what they show; and I have to regret, as every hon. member in this House will regret, that the figures are not such as we would desire them to be, but are figures that are rather discouraging. I find that, in 1871, the Dominion of Canada, then comprising the four Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, had a population of 3,485,761. Ten years later, in 1881, those four Provinces had a population of 4,044,060; or we had an increase in the four Provinces of 558,299 during the ten years—about 16 per cent. Now let us take each of those Provinces, and I may say here that the natural increase—and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me in this, taking a very low estimate indeed, an estimate lower, I think, than is ever taken in this matter—the natural increase in a country such as ours, of births over deaths, should average annually 2 per cent., which would be 20 per cent. in ten years. But the total shows that instead of this natural increase, at the low figure of 2 per cent., we have failed to come up to it by some 4 per cent. In Nova Scotia there was, in 1881, a population of 440,072, and in 1871, 387,-00; an increase 52,772, or 1·35 per cent. per annum, being ·65 per cent. below what ought to be the natural increase, without a soul being brought into the country from abroad, taking the low estimate of 2 per cent. In New Brunswick, in 1881, there was a population of 321,333, and in 1871, 285,591; an increase of 35,639, or 1 25 per cent. per annum, instead of 2 per cent. per annum which, as I said before, should be the lowest figure which we should take for natural increase. Quebec, in 1881, had a population of 1,359,027, and in 1871 1,191,516; an increase of 167,511, or 1·40 per cent. of an increase per annum instead of 2 per cent., the lowest natural increase. In 1881, Ontario had a population of 1,923,228, and in 1871, 1,620,851; an increase of 302,377, or 1·85 per cent. per annum, instead of the natural increase of 2 per cent. Taking this natural increase of 2 per cent. per annum which, as I said before, is below the mark, and we will find that Nova Scotia should have had 77,560 of an increase instead of her actual increase of 52,722; or Nova Scotia had 24,788 less of a population in 1881 than she would have had if she had had but the natural increase at 2 per cent. per annum, without a soul being brought in from foreign countries at all. We find that New Brunswick, instead of her actual increase of 35,639, should have had an increase of 57,119; or she should have had 21,480 more, if she had had the regular natural increase of 2 per cent. per annum, than she actually had in 1881. We find that Quebec should have had an increase of 238,303, instead of her actual increase of 167,511; or she should have had 70,792 more souls in 1881 than she actually had, provided she had but kept her own people there at the natural increase based on 2 per cent. per annum. Ontario should have had 324,170, instead of 302,377; or she should have had 21,793 more 1881 than she actually had, if not a single soul had been brought in from a foreign country at all, but had retained within her own bounds, her own natural increase. Summing up the four Provinces—and in 1871 there were but these four—instead of there being an addition of 558,299, there should have been an addition of 697,152; or there should have been 138,853 more than there actually was, if we had but our natural increase alone, and if not a soul had been brought to us from a foreign country. The figures may well make us pause. We have expended $2,000,000 since 1879-80, including the Estimates of 1874-75, and what do we find? We find that in the four older Provinces—I have compared only those four, as there was only those in Confederation in 1871—we find that all the immigrants that have been brought into this country have either left this country or, if

found here, are found at the expense, and by the displacement of those who were our own citizens, and that we are still 138,153 people less than we ought to be. The hon. Finance Minister and other hon. members of the Government told us during the *regime* of the hon. member for East York that they knew this state of things existed, that they knew that citizens of this country were leaving it and they declared it—well I give them credit for having honestly declared it—and they came forward and said they had a remedy whereby they would stop this state of things, and Parliament was asked to sanction the remedy and it was put into force. I ask now has it had the promised effect? I wish I could honestly say that we had, at any rate, kept our own people at home; but the figures I have given prove that we have not succeeded even in doing this. But I may be told by the hon. Finance Minister or other hon. gentlemen that the Census of 1881 show but the operation of two years of the new Tariff, show but two years' operation of the plans they devised, the machinery they made use of, in order to keep our own people. But I would remind the hon. gentleman that they claimed that we had a vast access to our population under their new system. I want to examine into this pretension. There are other figures given, from which we may form some conclusion as to the operation of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite in this respect. I am driven to look at figures that I have to find from American sources, and figures that I will compare with figures furnished by our own Department of Agriculture. I am free to confess that I think that the system of statistics in the United States and the results shown by them are not, I would fain believe, strictly accurate, and may not be strictly relied upon; but I will say this, that, while that is the case, I have equal doubts as to the reliability of the statistics that are gathered by our own Department. I think I may say that, without endeavouring to censure hon. gentlemen opposite too much. I suppose it is a difficult matter to get anything like accurate statistics in reference to this subject, but there are certain things, when taken together, and figures compared, one with another, that do lead up to this result, that the American figures, when taken in connection with the facts revealed by our own Census and with the facts revealed by statistics obtained from other sources altogether, are not as far from being accurate as I, from my heart, would desire they were. Now, in order to ascertain this point, let me call your attention to this fact. I find, from the American statistics, that from the year 1873 to the year 1883, those two years inclusive, the American statistics show that they received as immigrants from our Dominion 585,893 souls, and the figures of the Department of Agriculture for the Dominion show that, in the same ten years, we received a total immigration from foreign countries of 571,773 souls, or in the ten years we absolutely lost the whole 571,773 souls that, by a vast expenditure of money, we brought to this country, and 14,125 people besides. Well, Sir, for purposes of comparison, and in order to enable us to determine as to whether we had found the remedy for this, that everyone will admit is a matter to be deplored, I have divided it into two periods of five years each, in order that we might ascertain whether, under the working of the Tariff which was to produce such beneficial changes, we have stemmed the current and improved matters. And what do I find? Take from the year 1874 to the year 1878 inclusive, the years in which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was leading this Government, when the cries and the wails of hon. gentlemen opposite were oft repeated as to the terrible fact that our country was being depleted, when the American statistics, those which I use now, were used in this House as figures to be relied upon authoritatively. When gentlemen remember that they relied, in making their charges against the Mackenzie Administration, upon the figures given by the American statistics, they are estopped from objecting to these same statistics when they are applied in their case. I might mention that when a person was being examined at a certain place, the other day, whose testimony has been brought in on a previous debate on the floor of the House, in reference to this matter, when it was thought a point was made against the late Mackenzie Administration, the testimony of that individual was, that, with reference to that one port of Port Huron, about which there was a doubt as to the accuracy of the figures, the officer there declared that from 1874 to 1878 the figures were systematically added to, that they were systematically increased at that port, but that from the year 1879, in which he was dismissed, when, through Mr. Lowe making enquiries at that point, Mr. Nimmo, the Chief of Statistics, came to Port Huron, and a new order of things was instituted, the figures were —he had no means of positively knowing, but he does know that an attempt was made that they should be—gathered more accurately, and the impression—I believe I am giving him right—was that the figures from 1879 down to the present time might be accepted as more reliable than the figures made use of from 1874 to 1878 by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, the American statistics show that they received in the United States from Canada during the five years that my hon. friend from East York was in power, 125,619 souls, and the statistics furnished by our own Department of Agriculture show that we had brought into this country from foreign countries during the same five years, 149,277, or we did gain in population in those five years 23,658 souls—we brought in that many and kept that many more than went out. But take from the year 1879 to 1883, the period that is covered by the reign of hon. gentlemen opposite, the period that is covered by the operations of that which was designed as a means of stopping this exodus of our own people and giving employment to them within our own land, and what are the figures, and how do they compare? In those five years, American statistics showed that they received from Canada 422,720 souls, and during the same period our Department of Agriculture shows that we brought into the country, if I may take 133,000 as the figures for 1883—I take that from the speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, who, I suppose, had information with reference to it; the Report of the Minister not having been laid on the Table till to-day, I have not had an opportunity of examining it—taking that 133,000, which are extraordinarily large figures, in the five years we had brought in 372,446 souls; or, in the five years covered by the reign of hon. gentlemen opposite, during which their remedial measure was in full operation, the loss in population is 50,274. That is, that all the immigrants that have been brought into this country from every other country have either disappeared themselves to the United States, or have displaced an equal number of our own people, and 50,274 more. I say these figures call for serious consideration on our part. It is time that this whole subject of immigration and the expenditure that is going on in reference to it should have our most serious consideration. But I have some other statistics here, and I am sorry to say again that they bear out the inference that we have to draw from the figures I have already given, and I am the more sorry because they are taken from an altogether different source, compiled for an altogether different purpose, prepared by an altogether different Government—the Local Governments of two of our own Provinces. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his speech in reply to the hon. the Finance Minister's speech on the Budget, gave to us the figures of the school attendance in the Province of Ontario. I will not trouble the House with going over those again. I regret that I have not been able to ascertain the figures of the attendance of children in the Province of Quebec, but I

have obtained the figures of pupils in attendance at the public schools in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and I ask the attention of the House to the results that they show. In Nova Scotia, in the year 1879, I find there were 99,094 children registered as attending the public schools of that Province. In the year 1876, three years before that, during the reign of my hon. friend from East York, there were only 94,162 children attending those schools, or in the three years there was an increase in the attendance of pupils in the schools of Nova Scotia of 4,932. I suppose one child would represent about five inhabitants If so, it would show an increase of about 25,000 of population in the Province of Nova Scotia, between 1876 and 1879, inclusive.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. What does the hon. gentleman mean? That I estimate too many?

Mr. CAMERON. Rather fast.

Mr. PATERSON. I said one in five, did I not? I think that the figures that are given by the Minister of Education puts it at one in every five inhabitants attending school, as near as may be; and if I am not mistaken, I think New Brunswick is much the same—but I speak subject to correction. But if we take one child as representing four of a population, it gives something like 20,000 of an increase, and I think these figures will not be considered extravagant. A child going to school would be likely to have a father and a mother and a brother and a sister living, and if he had not he would be likely to have a father and a mother and one brother living, at any rate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Besides his cousins and his aunts.

Mr. PATERSON. But, as I desire to be strictly accurate, we will not take them in this, as that would be like some of our Census returns—a compounding of figures. Taking again the pivot year of 1879, when the Tariff was introduced, you had 99,094 pupils attending the public schools of Nova Scotia. In 1882, which are the last figures I can get, what do we find? That there were 95,912 children attending public school, or a decrease in three years of pupils attending the Nova Scotia schools of 3,182, during the three years that the hon. gentleman's policy was in operation; while for the three years prior to their policy going into effect, there was an increase of 4,932. Now, Sir, these figures are taken from the Report of the Minister of Education of that Province, and he certainly has no object whatever to serve in exaggerating them. I may say that these are, perhaps, the most accurate figures it is possible for us to get, for they profess to be the actual register of the number of pupils of all kinds attending school there. Now, then, we come to the Province of New Brunswick, and what do we find? Taking the same pivot year, 1879, we find that there were attending the public schools of New Brunswick 70,889 children; taking the year 1875, there were 59,625 children attending schools, so that in the four years, from 1875 to 1879, there was an increased attendance of pupils in the New Brunswick schools of 11,264. Take the year 1879 again, as the pivot year, and there were 70,889 attending school; taking the four years from that down to 1883, under the operation of the hon. gentleman's policy —as I have the returns for 1883 in New Brunswick—and what do I find? There were but 84,581 children attending in 1883, or 6,308 less.

Mr. PAINT. They are employed now, instead of going to school.

Mr. PATERSON. They are employed now, instead of going to school! I am sorry to see any member of a Canadian Parliament rise and plead as an excuse that boys and girls who ought to be at school, through the effects of that protective policy, have been driven into factories to earn their daily bread. But, Sir, these figures show that while there was an increase during the four years prior to this policy coming into operation, of 11,264, during the four succeeding years, while that policy was in operation, the attendance fell off 6,308. Multiply that, as I have asked you to do, on the basis of the scholars representing one in five—or, if the gentleman from Nova Scotia prefers, one in four—and they will tell a tale that, I am sorry to say, accurately bears out the conclusion forced upon us by a comparison of the American statistics of emigrants received from us, with our own statistics of immigrants that we have brought into our country. Now, then, I think I have said enough, perhaps, to warrant me in saying that I do think a case is made out with reference to the Emigration Department that calls for the most serious consideration of this House. I now propose to enter upon another branch of my subject, in order to lead up to a proposition that I desire to submit to this House, and upon which I desire them to express their opinion. Sir, if the figures I have given to you be correct—and I have shown the sources from whence they are derived, and hon. gentlemen can examine them for themselves—if the facts be as these figures declare them to be, I would ask if it is not time that the public moneys of the people of Canada should not be used for the purpose of bringing immigrants from other countries into our country, only to pass from our shores on to the shores of another country; or, if they do not do that, to displace an equal number of citizens who, without any disparagement to those who come here from abroad, I say it is more desirable for us to retain in our midst those who come to us from abroad to take their places. Now, Sir, I say, and I say it unhesitatingly, from personal knowledge, though we have been here now nearly three months, and I am free to confess that a business man shut up in the city of Ottawa, attending to his duties, having but limited correspondence with those who are left to manage his own affairs, is hardly in a position to tell exactly the actual state of affairs that exists in the country. I was impressed with this fact before I left my home to attend to my parliamentary duties, that we had, after a period of prosperity, much sooner than I could desire, much sooner, indeed, than I expected, that we had met with reverses in trade, that we had reached that stage of protection, if I might use that expression, which would come sooner or later, that we had reached it much sooner than I anticipated. As a result, I do know, though my own city is one of the busiest little cities I believe in this country, and we felt it perhaps less than other places, I could not shut my eyes to the fact that while there had been difficulty at some times during a pressure of business in some of the factories, of securing men, that that period had passed and that we were actually in a position—I myself, and others with whom I conferred, manufacturers in my own city—that we were forced to say that we regretted very much to find that we had applicants for labour to such an extent that it was painful almost to say, no, no; as we were forced to do in justice to the men that we had in our employ. And, Sir, that impression was strengthened by the fact that the newspapers told us that which had become a matter very palpable even then, that many of the manufacturing industries throughout the country, notably our cotton and woollen mills, had reached the stage in which they had over-produced, in which there was an enforced necessity for them to shut down production, and to discharge their operatives; and, Sir, from then till now, as I have been able to follow the course of events, I find this state of things, instead of becoming better, is becoming worse. I find that the wages of our workingmen are being reduced, I find in the newspapers that the men in the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway Company are in consultation whether it is possible for them, or whether they will consent to a reduction of

the wages that they are receiving at present. The manufacturers have been forced to reduce their wages. I know also that others have reluctantly been forced into that position, for it is with reluctance that a man—if he possesses the feeling that I believe the vast majority of that class possess—I say it is with reluctance that manufacturers will discharge their employees, especially during the dull winter months. But it was forced upon them. And we have the testimony of men who have written letters to their employers and signed them—letters in which they stated that they would almost sooner starve than strike, but in which they asked their employers to take into consideration their circumstances, to consider for a moment the amount of wages they were receiving and to ask themselves how it was possible that on those wages they could support and educate their families, and keep the sheriff away fron the door. This was the state of things when Parliament assembled; but limited as my ability is accurately, from actual contact with the outside business public, to ascertain what is transpiring in that direction, I am forced unwillingly to the conclusion that, instead of the position improving, it is rather worse; and though I am not one of those who take a too gloomy view of the affairs of this country, for I believe the people of Canada are a people full of energy, yet from my knowledge of the stocks of many manufactured articles in this country, I am able, as a business man, to say that there is a period before us during which we may not expect to have that prosperity which was upon us for two or three years past. I think my view is borne out by this fact, that the prosperity we enjoyed during the two or three previous years was a prosperity not natural to the years in which we enjoyed it, but that during those two or three years, in addition to the prosperity that was on the country, a natural prosperity, resulting from many varying causes, notably among which was the increase of wealth brought into the country from the sale of lumber, animals and their products, and agricultural produce—there was a prosperity, if by great trading prosperity may be defined, in a measure due to the fact that we discounted a year or two that were to follow; in other words, the goods which should have been manufactured in 1884 and 1885, and perhaps some of the goods which ought to have been manufactured in 1886, were, by the stimulus of the highly protective Tariff, manufactured during the three years of prosperity. It thus seems inevitable that for a year or two, at all events—I trust it may not be longer—we cannot expect to have anything like the prosperity we enjoyed during those two or three years; I hope my forecast may not be perfectly correct, and that it may turn out that we have not really discounted the prosperity which should occur during this and future years in the last three years which have gone by. But I have to bring before the House the views of the wage-earners of this country, as represented by their Trade and Labour Council in Toronto. Not many days ago petitions were presented to this House—petitions yards in length, and covered with the signatures of the men who, with bared arms, work for their daily bread in the different trades and industries—in which they set forth that there is no longer in this country room for any more labourers than we have in it, and that there are mechanics and artizans at the present time unable to obtain employment, and that assisted passages for mechanics and ordinary labourers should altogether cease from this time forth. I have before me a Report of their Legislative Committee on 7th March, from which I desire to read an extract to the House. And the House will agree with me that if it was a right and proper thing that the manufacturing industries of this country, if the interests of comparatively few men engaged in manufacturing were of sufficient importance to warrant the Finance Minister in bringing their case before Parliament and asking for special legislation, in order that they might be favoured and encouraged, then I hold that hon. members will admit it is a right and proper thing that I should bring before the House the claims of a class who outnumber the other class perhaps a hundred to one, when they ask this House not to give them any special favour, not to enact legislation directly for their benefit, but that from this time forward, under the present depressed circumstances, the Government will not take the wages paid by way of taxes into the Dominion Treasury, contributed by those wage-earners, for the purpose of paying the passages of men from foreign countries to come here and compete with them, and cut down the price of their labour. The Legislative Committee of the Trades and Labour Council said:

"Your Committee are pleased to find that the discussions in both the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial Legislature, on the immigration question, its abuses, and its evils, consequent upon the persistent efforts of your body in keeping the subject before the public, have, in a pointed manner, drawn attention to the very unreliable manner in which immigration statistics are secured by the Dominion Government. To this same looseness in enforcing the printed instructions and regulations of the Government on the part of agents abroad, is due in a great measure the fact that the classes required, if required at all, do not find their way to Canada In support of this contention it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that, during the month of February just passed, there arrived in Toronto 148 immigrants, of whom fifty-four were mechanics and thirty-six were clerks, leaving only fifty-eight under the head of "farm labourers." The system which encourages and abets immigration to Canada in midwinter, of the two first-mentioned classes, and under the present depressing outlook, is simply infamous.

"Your Committee feel that it cannot be too often repeated that there are more mechanics and labourers in Canada at the present time than can find employment, altogether irrespective of what wage they may be willing to work for, and as a consequence, regret that the Dominion Government still, and in face of this undeniable fact, evinces a disposition to further flood our labour market, as shown by the increased sum asked to be voted by Parliament for immigration purposes during the now opening season."

That is the report of the Legislative Committee of the Trades and Labour Council of Toronto, which, I take it, fairly represents the sentiments of the wage-earners. I may add that the petitions presented were not petitions from that body alone, but from other cities of the Dominion. At a meeting held on the 22nd March, the Legislative Committee made another report, with which I will trouble the House. The report says:

"Your Committee are glad to notice, through the press, that the Dominion Government has drawn the attention of the Tuke Immigration Committee to the undesirableness of many of those sent to Canada under or by direction of said Committee, and would express the hope that this is but the first of a series of steps towards meeting the views so often and so forcibly, as well as truthfully, brought under the notice of the Government by your body, regarding immigration by assisted passage, and as paupers.

"Your Committee are buoyed in this hope, the more particularly as the reports published during the past two weeks of the numbers of poor people fed and provided with clothing, fuel, &c., by the various charitable and benevolent organizations, are of themselves the very best evidence that the ground long since taken by your body in asserting that our labour market is more than over stocked with surplus labourers, was strictly correct. Your attention, as well as that of the public, is, in a particular manner, called to the following, credited in the city press to Mr Pell, one of the relieving officers of the St George's Society. He stated, 'that among the applicants were many newly-arrived immigrants, who came out on 'assisted passages' from the Dominion Government, and were entirely without capital. Most of the new arrivals are ordinary labourers, mechanics and clerks. None seem to have been brought up to agricultural pursuits.' Mr Pell concludes by hoping that he 'may never again have to witness so much distress in the city.' And with the same end in view, your Committee have been keeping the matter so persistently before the Government, your body, and the public generally."

I cannot read all the extracts. I hope it will all be allowed to be printed—but they say that they feel buoyed up in their hope, by the fact that one of the active agents of a reliable society, whom the press generally agrees in saying is Mr. Pell, hopes he may never be called upon again to witness such an amount of distress as existed in that city at the present time, among newly-arrived immigrants. Now, having read these extracts, having spoken of matters which, I suppose, are more or less within the knowledge of gentlemen present, I have no hesitancy in saying that there is not in Canada, at the present time, room for any more mechan-

ics, or for labourers engaged in towns and cities; and I do agree with this report that it is wrong—I will not go the length that the report goes, for they call it simply infamous—but I do say it is wrong and improper under present circumstances that the wages contributed by way of taxation by these people should be taken for the purpose of bringing more from older countries into this country, already glutted. I say it must have one of two results: it must have the result not only of putting down the wages of men who are employed here, but a matter worse than that is, as the Committee points out, that it can only have the result of making either those we bring into the country leave this for another country, or drive from us an equal number of those whom we claim as our citizens and are proud to recognize as such. Now, Sir, I find a short extract in Saturday's *Globe*, in the form of a telegram from London, England, dated March 21st, in which it is stated:

"Lord Lorne delivered a lecture on Emigration to-night in the district of Whitechapel. As usual, he lauded Canada, and pointed out the great advantages of emigration to the Dominion, where employment was offered to all who were willing to work. He assured his hearers that the coming summer would be one of increased prosperity in Canada and the demand for labour greater than ever before. The Baroness Burdette-Coutts will at once send fifty poor families to Canada, where arrangements have been made for their suitable location."

Now, in common with all other members of this House, I rejoice in the fact that our Governors General, during their stay in this country, become so favourably impressed with it that it seems to them that they regard it not only as their duty, but that they actually take pleasure in speaking well of the Dominion over which their Sovereign calls upon them to preside for some years. I am glad that Canada is able to produce such sentiments, and has produced them, in the breasts of the illustrious gentlemen who have presided as Governors General over this Dominion. Not only is that true with reference to Lord Lorne, but with reference to his illustrious predecessor, Earl Dufferin, and I trust it may be our good fortune—and I speak confidently, when I expect that it will be our good fortune—so to impress the mind of the distinguished gentleman who now occupies that position, that he, too, when he returns to his native land, will find it an easy and a pleasant task to speak in terms of admiration of this Dominion of which we are all so proud. But while I say this—and I have read this extract for this purpose—I consider that if Lord Lorne is correctly reported in these remarks, it is desirable that communication should be had with him, in which he should be informed that there is a change in the circumstances of Canada. He is now speaking from an experience that might possibly warrant him in using this language, with reference to all kinds of labour, when he sailed from our shores, amid the regrets of us all. But as I said before, there was a sharp turn in our affairs, and I cannot, speaking truthfully, state that the language, if uttered by Lord Lorne, is such as he would feel warranted in using, if he were fully aware of the circumstances in which we are to-day. I believe, and I would desire that if any communication, any words of this Parliament, any utterances to which he attaches any weight, should reach his ear, he should be told that in the outspoken and friendly way in which he is advocating our interests in the Old Country, he should tell the people of Great Britain, that in the Dominion of Canada there is room for men with small capital who desire to go on the land to till it, that there is room for that class of people in the almost boundless prairies of the North-West; that on the fertile soil of Manitoba there is room for all who desire to come, and we will hail as a benefactor the man who lends his energies in the direction of leading them there. I think he would be warranted in saying this, in addressing any audience comprised of men who have been labourers in agricultural pursuits, whether under tenant farmers or others, that he should say to them there is room, and I believe there is, in Ontario and I suppose, in the other Provinces, for people of that kind, and that labour will be found for them. And if he should be favoured with any of the fair sex in his audiences, he should say to them, in all confidence, that if there are any respectable females in that land, who are willing to engage in household service——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If there be females of respectable connection who are willing——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman seems to doubt that he would meet with respectable women in the places he goes to.

Mr. PATERSON. I trust the hon. gentleman is not trying——

Mr. MACKENZIE. To joke.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Brant is joking, and a bad joke it is.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; I was speaking in earnest, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me in saying that it is not very parliamentary to interrupt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If he will point out an expression which I have used that is improper, I can only say that I did not desire to use it; and though I cannot now remember the words I did use to convey the idea I wished to convey, I repeat here that if there are those of respectable connections—females that desire to come to this country, and who have characters that are such that it is well to introduce into our families, there is employment, I believe, for that class of female help in the households of Canada. That I have said, that I desire to say, and that, I believe, is what I did say.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I am glad the hon. gentleman approves of it. Now, Sir, these are the classes that we should bring in—female servants, such as are willing to work in the household, and agricultural labourers who have been taught to work on the farm, and have worked around the farm in the Old Country. There is room for them in the older Provinces, I believe; and, as I said before, farmers even with limited means, but who desire to take homesteads and become holders of real estate, will be able to get land in the North-West. I would not ask that he should say to them that there is everything here they desire, made ready to their hand, for I do not think anything is to be gained, nor do I believe that he or any other gentleman conversant with the actual state of affairs would desire to promote immigration by that means. But I believe that those who are honest and respectable, and are willing to work and willing to till the soil, will find homes in that country, and will be welcomed by everybody in the country. But with the other class, I maintain that the figures I have given show that we have not room for them, under the present circumstances. I can enforce that statement by referring to what the Finance Minister himself said in his Budget speech. When alluding to the depression in the cotton industry—though he attempted to make light of it in a way that, I think, the circumstances did not warrant—admitted that there was a depression, that the mills had closed down, and that several hundred operatives, as he put it, had been thrown out of employment. But he said: The saw mills have restricted their productions, and there is no outcry about that; but as soon as a few hundred operatives are thrown out of employment, a cry goes up in the coun-

try with reference to them. I have shown that is a serious matter even for a few hundred—although, if the hon. gentleman's figures were correct, I think the number would be more like a few thousand—to be out of employment for a month or two months in the year, when I pointed out the average wages paid to these employees, estimated from the Census returns made by hon. gentlemen opposite. No one will assert that there is room for more operatives in our cotton mills. Moreover, the proposed reduction in the number of employees on the Grand Trunk Railway, at the present time, as well as the reductions that have taken place in many industrial establishments throughout the country, all point to the fact that there are at present a large number, and there must necessarily be a greatly augmented number in the near future, of men willing and anxious to work, for whom the country is not able to furnish employment; and there will be more than the few hundred cotton operatives out of work, which the hon. gentleman says caused such a great outcry. But let me read a little further what the Finance Minister said in regard to this matter, in order to point out where he failed altogether in discharging his duty to the wage-earning class, according to the principle announced by himself:

"It may be said that within the last three or four months the wages of employees of manufacturers in the Dominion have in some cases been reduced: that we have not so many men employed just now as we had three or four months ago. I am free to admit that Canadian manufacturers have to-day an unusual strain put on them. And from what cause is this strain? Every hon. member knows that manufacturers in Great Britain, where the policy of Free Trade prevails, and manufacturers in the United States, where Protection prevails, have surplus stock on hand, that they are reducing the number of their employees, that they are diminishing their wages, that they are compelled to sell their surplus stocks, and the stocks they are even now producing from day to day at a lower rate than usual. Those reductions have in many cases taken place, though resisted by the operatives in both England and the United States. What is the result? Our American neighbours and British manufacturers, owing to their profits being reduced, and the wages paid to their operatives being now lower than before, come in here, and are sharply competing to-day with the Canadian manufacturers. A year or two ago, as I know, and other hon members know perfectly well, as the prices paid for labour in the United States must regulate the price of labour in Canada, because if the wages are not about equal the operatives will soon pass across the line. Our manufacturers found it necessary to increase the wages here when an advance took place in the United States, in order to keep their men; but now that there is a reduction in the United States, owing to reduced prices, our manufacturers, in order to successfully compete, have also to reduce the prices of their products, and in some cases the wages of their operatives."

Now, Sir, I have read the whole passage, in order that the Finance Minister might have justice done to him. But I call his attention and the attention of the House to the statement he there puts forth. He admits that there are employees out of work; he admits that wages have been reduced; and he assigns as a reason for it the fact that wages were reduced in Great Britain and the United States, that there was a surplus of stocks in Britain and a surplus in the States, and that the manufacturers sent these surplus stocks into Canada and sharply competed with our manufacturers—in other words, he admitted that they were coming in here to slaughter their goods; and that consequently, our manufacturers were forced to reduce the wages of their operatives in order to produce their goods at a less cost and have the same profit, or a fair profit, left to themselves. While the Finance Minister recognizes these facts, where he altogether failed in his duty, from his standpoint, towards the wage-earning class, where he failed to do what he recognized in time past to be fair and right, was that he allowed the wages of these operatives to be cut down and some of them to lose their places, from the fact that the glutted markets of the United States and Great Britain were sending their surpluses here and causing a reduction in wages. Why, Sir, if he had been fair, if he had been honourable—I do not mean to use that term, I take it back—if he had carried out what I understand to be the principles he himself has laid down with reference to this matter, he would not have been offering an excuse on the floor of Parliament for the reduction of wages of these operatives, but he would have done this: he would have said: I find the wages of operatives are reduced, and because American and English manufacturers are slaughtering their goods in this country, my action shall be on the line on which I went before. I will increase the duties, I will raise my Tariff higher, I will exclude those British American goods, I will prevent their competition with our manufacturers here; and then, if his reasoning be true, the wages of employees would not have come down, and the men would not have been cast out of work. He told us, when he introduced the Tariff, that he had the means of keeping up the wages of the men; yet, knowing that the men are suffering, he hesitates to implement the pledges he has given them, pledges relied upon by them, and which secured for him and the party he represents, the votes of many of those men, when he appealed to them on that occasion. I hold he has not done right with these men. If there is any class that has a right to find fault with the Government, it is that class in whose interest it was said a high Tariff was made, with the view of keeping up their wages by increasing the profits of those who give employment. Yet, the labour market is full. If I needed more proof, I could find it in the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and those of other hon. gentlemen opposite, who spoke here on the subject—I will be pardoned, for one moment, in referring to a past debate—of the advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and one reason strongly urged why this loan should be made to the Canadian Pacific Railway was that, unless we let them have this money, dire results would follow. One of the worst results predicted from such refusal would be that some 10,000 or 12,000 men who were employed by that Company on the north shore of Lake Superior would have to be discharged in the winter time, and would flood the already crowded cities. The matter was so serious that it was urged, as one of the strong reasons why this House should do that which, I venture to say, one short year ago it was never expected we would be called on to do, and it was one of the reasons that influenced many hon. gentlemen to cast their votes in favour of that measure. The evil is but removed, if evil it was, for three years; we are told that within three years we will have that road completed. Then these men will have to be discharged, and if they do not go out of our own country, and if the times will not have improved, he will have the same results following the discharge of those men then that we would have, as depicted by the hon. Minister of Railways and others, had this advance not been granted. Evidence from all quarters point out that for mechanics, artizans and ordinary labourers finding employment in the cities, and clerks engaged in mercantile pursuits, there is not room in Canada in the present depressed state of affairs. I think, therefore, is only proper and right that this House should express the opinion that, under these circumstances, it is an unfair thing to take the public money of this country, contributed largely by the wage-earning class of this country, and expend it for the purpose of bringing the same class of operatives from foreign lands to compete with them, and thus bring about the result, not only of putting down the price of labour in this country, but the far worse result of actually displacing an equal number of our population. Sir, this question of our people leaving us is a question that, I am sorry to say, is proved too often and in too many ways, and while that be the case, I ask why we should go on spending money bringing in a class that will inevitably produce the results of which I have spoken. I will read but one extract, taken from a source which I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will not discredit—their own organ in this city—and I will read it because it may have some influence on hon. gentlemen opposite, who seem to have almost made up their minds, if I can judge by their cheerful demeanour, to support the Resolution I intend submitting to this House. I find that

when the hon. member for Pontiac introduced to the hon. Minister of Public Works, on Saturday last, I think it was, the Rev. Father Paradis and a deputation which accompanied him, consisting of a number of leading gentlemen of Ottawa, in order to impress on the hon. Minister the desirability of improving the Upper Ottawa District, among the arguments made use of by the hon. member for Pontiac on that occasion was this:

"If father Paradis' scheme was adopted it would prove very attractive to intending settlers and keep thousands of our industrious habitants, who are now seeking homes elsewhere, on our own soil."

Mr. IVES. Keep them from going to the North-West.

Mr. PATERSON. That is our own soil. I do not understand our own soil is confined to the Province of Quebec. It is the North-West, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba—all the Dominion is our own soil, and the fact that Father Paradis was accompanied by Ontario gentlemen, shows that it was not keeping them on Quebec soil that was meant. That was not the point; they did not urge their project for any small, selfish reason like that, for from the broad ground that we should keep our own people in our own Dominion. I need not press on this point, for in the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works himself, delivered some time ago, he showed that he is cognizant of the fact that many of our best citizens from that Province have found homes elsewhere, and I dare say, judging from this and other expressions I have heard, instead of their returning to us, there is still a large exodus of people from that Province. Under these circumstances, if we are unable to find employment for our own people, it is undesirable that public money should be expended in bringing this class here. I do not desire to enlarge on the question, I do not desire to bring other questions into it, but I say that with such a magnificent country as this, with such possibilities for development as this contains, I find figures demonstrating the existence of this deplorable state of affairs. When I show that we have a territory containing millions and tens of millions of acres on which there are no settlers, yet still our people, instead of staying here, are flocking to another country, the conviction is borne upon me that there is, and that there must have been, legislation enacted in this country which is hostile to its best interests, which has produced the bitter fruit we now see; and if that conviction be borne upon the hon. Ministers who conduct the affairs of this House, it is desirable that they should give it their serious consideration. It is well for them that they give it serious consideration, and if errors in legislation have been made, that those errors be remedied; and, if there can be any scheme devised whereby a better state of things may be brought about, that they bend all their energies to bring that state of things into existence; but, until they have done that, Sir, and until there is more room for people of the classes I have mentioned than I have shown there is at the present time, I, for one, am prepared to express the sentiment, that it is not at present a desirable thing to expend the public money of Canada in assisting to this country immigrants of mechanical or labouring classes, such as work in our towns and cities. I, therefore, beg to place in your hands the following Resolution, to leave out all the words after "That" and insert the following:—

The whole question of immigration into Canada and emigration from Canada requires the serious consideration of this House; and that, in the opinion of this House, under present circumstances, no public money should be expended towards defraying the travelling expenses of mechanics, artisans, clerks or labourers, excepting agricultural labourers, emigrating to Canada.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a fortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, that other speeches than speeches such as the one we have heard, can be pronounced in this House and be read outside, in this country and abroad. Should all the speeches on the affairs of this country be similar to that which we have just heard, there is no doubt that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat would be perfectly right in saying that the immigration to this country would cease in a very short time. I am sorry to see that the hon. gentleman, whenever he gets up, has nothing else to say about the country but to disparage it, and try to show that this is a country that is oppressed, and that there is only depression all through the land, from Victoria to Halifax. The hon. gentleman even goes as far as this—he alludes to the speeches of the Governors of this country, those who have left us as well as those who govern us, and he is sorry to see that they have so many good things to say of Canada. He tries to minimize the good that can come from their speeches. He tries to show that they must be under a delusion, or that since they left the country things have changed to such an extent that their speeches are not in accordance with the facts. Well, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt that, in this country as well as abroad, the speeches of Lord Dufferin, the speeches of Lord Lorne, without speaking of the respected Governor we have now, will be read through the three Kingdoms, will be read through the United States, through Canada and everywhere where the English language is spoken and read; that they will be read with interest, that great weight will be attached to them, and that they will produce a great deal of good and will be a great benefit to this country. I must say that, in so far as Lord Lorne is concerned, he has already done a great service to this country, and we should be most thankful to him for the great interest he takes in Canadian affairs, the great interest he takes in the prosperity of this country; and I am sure that not one of us would say that there is, in this country, a better Canadian than Lord Lorne himself. One of those speeches will do more good to this country than two hundred speeches such as the one pronounced by the hon. gentleman. Those speeches pronounced by the hon. gentleman, or similar speeches, are only calculated to destroy the credit of this country, prevent immigration, and show to the outside world what is not the fact, that this country is a poor country, badly administered, and that we are suffering from all quarters. The hon. gentleman has gone into figures to try to prove his argument that this country is going down instead of prospering; that this country is not prospering; that, on the contrary the people are leaving the country for the United States, and that our schools, for example, are not encouraged; that the number of children has diminished in those schools, and he gave for example the schools in Nova Scotia. I will not enter into those details; he has had plenty of time to prepare and look over the statistics, but on the spur of the moment I will remind him that at the period he speaks of there were school difficulties, educational difficulties, in New Brunswick, between the two leading portions of the population there—the Roman Catholics, and the Protestants, as a whole—and at that time the fight was such that the Roman Catholics, or a large number of them, kept their children at home and did not send them to the schools; and that lasted to the period when an arrangement was come to, by which the two sections of the country could send their children to the schools. The statistics, if he takes them from that period, will show that the children who go to school have largely increased, year by year. The same thing will occur if the hon. gentleman refers to the school statistics all through the country. Surely, he would not point to his own Province, that great and prosperous Province of Ontario, to show that the number of children has diminished.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; they have.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He would show, on the contrary, that the number of children has continued to increase.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I want to show that in proportion to the number of people who remain in the country and have not gone to the North-West, where so many of them are now settled and are so prosperous, they have their wives and children with them, and it is not surprising that a large number of the latter, instead of being in the schools of Ontario, are now in the schools of Manitoba and elsewhere; and, therefore, the statement of the hon. gentleman does not prove his argument at all. It proves, on the contrary, that the schools are frequented as they were. Take the Province of Quebec, and you will find that the same increase continues there that we have had for the last twenty years. I have not looked at the statistics this year, but I know it was so last year, and I have no doubt it is the same now. Though I admit that a large number of people have been emigrating to find work in the factories of the United States, a great number of them have come back, and others have gone to Manitoba and the North-West; and now they can reach those prairies more easily, you will find them going there in much larger numbers to settle upon that immense domain, which belongs not to one nationality but to all the nationalities in this country. I hope that those of my French Canadian countrymen who wish to leave their Province and emigrate, will go to Manitoba and the North-West; then they will remain on Canadian soil, they will remain under British institutions, under which they were born, those institutions we all cherish and under which we shall prosper. The hon. gentleman has gone into figures concerning emigration. Now, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that figures may be grouped in such a way as to make them say yes or no, black or white, though I do not say he has done so. But if he refers to the statistics that are found in the Report of the Minister of Agriculture, and which are now before the House, he will find some very striking facts. First, the emigration by the St. Lawrence for the last seven years has been as follows: In 1877, 7,700—I give only round numbers; in 1878, 10,200; in 1879, 17,000; 1880, 21,000; 1881, 30,000; 1882, 44,000; 1883, 45,000. Now, take those that have come by the Suspension Bridge: 1877, 13,000; 1878, 15,000; 1879, 30,000; 1880, 47,000; 1881, 61,000; 1882, 90,000; 1883, 102,000. And if you take those that have come by the Maritime Provinces, including Portland, Halifax, Boston and St. John, direct, you will find: 1877, 2,700; 1878, 2,400; 1879, 3,900; 1880, 3,300; 1881, 3,800; 1882, 13,400; 1883, 13,700. By British Columbia you have: 1881, 5,000; 1882, 13,900; 1883, 9,000. These figures show that the immigration into this country, the passenger immigration as well as settler's immigration, has been increasing from year to year, and especially during the last two or three years. Now, if you take the totals you will have: 1877, 23,000; 1878, 28,000; 1879, 51,000; 1880, 75,000; 1881, 101,000; 1882, 162,000; 1883, 171,000. Then, if you take those entered at Custom Houses with settlers' goods, you find for the same years respectively: 11,000; 11,000; 9,000; 10,000; 15,000; 30,000; 34,000. And if you put all these together, you will see what has been the immigration into this country for the last seven years: In 1877, 35,000; 1878, 40,000. After that, the policy of this Government began to take effect in 1879, and has continued during the last four years. In 1879 the immigration was 61,000; 1880, 85,000; 1881, 117,000; 1882, 193,000; 1883, 206,000. This shows, at all events, contrary to the statement of the hon. gentleman who preceeded me, that the immigration to this country, far from diminishing, has increased from year to year, and more especially during the last four or five years. Of course, it will be said that a large number of these were merely passengers, and that a large number of them were destined for the United States, but they do not form the largest portion. No doubt a good many of them did not remain in this country; they came by the steamers as passengers, and went through to the United States. But, on the other hand, you find that the immigration of settlers into Canada, of those who have settled in this country, has been as follows: In 1874, 39,000; 1875, 27,000; 1876, 25,000; 1877, 27,000; 1878, 29,000; 1879, 40,000; 1880, 38,000; 1881, 47 000; 1882, 112,000; 1883, 133,000. Therefore, far from diminishing, the emigrants coming from all quarters, by the Maritime Provinces as well as by the St. Lawrence and the Suspension Bridge, have largely increased from year to year, especially during the last three years. The hon. gentleman has been speaking of the cost. That is one of the greatest hobbies of hon. gentlemen opposite. They pretend that we have been uselessly expending and squandering the money of the people on immigration; but what do we find? We find that in 1877 the cost of bringing settlers into Canada, including those that are reported by the Customs as settlers coming here to live, was $6.73 per head; in 1878, $6.23; in 1879 the cost had fallen to $4.35. in 1880 it was $4.71; 1881, $4.30; 1882, $3.08; 1883, $3.15; so that the cost of immigrants was reduced to the smallest sum possible, under the circumstances, in 1883. If you compare the cost of each immigrant in 1883 with the cost in 1877, you find that in 1877 each immigrant cost $6.78, whilst in 1883 the cost was only $3.15. If you take the five years —1874-75-76-77 and 1878, the number of immigrants was 92,700, while during the last five years, 1879 to 1883, inclusive, no less than 271,389 immigrants settled in the country; that is, three times as many during the latter five years as during the former. If you take the period from 1875 to 1878, you find that 109,000 people came into the country at a cost to the public Treasury of $1,052,298, or $9.50 per head; whilst from 1880 to 1883, the last four years, no less than 332,000 persons came here, at a cost of $1,555,000 or $3 30 per head. These figures are taken from the Blue Books laid before Parliament; and yet, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) has endeavoured to show the House and the country that this is an extravagant Government, that we throw the public money into the streets for the purpose of securing a few immigrants, while the contrary is the fact, and the results show that the cost of immigrants has been reduced, so that instead of the cost being $9.50 per head, as it was during the four years, from 1875 to 1878, it was only $3.30 per head, during the last four years. The hon. member has also endeavoured to show, that during the last decade there has been a large emigration to the United States. The hon. gentleman well knows, that if we have lost population on the one hand, we have gained a great deal, on the other, and that the people who have left the old Provinces have not left the Dominion for good, because a large portion have gone to Manitoba and the North-West, while another portion of the population, counted as emigrants, return after the season and bring back their earnings and live in Canada. These people go to the United States to obtain that special work which they are unable to find in their own country. A similar state of things prevails in the United States. Why are the eastern States not so populous as they were, and why does the population not remain there? It is because the people are attracted to go west. They go and settle on new lands: they wish to improve their position. And what is true in the United States is true here also. From my own knowledge of the French Canadians of Quebec, I say that history shows that for all time French Canadians have been desirous of travelling and going west. You find them all over Canada, from Victoria to Halifax; you find them in the United States and in Mexico; and the other day I found a wealthy French Canadian of Montreal who had been settled at Bray, near Dublin, for the last eight years, and when he returned the other day he could speak the French

only with difficulty, and then with an Irish accent. The hon. member for Brant has, by statistics, endeavored to prove to the House and the country that the population of the Dominion has not increased, but even decreased. He should have compared the Census of 1871 with that of 1881, and he would have found that every Province has increased, and increased largely. The increase in Prince Edward Island, which is isolated, and does not receive much immigration, showed an increase of $15\frac{8}{10}$ per cent.; Nova Scotia, $13\frac{6}{10}$; New Brunswick, $12\frac{4}{10}$; Quebec, $14\frac{6}{10}$; Ontario, $18\frac{6}{10}$; or an average of 16 per cent. The increase altogether has been over half a million (573,000).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what I said. The increase is for ten years.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But the conclusion which the hon. gentleman drew was that our population is not increasing; that the country is not prosperous and contented; that it is a poor country, and I am sorry to say the hon. gentleman sought to disparage the country. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has taken this course, because his speech will be read. The public will say that a leading member of the Opposition has thus spoken, and they will quote his speech. It will also be quoted, doubtless, on the other side of the lines, and published in pamphlet form, and circulated throughout the country as an immigration pamphlet, which will be very useful to the United States. But I should have thought the hon. gentleman, for once during this Session, or during this Parliament, would have found something good to say of Canada. Let us take any of the speeches of the hon. gentleman, let us put them all together, let us take from them what he says of Canada, and we will not find in them one word favourable to Canada. He is always despondent and discouraged, and wants to discourage others. Well, if the hon. gentleman loses courage in that way, he should not, at all events, try to communicate that want of moral courage to others. He must see that, at all events, there are some thousands of people in this country—last year there were 133,000 of them—who think otherwise, who have come into this country and settled here and are remaining here. The hon. gentleman must see that his despondency is not shared by the people of this country. He says that the people are borne down by taxes, and that we are taking away the hard earnings of labourers and mechanics, which should remain with them, otherwise they must go to the United States. The hon. gentleman must see that there is no such feeling in the country; that the people are perfectly satisfied with their present position. There will be, at times, as you will find at the most prosperous times, people who are not prosperous, who are not wise—people who will import too largely and will fail. There will be others who are not careful about their credits, who give away their goods and scatter them through the country, and when the time comes to get their payments they are unable to get them and have to close their doors and go down. But that is not the general rule. It is true that at this moment the revenues of the country are not so large as they were two or three years ago; but I do not think we should complain bitterly, when we know that one of the strongest reasons is, that the people have learned by the past that they should be more careful, that they should not import so much, that they should curtail their expenses, that they should be more prudent; that all years are not similar, that after a certain number of years of great prosperity, you always have a few years of adversity or reaction, but that, after that reaction, the good years will come again. We read in the Sacred Book, that in that country where now the British army is fighting hard battles, after seven years of great prosperity, there were seven years of great distress, and that the people were taught——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They had no Tilley there.

Mr. MILLS. And no National Policy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There may not have been a National Policy, but there was a good policy, and that was to save for the bad years, and the people are doing this now—they are saving for the bad years. And what have we done? We have saved those large surpluses to pay the debts of the country. True, we have been paying a large portion of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway out of those surpluses; we have paid for those great works which were required for the country in that way, and thus if the people have given us a revenue it has gone back to them in these works, and the money has been expended in the country. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman wishes to take the part of the operatives and the mechanics. He is a father to all these operatives. He does not wish them to suffer; we are their oppressors—he is their benefactor and protector! But, Mr. Speaker, where are the petitions from the operatives and the mechanics? Have they complained to the House that we have been crushing them by taxes to such an extent that they could not live and must leave the country?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to my hon. friend, and there is the best proof of that in the bye-elections which have been held lately; the people have returned men to support this Government. See what they have done since the last general election. Has the Government gone down in their favour? Have they found their strength smaller in this country than at that period? Have we lost caste with them? Have they found fault with us? Did they show it at the polls? No; they have supported our candidates and returned them to the House; and the Government is in the proud position of being able to say, with all their great measures, and, as hon. gentlemen opposite will say, difficult measures to pass, nevertheless these measures have been sanctioned by the people, and they have sanctioned them by sending other representatives here to support us. I will not detain the House longer, but I wished to show, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that there are two sides to this question. The bright side of the question is the one which we have shown. It is the true side of the question; it is the side which the people say and know to be perfectly true and correct. They know that this Government represents their views; that with the support of Parliament, it has given them the years of prosperity which they have had—the great era of prosperity which has followed the era of adversity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no doubt about it; the hon. gentleman may cry, hear, hear, but he knows very well that instead of the deficits of a number of years we have had large surpluses. That is an undeniable fact; it is a matter of history. The figures are there, and the money came into the public Treasury, and if it were not the case, how is it that hon. gentlemen have been saying, and are now saying, that we are grinding the people, and keeping them down with taxes? It is because they see the money has come into the public Treasury, and that after these deficits we have had surpluses; but the people have paid them with cheerfulness, because they knew it was for the good of the country; they know that the country is prosperous, and they have come forward and paid a shilling a head more than they used to pay, when they know that they are earning one dollar more than before. I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one question. He has laid a good deal of stress upon the fact that the money is spent in the country. What is the reason for building vessels in Lockeport, New York, in-

stead of in this country? I would be glad to have a reply to that, as it has never yet been answered.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason why two or three dredges have been built at Lockeport is, that these vessels could not be built in this country. There were no establishments to build them here, and so true is this, that those companies who have had to obtain dredges for the purpose of works in this country, have been obliged to go to the United States to have them built. We required them, they had to be built, Parliament gave us the money, and therefore we had to go where they were built. When the time comes to give the explanations fully, I will give figures and facts which will show the hon. gentleman that I am sustained in what I say.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is, perhaps, rashness on my part to rise from my seat and address this House after the hon. Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin). I should not have dared to do it had he made to-day, as he has made in other circumstances, one of his practical speeches, teeming with facts and arguments, and I should have left to others, holding a higher position than mine in the Liberal party, the task of refuting his arguments. The House must have seen with surprise that the hon. Minister of Public Works, while speaking in answer to my hon. friend, the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), intrenched himself behind general remarks, which have been repeatedly refuted in this House. In fact, it is not the first time that the Liberal party is charged with want of patriotism. Not very long ago the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) flung this accusation at the face of the Liberal party, because we refused to expend $30,000,000 in the North-West, in order to aid the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. Minister of Public Works has once more flung this accusation at us to-night, and why? Because we refuse to expend enormous sums of money to attract European immigrants to our shores, and because we want to aid our poor countrymen who are obliged to leave Canada go to the United States. It must be admitted that these two circumstances are very far from making us liable to a charge of want of patriotism. I have been fairly astonished to see the hon. Minister of Public Works refuting in such a peculiar manner the statistics furnished by the hon. member from Brant. In fact, what answer did he give to these statistics, so carefully prepared by my hon. friend? He has purely and simply denied the truth of his assertions, but he has not given one solitary figure nor one solitary argument to contradict them successfully. True, he has given, himself, a few statistics in an opposite sense He has endeavoured to show that a great many foreigners are coming to us; but of the emigration of our countrymen who are leaving us to go to a foreign country he has not said a word. He has not given one solitary figure, which proves that he has not for a moment taken that matter under his consideration, and he has only taken into account the foreigners who come to Canada. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the Government should adopt a policy of some kind or other to solve at last this political and social problem of the emigration of Canadians to the United States, in connection with European immigration. I think it is high time that we should make some efforts to know which are the causes of the emigration of our people to the United States, and that we should try to remedy the evil, if such a thing is possible. My hon. friend, the member for Brant, has given a certain number of statistics, which, according to the hon. Minister, are not accurate; but that hon. gentleman has not given, himself, any statistics on emigration, to contradict the figures of my hon. friend, as I have just stated to the House. We have a right to blame the Government for not preparing statistics on this subject themselves. Whose fault is it, in fact, if we have not any, and if we are obliged to give certain calculations which are, in a measure, based on suppositions? The fault lies with the Government, who have not taken the trouble to prepare those statistics, and to furnish to the House sufficient data on which to base our calculations while dealing with this important subject. But there is a curious argument put forward by the hon. Minister of Public Works. He has pretended that if a great number of our people emigrate to the United States, on the other hand, a still greater number of immigrants come to us from Europe. That seems to be his way of balancing these two states of things. There is a fact which has been proved by modern science, and that is, that the physical strength of a State does not depend only on the number of its population, but of what physical and moral strength it possesses. There are in a country people who are useful and people who are not. Some people may be rather an encumbrance than anything else. That has been our experience as regards a large number of immigrants who have come to us from European cities. Several newspapers, even among those which are Conservative in politics, are forced to admit that we are daily receiving immigrants who are not at all useful to us. By the way, I think I ought to remark to the Government that those who are really useful are immigrants belonging to the farming class, coming from the country parts of Europe, because these people will contribute, like ourselves, to the increase of the wealth of the country, by taking lands either in the North-West, or in the Province of Quebec, or in the Province of Ontario. Most of the immigrants who come to us, and who belong to the industrial or labouring class, cannot be of any advantage to the country. In fact, they are only taking the place of our own fellow-citizens, who are obliged to go abroad, and they can only make a much-to-be-regretted competition to the labourers we have here. Why do our labourers leave Canada to go to the United States? Evidently, because wages are higher in the United States than they are here. And why are wages higher in the United States? Because there is greater scarcity of labour in proportion. And the more labourers will come here from Europe the greater the disproportion in wages will be, and the greater will be the number of our countrymen emigrating to the United States. Mr. Speaker, I think that if we should take into account the number of immigrants who come here, and who are not useful to us, if we should compare them as to their real value with those who are leaving us, we would arrive at the conclusion that the country gains nothing whatever by the exchange, and that it even loses to a great extent. In fact, who are those that are leaving us? A few men belonging to the liberal professions. Thus we find a great number of French Canadian doctors living in the United States; there are also lawyers, but that is due to the over-crowding of the liberal professions. Then a certain number of labourers out of the great mass of those who emigrate are certainly farmers, and I think this fact has already been stated in this House by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). The hon. member from Bagot has stated in a speech that a very large emigration from Canada takes place. I will take the liberty of reading here an extract of this speech, because I think it contains statistics which are the most accurate; they are in direct contradiction with those which were given by the hon. Minister of Public Works. Here is what that hon. member said, on the 13th of February last:

"Thus we learn by the last Census that the population of the county of Iberville has decreased by an amount of 954 souls; that of the county of Verchères by 328; of the county of Laprairie by 400; Napierville, 1,100; Chateauguay, 2,000; Huntingdon, 900; and there are various other counties in the Province of Quebec where the population has not increased However, Mr. Speaker, the county which I have the honour to represent, and whose population increases but slowly, because all the land is cleared, has, nevertheless, each year a large excess of population; the excess of births on deaths is from 500 to 800, which, during a decade, for a county having a population of 21,000 inhabitants, as the county of Bagot, would give a surplus of from 5,000 to 8,000 inhabitants, and by applying the same proportion to all the counties in the Province, we would have a surplus of 350,000 inhabitants per decade, taking only into

account the farming population. Still, the population of the Province of Quebec has not increased by 200,000 inhabitants during the last decade; and why? It is because the population goes off towards the western plains of the United States, where there are now important groups of populations, important localities formed by Canadians, who have emigrated from the Province of Quebec. There are also, in the New England States, cities which are completely under the control of people who have emigrated from our Province, and American statistics show that the French population emigrated from the Province of Quebec to the United States amounts to 600,000 or 700,000 souls. What an advantage it would be for the Province of Quebec, and for the Dominion revenue, if our Province had 700,000 or 800,000 more inhabitants than it has to-day."

It will be seen by this extract from the speech of the hon. member for Bagot, that the emigration from the Province of Quebec, is far greater than the hon. Minister of Public Works would have us believe. The emigration of men belonging to the liberal professions can not be stopped, for it is due to the overcrowding of these professions. The same thing may be said of the labourers who emigrate to the United States: they emigrate because they find better wages, and I have already taken occasion to say that it is not within the power of a Government to increase or diminish wages by a special policy, so this kind of emigration can only be controlled in its connection with European immigration; it will be greater or smaller, according to the number of foreign immigrants who will come to Canada. But there is one thing which I think I will be able to prove here—at least I shall try to prove it—and it is, that the emigration of farmers might be controlled in a measure, by the adoption of a policy more favourable to agriculture in the Dominion of Canada. I regret to say that the present policy of the Government, is not at all beneficial to the farming community. I will venture to speak here more especially of the Province of Quebec, to which I belong, because I have had more occasion to find out by myself what takes places in that Province than in any other. Our Province suffers doubly under the present circumstances. Indeed, in the difficult position in which our Local Government finds itself, with annual deficits accumulating, the Government of Quebec can do very little for colonization. This fact has already been established by the member for Bagot, (Mr. Dupont). Well, it is perfectly clear that the money which would be spent for colonization would be an antidote for the social evil resulting from the emigration of our people to the United States. I may remark that we are in a rather peculiar position towards the Federal Government with respect to our revenues. While the Province of Quebec, like all other Provinces, for that matter, is obliged to pay large amounts to the Federal Government, which go to form the annual surpluses which have amounted to $7,000,000 or $8,000,000, it is painful to find, that in the meanwhile we have in our own Province deficits as large in proportion. Well, where are those surpluses going, to which we have contributed for the last few years? I think the facts will bear me out, when I say that they have all been expended in the North-West for the construction of the Pacific Railway, for the settlement of new Provinces, and for the purpose of bringing European immigrants to our shores. The old Provinces of Canada have hardly received anything to compensate them for the heavy sacrifices they have imposed upon themselves to form these large surpluses of the Federal Treasury. I do not wish to say that we should do nothing for the North-West. I understand that in the future the North-West will be a very important country, but what I desire to remark is, that it is curious to see our Province making such heavy sacrifices to settle the North-West when it has not the means to settle its own territory. I think it is high time that we should spend a little less in the new Provinces and do a little more for the old Provinces, if we do not wish to see their *prestige* completely annihilated and to diminish their importance in the Dominion of Canada. I think it is my duty to suggest to the Government that it would be better to spend less money in the North-West, and to adopt, in place of the present policy, a policy more calculated to promote the interests of colonization. With a proper policy the immigrants would go of their own accord to these territories, and there would be no need for us to pay so much money to bring them here. That is what I shall try to prove. A celebrated economist, Montesquieu, has said in *l'Esprit des Lois*, "that countries are cultivated not by reason of their fertility, but by reason of their liberty." Contrarily to what the hon. Minister of Public Works just said, we have not depreciated the North-West until now, and I have no intention of depreciating it to-day. I am happy to say that our North-West is one of the finest and most fertile countries in the world. Besides that, in many places the climate is splendid, and in spite of certain inconveniencies which may occur anywhere, it is one of the countries in the world which offers the greatest advantages to colonization. Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all these advantages, what is the reason immigrants do not go there of their own accord? It is because there are in the North-West a great many causes for complaints. There is a state of things of which immigrants are suffering to-day, and of which they complain bitterly: it is the want of liberty; want of political freedom; the policy of the Government concerning the granting of charters by the Government of Manitoba for the construction of local railways has prevented the growth and increase of that country. There are, besides that, Mr. Speaker, monopolies which have been created by the Pacific Railway Company and monopolies created by the National Policy. The want of commercial liberty, from which the North-West is suffering through the heavy taxes that are paid, in consequence of the high tariff paid on railway freights, are reasons which prevent the immigrants from going to settle in that country. Here is a letter which I received some time ago from the Hon. Mr. Joly, who visited the North-West last summer, which letter contains a few things concerning the complaints made by the immigrants of that country on the subject of taxes imposed on agricultural implements. Here is an extract of that letter:

"I was reading, the other day, in the papers, a summary of complaints made by the people of Manitoba. They are generally well-founded. There is one especially, of which I can speak with a knowledge of the facts: it has reference to the Customs duties on agricultural implements.

"If there is a place in the world where agriculture is obliged to call machinery to its aid, it is certainly the North-West. The fields are immense, labour is scarce, the soil is prepared beforehand by nature to be cultivated exclusively by machinery. Distances are so great, freight is so high, that an encouraging profit can only be expected by raising large quantities of products. Consequently, everything indicates that the only way for the farmers of the North-West to work their immense farms with profit, is to use agricultural implements of the most improved style.

"Everywhere in our North-West, bitter complaints are made, as to the inferiority of the agricultural implements made in Canada, and in spite of the high Customs duties that protect them, a great number of persons have made up their minds to import American implements.

"The warmest friends of the Government, those who believe sincerely in the advantages of the National Policy, are the first to complain. If you wish to have a proof of this, take the largest farm, not only of our North-West, but of all America, Bell's Farm, in the valley of Qu'Appelle, having an area of 60 square arpents; enquire of them as to the result of their experience while using Canadian and American implements; they will tell you what they think of Canadian implements.

"It is a crying grievance, and I am not astonished that our farmers of the North-West are indignant, and are making a not very flattering comparison between their condition and that of the American farmers, separated from them only by an immaginary line.

"This question offers difficulties; but they are not incapable of being solved. It is perhaps the most easy to solve of any of the difficulties now agitating the North-West—and bear in mind, it is one of the most serious. If you wish to make of the North-West, the granary of Europe, if you wish to draw into it thousands of farmers, foster agriculture by giving it the advantage of the best implements, at the lowest price, and admit to the North-West, agricultural implements free of duty.

"These few remarks, written in haste, will perhaps, be of some service to you.

"Believe me,

"Yours truly,

"H. G. JOLY."

If all the grievances of the North-West, the monopolies to

which I have referred, the taxes imposed by the so-called National Policy, were removed, I do not hesitate in saying that it would be the country chosen, not only by foreign immigrants, but also by the sons of old Canada, as the finest, the richest, and the most advantageous country. We could attract immigration here without having to spend money, but simply through the popularity which the North-West would acquire by these political changes. Another cause for the emigration of the agricultural class to the United States is the heavy taxes imposed on the farmers. I shall take the liberty of submitting to the House a statement of the expenditure and revenue of the country during the last four years, during which period the emigration has been greater than ever in Canada: thus, in 1880-81, the expenditure of the country has amounted to $25,502,554; in 1881-82, to $27,067,103; in 1882-83, to $28,805,229; in 1883-84, to $31,200,000, according to the estimate of the hon. Minister of Finance. The revenue of the country has amounted, in 1880-81, to $29,635,297; in 1881-82, to $33,383,455; 1882-83, to $35,883,334; in 1883-84, to (estimates) $32,200,000—making a total for expenditure of $112,574,886, and for revenue of $131,107,086. In 1878, when the Liberal party left power, the annual expenditure amounted to $23,500,000; but it must be admitted that since then there has been an increase in the population, and that it is perfectly natural that there should be an increase in the expenditure. I think it would be fair to estimate the average of the expenditure of these last four years at $25,500,000; to-day, in 1884, we would be justifiable to expend a little more than that amount, but I think that $25,500,000 is a fair average for the expenditure of the last four years. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada has expended $10,500,000 over and above what they ought reasonably to have expended for the good administration of the country. If we add to that the large surpluses which we have had for the last few years, and which amount to $13,500,000, we come to the conclusion that the people of Canada have paid in taxes $29,000,000 more than was necessary for the good administration of the country. It must be admitted that this amount of $29,000,000 is an enormous amount, as it only represents unnecessary taxes paid by the people, independently from those which have been paid for the administration of the Local Government, of the Federal Government, and of all municipal and school taxes. We must add to that an amount probably still larger, which has been paid by taxes on articles which have been sold in the country, and which have been sold dearer on account of a higher rate of Customs duty levied on articles coming from abroad. If we add together all these amounts, we arrive at the conclusion that the people of Canada have paid far greater amounts than they should have had to pay, or than they should have paid if we had continued the fiscal policy, the revenue Tariff of the Mackenzie Administration. A compensation was promised to the farmers in exchange for this increase of taxes. It was said to them: You shall pay taxes, but on the other hand, you will sell your produce dearer. We said at that time, and we now repeat, that it is perfectly impossible, by any legislation, to increase the price of farm produce, because our markets are regulated by the European markets. The hon. Minister of Finance then said that we should have a national market and that we should have no need of the European markets as an outlet for our produce. It is proved to-day as clearly as possible that we have no home market. In fact the exportation of our farm produce must still continue for years to come. The Government has been altogether unable to carry out the promises they have made to the farmers of Canada. It turns out that farm products, instead of being sold dearer than heretofore, have, on the contrary, been sold cheaper, from 1879 until now, than they were during the period which elapsed between 1874 and 1878. A few figures will prove my statement; these figures are taken from the *Monetary Times*, and I have taken the average of the wholesale prices for each three months during the year. While, from 1874 to 1878, wheat was sold at $1.12½ per bushel, from 1879 to 1883, it was sold for $1.26. It is the only article which has been sold dearer since the adoption of the National Policy than under the old Tariff. Oats, which from 1874 to 1878 sold at 40½ cents, only brought 37 cents from 1879 to 1883; barley, which was selling at 76 cents, sold afterward at 70 cents; peas, which were selling at 91½ cents, sold at 88 cents; butter, which sold at 20½ cents, only sold at 18 cents afterwards; the price of cheese has not varied—it has been 11 cents; live hogs, which sold at $6.75, came down to $6.00; beef, which was selling at $5.00, sold at $4.80; and wool, which had been sold at 30 cents, only brought 22½ cents. It will thus be seen that notwithstanding the improvement of business in the whole world, farm products have been sold cheaper, on an average, since the adoption of the National Policy than they sold under the old Tariff. Before 1879, prices were regularly higher in Canada than in the United States. We have just the contrary to-day. That is to say, prices have been regularly lower in Canada than in the United States since the adoption of the Tariff. These facts show that there has been an increase of taxes and a decrease of the profits realized on the sale of agricultural products. And we should not be surprised if we have had, as a consequence, such a large number of our fellow-citizens emigrating to the United States. A few years ago, when the hon. members opposite were on this side of the House, they were loud in their denunciations of the Mackenzie Government, whom they charged with doing nothing for the repatriation of our countrymen who emigrated to the United States; and during the elections of 1878, charges of that nature were the favourite topics of Conservative speakers on the hustings. This charge was hurled at the face of the Liberal candidates who ran for election in 1878. Since then until now, there has been regularly said in this House a few words on the repatriation of Canadians who have emigrated to the United States. It is the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) who took upon himself the task of making speeches on this question, and very recently the hon. Minister of Public Works, in a speech which he made in Montreal, on the 18th of October, 1883, a speech which was published in *La Minerve*, said:

"But, gentlemen, only half our mission would be accomplished, if we should forget that we have on the other side of the 45th line a great number of our countrymen who desire, above all, to come back to this country and live under the splendid institutions we have in Canada.

"Therefore, it is useless for me to say that it is with the greatest of pleasure and with the greatest satisfaction that I will inform you to-night that the Government has the intention of taking energetic measures to call back within the limits of our territory all of our compatriots who are exiled from their country and who wish to come back and live with us. (Applause.)

"You will understand, gentleman, that in a banquet such as this, I must be excused from giving you a full statement of all the Ministerial measures which we are preparing for next Session; but, at any rate, it is proper that you should know that our countrymen, whether French-Canadians or belonging to other origins, will not be forgotten, and that we will heartily do all in our power to bring them back to this country. (Applause.)"

Well, Mr. Speaker, I perfectly understand that the hon. Minister of Public Works, could not give out the Ministerial secrets at the public dinner given on the 18th of October, in Montreal; but to-day I do not see at all what prevents him from stating what are the measures which the Government intends to adopt with regard to repatriation. When I saw the hon. Minister of Public Works rising a while ago, I was expecting every moment to hear him expound some definite policy or system with regard to repatriation. Well, this system which has been announced not only on the hustings, but in this House and everywhere, this system does not come. We are waiting for it, with the Canadians living in the United States, who are only waiting for that system to come back to

Canada. I have no need to say that on this question, as on many others the people of Canada have been deceived. Here is an extract of *Le Monde*, on the subject of repatriation, dated 18th of March, 1884:

"Nearly every year, Mr. Tassé courageously raises his voice in favour of repatriation, either in the Province of Quebec or in the North-West, of the French Canadians who have emigrated to the United States. He does it with a vigour of argument and a conviction which wins for him the respect of both sides of the House, and the approbation of the representatives of other Provinces; but his success is immediately neutralized by the ill-will of the chief, who is charged with the questions of emigration. Essentially selfish, Mr. Pope hears the remarks of our friends without listening to them; dreaming of the price at which he will sell the International to the Pacific Railway, wondering what price the charter of the 'Atlantic and Western may bring him,' and to what he shall do with the $158,000 of subsidies, already well pocketed, of which he has prevailed upon the Government to make him a gift, last year, for a railway which was already built. Do not disturb him from these grave occupations, which ought to be sufficient for the country. It is impossible for a man to do everything at once, and as Mr. Pope excels in thinking about himself, has he not a right to forget his duties as a Minister?

"The French members of the House of Commons will not always be willing to tolerate the help given to our enemies who are trying to crush us. They can remedy the evil if they have the courage to wish it, for they hold the balance of power in the present state of parties. Therefore, we have a right to hope that they will strongly press our claims for our share in the expenses of immigration, both for French settlers and for the repatriation of the Canadians who have emigrated to the United States."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one to find that nothing is done in favour of emigration. Here is a Conservative newspaper, one of the most important papers in the Province of Quebec, which finds the same thing.

Mr. DESJARDINS. What paper is that?

Mr. RINFRET. *Le Monde*. Mr. Speaker, I shall not prolong these remarks any further. As I was saying a moment ago, I think that if we wish to diminish the emigration of our countrymen to the United States and aid the repatriation of those who are already there, we ought to adopt a wise policy of economy, so as to reduce the enormous burden of taxation which the country has to bear; besides, we must abolish all the monopolies now existing in the North-West. We should also have free interchange of agricultural produce with the United States by the adoption of a Treaty of Recriprocity. If we wish to see our fellow-citizens who have left their country coming back to us, if we wish to prevent emigration, what is needed is a policy frankly and sincerely favourable to agriculture. It is by agriculture that we shall make of Canada a rich and a prosperous country. Mr. Speaker, when the hon. First Minister was in the Opposition, he thought he heard from all parts of the United States, complains of Canadians asking for aid. I shall take the liberty of asking him if he does not sometimes hear an interior voice crying for aid in favour of our countrymen who are leaving us in such large numbers to go to the United States, and could live here if the Government would only expend in the old Provinces what he so gladly expends for the new ones? Does not he hear an interior voice asking him for aid in favour of all the Canadians who are now in exile and who only wait, to come back to the country, the adoption of an honest policy, of a policy of economy—who are waiting for the North-West to become a free country, whose inhabitants may enjoy all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the other British citizens.

Mr. CURRAN. I have no intention to detain the House more than a few minutes; but I noticed a few days ago, in one of the Montreal papers that an association there, for whose energy and perseverance and patriotism I entertain a very high respect, had passed several resolutions which it was their intention to forward to me to have presented to this honourable House. I regret very much that I have not as yet received those resolutions, and that therefore I am unable, in the course of this debate, which would have been the appropriate time to do so, to lay them before the House. However, I have no hesitation in saying that I look upon the amendment offered by the hon. gentleman who was speaking when I came in, as purely *ad captandum*. The fact of the matter is, he is endeavouring to criticise a policy and is building up an argument upon a purely fictitious basis. It never has been, it is not now, and I do not think it is likely to be the policy of this Government, to induce mechanics, or persons such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, to immigrate to this country. On the contrary, if we refer to the statistics that I have under my hand, we shall find that the policy of the Government has been productive of the results which he desires so ardently, if we are to believe his utterances on this occasion. If we take, for instance, the year 1877, we find that during that year the number of immigrants who came in *vid* the St. Lawrence, was 7,100, of whom 1,100 were mechanics; while in 1883, there came in *vid* the St. Lawrence 46,000 immigrants, of whom 1,800 only were mechanics. Now, Sir, as regards a branch of this subject in which I am more particularly interested, that is, the emigration from Ireland to this country, for my part, I sincerely hope that every man who can live in Ireland and make a good living there will stay there for the benefit of Ireland. But, as I know, there will always be adventurous spirits—good, hearty, able-bodied young men and women—who will seek their fortunes abroad, I desire to say, from my place in this House, that there is no place under the sun so good as the Dominion of Canada for an Irishman to emigrate to. Now, Sir, we have had some remarks made here this evening, to which I desire to refer; and in doing so, I wish to allude particularly to the report of Mr. John Hoolahan, an Irish travelling immigration agent, who was appointed last year by the hon. Minister of Agriculture to meet the emigrants of the Tuke Committee, at Point Lévis, and to accompany them to any part of the Dominion between Point Lévis and Toronto, wherever their destination might be; and I may say that, in mentioning this gentleman's name, I am speaking of a man of high character, of first-class education, who speaks not only the English and French languages, but who has the advantage of speaking the Irish language, who is in every way qualified for his post, and who enjoys the confidence and esteem of the whole Irish population of the city of Montreal, where he is well known, at least to 90 per cent. of them. With reference to his labours, I would just read a short extract from his report, which, with the permission of this House, I will hand in, so that the whole of it may be incorporated with the notes of the stenographer. It is as follows:—

"MONTREAL, 21st December, 1883.

"HONOURABLE SIR,—I have the honour to submit my report for your information, for the period commencing the 1st May and ending the 30th November, 1883.

"I received an official letter from the Department of Agriculture, dated Ottawa, 13th April, 1883, appointing me an Agent of your Department. My instructions were: to take charge of the Irish immigrants arriving at Quebec and travel with them to Montreal, and even to Toronto, as circumstances might require; to give them the best possible advice, and to communicate with the several Agents of the Department, with respect to finding work for them, &c.

"In compliance with my instructions, I proceeded to Quebec, where I arrived on the 4th May, 1883.

"That I have made twenty-nine trips from Point Lévis to Montreal and Toronto during the season of St. Lawrence navigation, viz., from the 1st May to the 30th November, 1883, as will more fully appear on reference being had to the tabular statement which is annexed hereto.

"During the season, I met the immigrants of the steamships named in the accompanying table, at Point Lévis, and accompanied them by Grand Trunk railway to Montreal and frequently to Toronto.

"The large majority of the immigrants of whom I had special charge, were farmers, farm labourers and female domestic servants, and were, as a rule, easily placed in situations. Those arriving in the early part of the summer, viz., May, June and July, were eagerly sought after and at once employed. But parties coming later in the season, found much more difficulty in obtaining work.

"The large majority of those people went to Ontario; only a small percentage remained in the Province of Quebec.

"Whilst accompanying those immigrants, I made it my special business to get thoroughly acquainted with them, when I would give them

the best possible advice as to how to proceed to their destination, and on arrival there, how to act in this their adopted country.

"A certain number of those people were at a disadvantage here, owing to the fact of being able to speak the Irish language only. Of course it is a difficult matter for such persons to make much progress in this country, where the Irish is almost totally unknown.

"Further details are hardly necessary, as Mr. Stafford, Immigration Agent at Quebec, having all official documents in connection with those people, will furnish all the necessary information concerning them.

"It is to be regretted that a large number of those people could not be induced to go into the country districts, preferring to remain in the cities, more particularly at Toronto, where some of those, failing to obtain employment, have suffered in consequence.

"Permit me to add that Miss M. Phelan, who had charge of the female immigrants, rendered me every assistance in the discharge of my duties.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"JOHN HOOLAHAN,
"*Travelling Immigration Agent.*"

Now, Sir, we perceive by this report, which I trust will have its effect, that there are favourable seasons and unfavourable seasons for the immigration of these people—that those who come during the months of May, June and July, especially of the class indicated—who, it appears, were in the large majority—get employment without any trouble. I am personally aware, from the statement of Mr. Lesperance, the Immigration Agent in Montreal for the Quebec Government, that these people, in a great many instances, cannot be induced to remain in the Province of Quebec; whereas, if they would do so, and would go into the Eastern Townships, where they would find a large population, where they would obtain employment from the farmers, and where they would learn the farming habits of this country, they could, in a very short time, accumulate enough money, if they did not wish to remain there, to go westward and procure farms for themselves. I think it is hardly necessary for me, after the very able and exhaustive speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works, to say one word in reply to the hon. gentleman who proposed this amendment. I certainly congratulate the hon. gentleman who last spoke, because he did say some patriotic things; but it would be drawing too much upon the imagination, for one moment to suppose that he added a word to the speech of the hon. Minister who went before him. With regard to those employees of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to whom the hon. gentleman referred as being about to lose their employment, or to have their wages curtailed, I think this honourable House and the country also will agree with me that it is a good thing that through the policy of this Government, there is more than one railway company in this country to give men employment. With regard to the disbanding of 9,000 men employed in carrying on the work of Pacific Railway construction north of Lake Superior, I think the argument used by the hon. gentleman was entirely unfair. It was never suggested for one moment that it would be a great disaster to this country to have these men disbanded and scattered broadcast throughout the land. Why, such a fraction would make no difference whatever. These men could obtain other employment; but the argument that was used was, that it would be a difficult matter to obtain men organized for that work, and in a position to carry it on, if these men were once disbanded. I contend that this amendment is purely *ad captandum*. It has never been the policy of the Government to induce those people, mechanics and others, to come to this country unless they intended devoting themselves to agricultural pursuits; and I think that the document I have read, signed by a gentleman so responsible as Mr. Hoolahan, will have its effect in the proper quarter, and that those who come here from Europe, the immigrants who come from the poorer districts of Ireland, who desire to make their home here, will abandon all idea of settling down in the large cities where they get employment in the summer on public works, but where, unless they save money and make provision for the winter, they will have to undergo great hardships. They will understand that they will have a rigourous winter to encounter, and that it is better for them not to come here at all than to come here and settle down in the cities; but that if they do come and take the advice of those who know what is best in their interests, they will go into the country districts, engage on farms, learn the habits of the country, and prosper as others before them have prospered, and I trust that all those who will come in the future will come in the proper season and follow the advice I have just given, and prosperity will be sure to attend them.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. Minister of Public Works rose to reply to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), I felt satisfied that he would take advantage of an opportunity for which I considered he had been watching since the commencement of the Session, to develop that great policy with reference to immigration, by which he informed us, in the speech from which my hon. friend from Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) quoted, this Government was about to immortalize itself once more this Session. I expected, when the hon. gentleman rose on behalf of the Administration, to deal with a motion which brings up such considerations as the immigration to, and the emigration from, Canada, and the policy of the Government at large upon it, a motion which was supported by such an array of facts as those brought forward by my hon. friend from Brant, that it would have been dealt with by the hon. Minister who made the public declaration to which I have referred, and from which my hon. friend from Lotbinière quoted, not only in the spirit of defence which he used, but also in that spirit of exposition of the policy of the Government upon this subject, which he had foreshadowed in Montreal in such a way that he led us to hope for better things than we had experienced in the past. He alluded to several arguments generally alluded to in this quotation, and among them to the fallacious argument based on the *per capita* expenditure. We all know there are certain fixed charges with reference to the expenditure on emigration, as well as on most other subjects, and that to apply the question of the *per capita* cost of immigrants as the real test of the economy of an Administration, when the numbers conflict, is a wholly fallacious and illusory test. It would be trifling with the patience of the House to enlarge on that position. The hon. gentleman then adverted to the great increase in the imported numbers of immigrant settlers in Canada recently; but one of the great difficulties we have to deal with in this connection is that while we have not been able, from any bases of information which are given us, from all the information we can gather on all hands to check the accuracy of statements as to the number of immigrants settled in Canada recently, there do not appear to be any places in which the immigrant population, to which the hon. gentleman referred as remaining in the country, are. We cannot find them, and it seems to me entirely out of the question that these figures can be accurately stated. The hon. gentleman alluded, with reference to those telling statistics of my hon. friend as to the school population, to the difficulty arising out of the alteration in the New Brunswick school law. But that argument told wholly against himself, because the very period in which that trouble arose, and in which, owing to it, there would be a diminution in the attendance, was a period which contrasted favourably with the later period, when the difficulty was all over. So that, while that circumstance was to be taken into consideration, it was to be taken into question as one intensifying the force of my hon. friend's comparison of the earlier with the later years. There was, of course, no such suggestion with regard to Nova Scotia. But as to Ontario, if my hon. friend will analyze the figures as to the immigration to the North-

West from Ontario, and look at the character of that immigration and at the school figures of Ontario, he will find that his theory, that the immigration to the North-West accounts for the actual school diminution in Ontario, is one that will not hold water at all. He said these figures did a great deal of harm—that they were injurious to the country. Well, I don't know that they are injurious to the country if they represent the facts of the case. What is important is, that we should know whether there are difficulties, leaks, mistakes and errors, that we should know what our real, substantial progress has been in those two important elements of nationality, retaining our people and obtaining fresh additions to our population from abroad; and if the facts be not such as would gratify hon. gentlemen opposite or ourselves, we want to consider what the cause of the difficulty is; we ought to ascertain what the reason of our comparative failure is in this regard, with the view to discovering and applying a remedy. With reference to the hon. gentleman's own Province, he has acknowledged, in the speech to which I have alluded, the existence of that difficulty. It has been alluded to by one of his own supporters, my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont), not long ago in this House, and it has been alluded to repeatedly during the period of both Governments, for many years—the difficulty of the emigration from Quebec. If the circumstances are so serious in Quebec as they are, if they are such as I shall point them out to have been in Ontario and throughout the whole Dominion, it is important that we should first ascertain what the facts are, and secondly, if those facts are not such as gratify us, we should address ourselves to procuring a remedy, by ascertaining what is wrong, by ascertaining what that is which produces results we do not like to see, and which do not remedy by concealing them from ourselves. The preaching of hon. gentlemen opposite agrees not with their practice. If I recollect right, during the period when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in office, there was no such restraint on their tongues as they would propose to put on ours. I recollect when a much smaller emigration from the country than has ever taken place since, was harped upon by all of them, from the First Minister down, as a difficulty and calamity of a most intolerable character, and which called imperatively for some remedy at the hands of the Government. Now, Sir, we did not complain that these speeches of the hon. gentleman were unpatriotic, we did not complain that it was wrong for him to state facts if they were facts—not at all—nor do we intend to be deterred from stating facts to-day, simply because hon. gentlemen opposite think they are facts which it is disagreeable to their ears to hear. Now, I have looked a little into the general question as developed in the Census returns, as compared with the Census returns and the growth of population in some other countries, and it seems to me they have not been fairly put before the country, either in the official reports or otherwise. When we discuss the progress of the older Provinces of Canada by themselves, we are met, more or less fairly, with the suggestion: "Oh, but you must compare that with the progress of the older States in the United States; you must take the whole country together; you find a slow progress in some of the older States, but why is it? It is because the inhabitants go to the other parts of the United States, and therefore you ought to take the whole of the United States together and the whole of Canada together, and make your comparison in that way." In that proposition, as I have said, there is a very considerable element of truth; but we have our own less peopled and more peopled territories, our own older and our own newer territories, and if we take the whole of Canada, and consider what the results are, as developed by the Census for the whole of Canada, we may fairly compare these results with those that have been developed for the whole of the United States. Now, in comparing the results of the Census of 1881 with those of the Census of 1871, it is not to be forgotten that, according to the view of a great many persons who have watched the practical mode in which the Census of 1881 was taken, there was an over-estimate of the population of the country by it. To a certain extent, that is got rid by the circumstance that the portion of the population of Ontario, for example, who had gone to the North West, was counted, perhaps, in Ontario, when it ought to have been counted in the North-West; and, in counting the whole of the population of the Dominion, that, perhaps, becomes a matter of indifference; but in reference to those who have gone beyond our borders altogether, it is a material consideration. I put it aside, however, and assume the figures both of the Census of 1871 and of the Census of 1881 to be substantially accurate. To make a comparison between the two, it is necessary to get at the increase on the area of 1881, to make allowance for the population of the North-West Territories, because the population of the whole of Canada, as given by the Census of 1871, included nothing whatever for those who were in the North-West Territories, while they are all included in the Census of 1881; and you must therefore begin by assuming, in order to make a fair comparison, a certain population as the population existent in the North-West Territories in 1871. Add that to the Census population of 1871, and then make your comparison with the Census population of 1881. The population of the Territories, in 1881, is counted as 56,400, and of those 49,500 were Indians, and of the total, there were born in the Territories, 51,800. What, on those figures, shall be allotted for the population of the Territories in 1871. Having regard to the fact that the added territory of Manitoba contains about 6,400, which belonged to that, and of which a great proportion were also in in 1871, I think I make a fair allowance when I estimate the population of the Territories and the added portion of Manitoba, in 1871, at 50,000, and I add that 50,000 to the Census population of Canada for 1871. This gives you a Canadian population of 1871, by the Census, of 3,635,000, and for the Territories and added part of Manitoba, 50,000, making a total of 3,685,000, as against a Census population of 1881, of 4,324,800, giving you an increase of 639,800. The rate, therefore, of increase would be 17·38 per cent., instead of 18·98, which is the rate stated in the Census report, arrived at, as I have pointed out, by omitting altogether to consider the number of persons in the added part of Manitoba and the North-West Territories in 1871. Now, during this decade, in which our rate of increase in the whole of Canada was, as nearly as may be, 17·38 per cent., the immigrant settlement in Canada was, according to the Reports of the Department of Agriculture, as follows: 1871, 27,800; 1872, 36,600; 1873, 50,000; 1874, 30,300; 1875, 27,400; 1876, 25,600; 1877, 27,100; 1878, 29,800; 1879, 40,500; 1880, 38,500; or a total of 333,700. Therefore, you see, that apart altogether from the question of natural increment on the immigration, the increase of 639,800 would be divided between immigration and the natural increment on the home population as follows: total increase, 639,800; immigration, 333,700; leaving for natural increment, 306,100. This would produce these results: immigration, in proportion to the initial population, 9·05 per cent.; natural increment in proportion to initial population, apart from immigration, 8·33 per cent., or a total of 17·38 per cent. I wish to compare those results with the results which were obtained in the whole region of the United States, during practically the same period—the period from 1870 to 1880. In 1870, the population was given as 38,588,400, and in 1880, as 50,152,900, making an increase of 11,594,500. There was in the same period an immigration of 2,812,200, which leaves for the natural increment, 8,782,300. There you find that the immigration, in proportion to the initial population, was 7·29 per cent., and the

natural increment, in proportion to the initial population 22·78 per cent., or a total increase of 30 07 per cent. It will be seen thus that on this hypothesis, on the hypothesis that we have received during the decade that immigration which the reports of the Department say we did receive, our comparative failure—because I have shown you that our total increase was but 17·38 per cent., as against an increase in the United States of 30·07 per cent.—was not due to a deficient immigration, because the immigration in the States was 7·29, while ours was 9·05 per cent. on the initial population, making an excess in proportion to the initial population on our side of very considerable proportions. But, while you look at these figures and ascertain that the immigration was more favourable than the immigration for the States, if the figures be true, you find on the other side, that the proportions as to natural increment are nothing less than appalling, because our rate is 8·33 per cent., and the United States rate 22·79 per cent., or nearly three times as large as ours. A more exact enquiry, however, requires the division of the natural increment, and the assignment of a share of the natural increment to the increment on the immigration, because not merely did there subsist at the end of the decade an excess of those who were in the country, but an excess, due to the excess of births over deaths, on the part of those who immigrated. For example, in the United States, assuming the immigration to be equally distributed over the ten years, the rate of increment for such immigration would be about 10 per cent. for the decade, and the result would be: immigration, 2 812,200; natural increment thereon, 281,200; total increase due to immigration, 3,093,400; leaving the natural increment on the old population, 8,501,100, or a rate of a trifle over 22 per cent. of natural increment, and, as near as the data in the United States will permit, I make that out to be the annual increment of their population, as their statistics show, for the last decade, 22 per cent. Now, if you apply to Canada these rates of the United States you will find it as follows: immigration given by the returns of the Department, 333,700; natural increment, 33,400; due to immigration, 367,100, leaving a balance due to natural increase of 272,700, or a rate of only 7·4 per cent. instead of the United States rate of 22 per cent., or about one-third of the United States rate. Had we realized the United States rate, the result would have been this: immigration and increment on immigration, 367,000; increment on the old population, 810,700; total increase, 1,177,700. The actual increase is 639,000, showing a comparative loss of 538,000 souls. Now, the natural increase in England and Wales is, of course, very different from the natural increase in the United States. The conditions are entirely different, and one must not expect to find a natural increment at all so great. I find that, by the last returns, the rate of increment during the last decade was 15·08 per cent, instead of 22 per cent. in the United States; and if you apply even that rate of England and Wales to Canada, the results will be these: immigration, 333,700; increase thereon at 7 per cent., 22,400, a total due to immigration of 356,100, leaving due to increment on the old population, 283,800, or a rate of 7·7, about one-half the British rate, which is so far below the rate we ought to have. Had we realized that rate, the result would have been this: immigration and increment thereon, 356,000; increment on the old population, at 15·08 per cent., 555,700, a total increase of 911,700, as against an actual increase of 639,800, showing a comparative loss of 271,900 by that calculation. Then if you take the mean rate—which I do not believe we ought to take, for I believe that the natural increment on the population is at least as great as the natural increment on the population of the United States — the mean rate between the United States rate and the English rate is 18½, the mean between 15·08 and 22—the immigration would be 333,700; increment thereon, 28,400, or a total of 362,100, leaving due to increase on the old population, 277,700, or a rate of 7·42 per cent. instead of 18·5—about two-fifths. If we realized the mean rate, the immigration would be 362,000; increase on the old population, at 18·5, 681,600, giving a total increase of 1,043,600, as against 639,800, showing a comparative loss of 403,800 souls. Now, I do say that the mean rate is too low to take for Canada. We know the boasted fertility of the French Canadian population, and I do not believe that it is reasonable to put the rate of natural increment in that Province at the rate of the United States, in the eastern parts of which we know families are and have been for a long time very small indeed; and there are large families—although they will not compete with those of my hon. friends from Quebec—in the other Provinces of this Dominion; and I see myself no reason why the rate of increment of the United States should not be the rate of increment for Canada. Well now, these results indicate, Sir, conclusively, that there is a leakage some where or other: either that those who are reported as having settled in Canada during the last ten years did not stay here, or that the home population of the country has left it, or both. It is utterly impossible to reconcile the figures I have given, even the least favourable figures, even applying to this new, and young, and vigorous country the rate of increase of England and Wales—it is utterly impossible to reconcile these figures with the facts, as they are, except by adopting one or both of these theories, either that the immigrant population did not stay with us, or that the home population has left us, or both. It would seem that there is a good deal in the view that a large portion of the Canadian population has left us and gone to the United States. By the Census of 1870, the native-born Canadians there were about 490,000, and in 1880, 712,000, out of 6,680,000 foreigners, being over one-tenth of the whole. The increase thereof between 1870 and 1880, was 222,000. But to ascertain how many left us during the decade, you must, of course make allowances for much more than 222,000, because there did not only enough leave us to increase the numbers at the end of the decade by 222,000, but also to fill up all the gaps created by death in the initial population of 490,000, and in the immigration in the course of ten years. You must find thereon what addition should be made for the decrement by death during that period. Now, the rate of decrement by death in England and Wales during the last decade was 21·27 per cent. A calculation which I have made at a less rate than that, at 2 per cent. a year, would produce results indicating that the decrement of the Canadian born population in the United States, making proper allowances in each year for the immigration, would amount to 123,000 souls in the decade, and thereon you must add that number to the number that I have given as being in the United States in excess of the number there at the commencement of the decade, making a total shown by these figures of about 340,000 souls as the emigration to the United States from Canada during the decade. That there has been a very large depletion of our population, and that it has gone very largely to the United States, is shown also by the contrasted numbers shown by the Census in the United States, of which I will give the round figures of some of the more important:

1870.		1880.
10,600	California	18,800
10,800	Connecticut	16,400
32,400	Illinois	34,000
17,900	Iowa	21,000
5,300	Kansas	12,500
26,200	Maine	37,500
67,700	Massachusetts	116,000
88,300	Michigan	144,400
16,700	Minnesota	29,600
8,400	Missouri	8,600
2,600	Nebraska	8,600
12,900	New Hampshire	27,100
78,500	New York	83,700

12,700	Ohio	16,100
9,800	Pennsylvania	12,300
10,200	Rhode Island	18,300
600	Texas	2,400
28,600	Vermont	24,600
25,600	Wisconsin	28,900
700	Dakota Territory	10,600

Massachusetts gives an increase of 49,000, Michigan of 56,000. We are able to ascertain—I have not analyzed the result in other Provinces—with a good deal of clearness where the bulk of the leakage takes place in Ontario, by another mode of enquiry. In Ontario, I maintain the bulk of the leakage has occurred in the reported immigration—not all of it, by any means, but the bulk of it—that is to say, that the reported immigration for the decade has not at all answered our expectations of its being *bona fide* immigration. In Ontario, in 1871, the immigration was as follows:

	1871.	1881.
Home born	1,131,300	1,435,600
Foreign	489,500	487,600
Total	1,620,800	1,923,200

Thus, you will see that the home-born population increased by 304,300, or about 18½ per cent. on the population of 1871, though it was really a little less, because that took no account of the natural increment on the immigration during the ten years. But the immigration, having regard to the fact to which I have referred, merely supplied the decrement by death on the foreign-born population. That decrement was, perhaps, 100,000 or 110,000—say 105,000. So, all we have accomplished in regard to immigration into Ontario during the ten years was not quite sufficient to fill the gap caused by death during that period. That decrement would be, say, 105,000, while the supposed immigration into Ontario, as stated by the Departmental Reports, was 255,000, so that 150,000 of the 255,000 had vanished altogether and were not to be found. It is impossible, on the figures I have given, to show they remained in the country, or at all events were there at the end of the decade. Supposing those figures were discarded to the extent to which I have just referred, and you come to assume that the immigration population which entered Ontario as reported must be there, you would reach some very extraordinary results; and, perhaps, that may be the assumption which hon. gentlemen opposite will make, and if they do not make it, I maintain we are bound to consider what our immigration system amounts to. I have shown the House by the Census that it is utterly impossible that more than two-fifths of those reported as having come into Ontario and settled there, remained there during the decade, and if that be so, we want to ascertain what the system is which produces such miserable results, and what the system of statistics and publishing information is, which produces such illusory and fallacious results. But if you discard those figures and assume that 255,000 people were brought into the Province and stayed there, what is the result? The population of Ontario, in 1871, 1,620,800; 1881, 1,923,200, increase 302,600, or at a rate of 18·66 per cent. Immigration was 255,100, apart from the natural increment on immigration. The increase would therefore be divided between immigration and natural increment, thus: Total increase, 302,400; immigration 255,100, leaving for natural increment, 47,300. Immigration in proportion to initial population 15·74 per cent.; natural increment, 2·92 per cent. But, if the natural increment due to immigration be ascertained at United States rate, say 10 per cent. for the decade, the result is this: Immigration, 255,100; natural increment thereon, 25,500; total due to immigration, 280,600, deducting which from 302,400, leaves 21,800, or only 1·35 per cent. for natural increase. Apply to Ontario the United States rates, and the results would be this: Immigration, 255,100; increment thereon, 25,500; total 280,600. Natural increment on initial population, at 22 per cent., 356,600. The proper increase would be 637,200, but the actual increase is 302,400; showing a loss of 334,800. Apply the English rates, and we have the following: Immigration, 255,100; increment thereon, at 7 per cent., 17,900; due to immigration, 273,000; the natural increase on the initial population at 15·08 per cent., 244,400; giving 517,400 as the proper increase. The actual increase was 302,400, showing a loss of 215,000. Apply the mean rate, say 18·5 per cent., and the result is as follows: Immigration, 255,100; natural increment, at 8 per cent., 20,400; due to immigration, 275,500; natural increment on initial population, 299,800; proper increment, 575,300; actual, 302,400; loss, 272,900. The fact remains that a large portion of the native population has been lost. Notwithstanding all these facts, it is alleged there is no exodus. But assuming the immigration to be genuine, there has been a very large exodus. It will be said, and indeed has been said, that this exodus took place during what hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to call the "hard times," when hon. gentlemen opposite said to the people that when we get into power we will prevent the people from leaving the country. We have machinery to ascertain what the exodus is, so far as regards Ontario. As the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out, we have the school and municipal statistics of the Province, from which you can ascertain, with reasonable accuracy, how we move. It is true that the figures are smaller, but they are on the same scale all the time. The municipal census is taken on a different principle; it is a census of ratepayers, but there it is, and for comparative purposes it is good and accurate. And I may say that the general result of the municipal census is on the initial population a larger rate of increase during the whole decade, than is given by the Dominion Census for the same period. Now, I take eight years, with reference to the municipal census, and I take them in two periods, the first of which is 1876-77-78-79, and the second, 1880-81-82-83. The first of those periods was the one which hon. gentlemen say was the period of hard times, when the country was losing its population, when there was a dreadful exodus, when it was necessary to make an alteration in policy to keep the people in the country. The second is the period of good times, as they say, when their policy was in successful operation, and its results in keeping the people in the country and increasing its population were apparent. It will be noticed that I have taken in the bad period not only the year 1878, but the whole of the year 1879 as well, so as to give full opportunity for the complete fruition of the hon. gentleman's plans. Now, then, what are the results, by the municipal census? Take the whole period of eight years, from 1876 to 1883, and the results are these: that there was an increase in the rural population of 40,700, and an increase in the urban population of 120,700, making a total increase of 161,400, which, as I have said, on the smaller initial population of the municipal census, was a greater rate of increase than is given by the Dominion Census, on the large initial population. So, we get an increase, a small one in the rural parts, and a larger one in the urban parts, and during this period, in which there was a total increase of 161,400, the immigrant settlers in the country were: in 1875, 21,800; in 1876, 19,100; in 1877, 17,900; in 1878, 17,900; in 1879, 28,800; in 1880, 24,700; in 1881, 25,200; in 1882, 34,200; making a total increase of 189,600 immigrants, or 28,200 more than the total increase by the municipal census. Of course, all the immigrants do not come at once in the municipal census, and, therefore, that calculation is to be made with a certain allowance, and this is the result, irrespective of natural increment at all. Mark, that irrespective of the natural increment at all, the immigration into Ontario, in these eight years, more than balanced the whole increase by the municipal census; and, if you take into account the natural increment,

and add that to the immigration, and compare that with the increase, you find a tremendous drain—a loss, probably, of from 250,000 to 300,000. And then, as I said, hon gentlemen may say that this drain was in the first period and not in the last; things have been mended in the last period; we are better off now. It is true there was a great leak in the first of these four years, but in the second the picture is entirely reversed. Now let us compare the periods. In the first of these four year periods there was a rural increase by the municipal census of 55,500. In the second of these periods, there was a rural decrease of 14,800, which being deducted from the rural increase of the first of the periods, produces the result of a total increase over the eight years of 40,700, which I gave before. That does not seem to indicate a very great improvement in the condition of the population of Ontario, so far as the rural parts are concerned, over those four evil years, as hon. gentlemen described them, as compared with the four years in which they have acted as our Providence. With regard to the urban increase, they may say that they devoted particular attention to this; that it was the cities, towns and villages that they had in their tender regard; that it was the manufacturers they proposed to advance; that they proposed to get a large manufacturing population, and that they pointed out that the young people would not stay on the farms but went elsewhere to find manufacturing industries, and that it is not fair to take the rural population. I tell them now, as I told them before, that the rural population is the backbone of the Province of Ontario, and the Dominion of Canada; and without the country, the towns will make little show, and the manufacturers a very poor show. But how is it with reference to the urban increase? In the first of these periods of four years, the urban increase, according to the municipal census, was 71,400; while in the second it was 49,300, showing a smaller urban increase in the great era of manufacturing prosperity than in the four evil years, when manufactures were dying, and the towns, cities and villages were going to pieces. This makes a total urban increase of 120,700 for the eight years according to the municipal census. Thus we get, during the first period, the total increase, urban and rural, of 126,900; and in the second period, a total increase of 34,500 only, which gives you again an increase for the whole period of 161,400. Therefore, I say, the municipal census which, for comparative purposes, is an admirable guide to the progress of the country, which is improving and becoming more fuller and more accurate year by year, and therefore, telling so far against the arguments as to the comparison of earlier and later years, gives incontrovertible proof of the melancholy fact we have been pressing on the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, that their policy has not been a success in increasing or even in retaining population in the Province of Ontario. Well, then, these are calculations which merely give the gross results. We have not taken into account what the natural increment of the population would be, and what the result of it would be; we have not even taken into account the immigration for the two periods. Now, I propose to take the immigration for those two periods. In the first period the gross increase was 126,900, and the increase by immigration during that period was 76,700, giving a net increase from the natural increment of 50,200. In the second period the gross increase was 34,400; the immigration was no less than 112,900, giving a net decrease of 78,500. So, taking into account the fact that there was a larger immigration in the second four years than in the first, the figures are still blacker for the second period, as compared with the first, than they would have been without taking the immigration into account. Now, then, if you ascertain these results still more closely, you might apply to the Dominion Census the figures of the municipal census as showing the ratio of increase for each year, and the result is, for the whole period of eight years, an increase of 151,300, divided into, for the first period, 119,000, and for the second period, 32,300. And, taking the immigration of 189,600, we have a total decrease of 38,300, which is divided as follows: In the first period there is an increase of 119,000, and an immigration of 76,700, making a net decrease of 42,300; in the second period the increase was 32,300, and the immigration 113,000, making the net increase 80,700, thus wiping out all the increase of the first period, and leaving a loss on the eight years of 38,100. But so far, I have not enquired into what the results would be if we had retained the natural increment of our population. Even if you omit altogether the natural increment in the immigration, the figures become less favourable in the view I am putting forward. In that case, the results would be these: According to the English rate, during the whole period, the immigration was 189,600, and the natural increment, 204,800, making the proper increase 394,400; the actual increase was 151,300; showing a loss of 243,100. This is divided into the two periods, each of four years. In the first period, the immigration was 76,700, and the natural increment 100,100, making the proper increase 176,800; the actual increase was 119,000; showing a loss of 57,800. In the second period the immigration was 113,000, and the natural increment 104,700, making the proper increase 217,700; the actual increase was 32,300; showing a loss of 185,400. If you take the United States rate for the same period, you find that the immigration was 189,600, and the natural increment 296,700, making the proper increase 486,300; the actual increase was 151,300; showing a loss of 335,000. Divide this into the two periods, as before, and in the first period you find that the immigration was 76,700, and the natural increment 145,100, making the proper increase 221,800; the actual increase was 119,000; showing a loss of 102,800. In the second period, the immigration was 113,000, and the natural increment 151,700, making the proper increase 264,700; the actual increase was 32,300; showing a loss of 232,400. If you take the mean rate, you find that the immigration was 189,600, and the natural increment 250,700, making the proper increase 440,300; the actual increase was 151,300; making a loss of 289,000. Divide this into the two periods, and you find that in the first period the immigration was 76,700, and the natural increment 122,600, making a proper increase of 199,300; the actual increase was 119,000; showing a loss of 80,300. In the second period, the immigration was 113,000, and the natural increment, 128,100, making the proper increase, 241,100; the actual increase was 32,300; showing a loss of 208,800. Now, Sir, these would be the figures of the loss, assuming that we had all the immigration which we say we got in. I maintain that we did not get it, but that, in fact, we have lost it, and very large numbers of our people besides. The same results are shown by the returns of the school population. In 1877, the total school population was 494,900; in 1878, 492,400; in 1879, 494,400; in 1880, 489,900; in 1881, 484,200; and in 1882, 483,800. While the salaries have increased, and the number of schools opened is also somewhat larger, you find in the number of pupils attending the schools a decided diminution. Well, if you find the attendance in the schools falling off by 15,000, if you find the school population very considerably less, that indicates a very large loss of population. Now, as I have said, when you find a loss of population in the country, you know this: you know, first of all, that the country has lost a number equal to all those that have come into it during the decade; secondly, you know that it has lost the natural increment; and, thirdly, you know that it has suffered a loss beyond these, for it has lost a part of the initial population; so that when we find these results, it is quite impossible, so far as I can see, to reconcile them with the figures of the hon. gentleman. Now, I have not

entered into any analysis of the statements of the Minister of Agriculture, which were laid on the Table to-night. I find it difficult to reconcile his returns in many respects with the returns which we get from England. I see that the British returns for 1883 give an immigration to Canada of 44,100 English, Scotch and Irish, and 9,400 foreigners, or a total of 53,500; while our returns give 133,000. I am unable to see, although I have looked hurriedly at the hon. gentleman's statement, where the other 80,000 come from. I see something in it, however, which perhaps indicates the character of these figures. I see that there has been an increase during the year, according to these figures, by immigration from the States to Algoma of 6,000, and to Port Arthur of 4,000, odds. I presume that the bulk of these people are navvies who were brought in to work on the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they represent those 9,000 good Canadians whose sufferings from the loss of work were to be so serious; but that there has been a real settlement at Algoma of 6,000, and at Port Arthur of 4,000 people from the United States alone, I fancy no one will believe. But this circumstance indicates the transitory character of that population which I am sorry to see is set down as a satisfactory and valuable increase to our population in those sections. Now, if you turn to the Province of Quebec, you find that the population of 1871, was 1,191,500; that of 1881, 1,359,000; and that the increase, according to the Census, during the decade, was 167,511 or 14.06 per cent. If you apply to that Province the natural increment, at United States rates, it would be 262,182, showing that there has been a loss of 94,671, besides all the immigration which came into the country during the decade. In other words, the Province of Quebec has lost its immigration, and 94,671 souls besides. Now, it should be observed that one-fifth of that whole increase is in the city of Montreal, for the rate in the country is much lower. Where did all these people go to? They went, the hon. gentleman said, a great many to the Eastern States, some of them to Manitoba and a few of them to Ontario. But when one compares the population of 1871 with that of 1881, the increase in the French population of Ontario is not so great as I had supposed at first it was. The immigration of French Canadians to the eastern States has, no doubt, assumed alarming proportions, in two respects—first, in the extent of the departure, and secondly in the character of the exodus. It is proved by the very thorough examination that took place in the year 1882, under the instruction of the Legislature of Massachusetts into the question, that it has only been within the last ten or fifteen years that this immigration has assumed such large proportions in that part of the country. It was only within a much shorter period, five or six years before 1882, that it began to assume the character of a permanent settlement in the country to which these people went. One of the resolutions which was passed by a gathering of the French Canadians of Lowell, recites as follows:—

"Whereas, since the French Canadians have come to this section they have reached a population of 400,000 in New England, and whereas a large number have become proprietors, paying large taxes, and whereas for the most part the young men propose to make their home here,—

"Resolved, that we protest against the portion of the report which says that we 'are a horde of industrial invaders.'

"Whereas, we have to live five years in this country before we can become citizens of this glorious Republic, and the French Canadians have been here in large numbers but five or six years, there are over 200 voters of this class in Lowell alone—"

Then amongst the witnesses examined was Mr. Millet, and he is asked this question:

"Mr. WRIGHT. If I understand you, the attempt was made by the Canadian Government to repatriate French Canadians from the United States?

"Father MILLET. Yes, Sir; not only that but great inducements were offered if they would return; and some of them did return, but of those who did go, a certain proportion returned to the States again and, in a majority of places, the thing was a total failure, so much so that the subsidy which was given has been withdrawn.

"So that the work of repatriation has ceased?

"It is the desire of the Government that they should return, but it has ceased to pay; though it encourages immigration to all parts of Canada, it has ceased to subsidize these agencies."

Further on he is asked:

"But have the French been in a transition state, during the past five years, as the result of the establishment of and failure of the repatriation system, and the gradual establishment of churches here?

"A. I should consider that especially for the last five years this has been partially so. I look upon it now as a permanent population.

"Q. And that permanency has just begun to take a positive form?

"A. You mean, take it from ten years back?

"Mr. Gagnon. From the establishment of our churches?

"Mr Wright. From the establishment of the French Canadian churches in America, the permanency of the French population began?

"A. The permanency of the French population was secured."

There is Mr. Lalime, who says:

"I wish to tell you what I know personally about this immigration matter. I have been appointed Agent by the Federal Government in Canada since 1875, and I am still the Federal Government's Agent for the New England States; that is, what you might call the repatriation Agent. I wish to state this that, as stated a few minutes ago by the Rev. Father Millet, this repatriation is almost a failure, if it is not a total failure. Why? Because we have work in the New England States; because everybody finds occupation and our Canadians will not go west, or a very few of them. For the last four years, gentlemen, for the last three years, we certainly have not sent from New England more than, I should say, thirty families—I mean sent to Canada or any one of the Provinces of Canada, or to Manitoba. Quite a number from the other side have gone to settle in Minnesota and Dakota."

Mr. Gagnon says:

"I was the Agent of the Government at that time. We sent about 600 families to Canada and about 300 only stayed there; the other 300 did not settle, but came back to this country, or if they did not come to this country, did not settle on the land given for the purpose by the Government of Quebec."

Mr. Dubuque says:

"The most overwhelming fact that we can bring to bear on this question is, that for the last ten years, in every place where the French have settled, it is a known fact that they have doubled, if not trebled, in population. Now, if they were coming here and earning money, and going back to Canada, how could it be possible that the population would double and treble in such a short time? It must be that there is a new influx from Canada right along, and that those who are here stay here continuously. Now, we are prepared to show, by various witnesses, that it is the minority, the very small number, that go back."

R. Gagnon says, again:

"Mr. WRIGHT. Briefly, our idea is, that the tendency to permanency has gained strength?

Mr. GAGNON. Many come with the idea of earning money to pay off their mortgages. With the aid of a *confrère* in Worcester, I have written some papers for them, and I am quite sure that others could testify as I do, that many of them come with this idea; but we write more papers to those who are in Canada, buying from those who are here, and holding property there, than for those who want to return. They come with this idea of going back, but their ideas change, and they sell their property to land owners in Canada."

Mr. Bourvier, ticket agent, gives the following evidence;—

"Now, Mr. Bouvier, I believe in your business your are also ticket agent; sell tickets from Woonsocket to Canada?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Can you tell us what is the disposition of the French people, about going back to Canada to live?

"A. We do not have many that go back, and those that do go, we most always see them back here again.

"Q. Whether the French population of Woonsocket has decreased during the last ten years?

"A. It has increased very largely; it is now between 6,500 and 7,000."

Dr. Fontaine, of Spencer, Mass., says:

"Q. Will you please state to the officers of the Bureau what you know about Canadian immigration or repatriation?

"A. There is not much of it done in Spencer.

"Q. How long have you lived in Spencer?

"A. For the last ten years. When I went there the French population was 1,600, ten years ago. The last Census gave us 3,450. Now, as to immigration and travelling, you can say that it don't pay over there to be a railway agent. I was agent there for the Vermont Central, and I had to give it up, I could not make it pay. Last year I was agent and I sold only ten tickets for Canadians going to Canada."

Mr. Lalime says:

"We can go to Montreal for $4, and three or four weeks we could go for $2. There we have left friends, we have left many of our relatives, and there is nothing strange if we go there once in a while to meet them. Of course you will hear everywhere, in all places, Frenchmen saying they will return to Canada. But you must not forget that experience shows us that only a few will go there to stay. Every one of our fathers and mothers who came here from Canada always came here to stay two or three years. The children take the customs of New England of the United States, and after three or four years residence when the father says: we will go home, the children say we will not. Gentlemen, I could give you lots and lots of examples where the father and mother have gone back to Canada, but the children are here. They have settled, they are American citizens, and they will never go back to Canada. Immigration has good deal to do with the railway business. Let me state to you that the monthly railway receipts of ticket sales from here to Canada for one line, and that is the one I represent, the Vermont Central, are about $9,000. These are the sales to the French population from New England to Canada. That amount may seem to be quite large, but let me tell you that our sales to return average at least $18,000 to $20,000 a month. That is from Canada to New England States. The reason also, gentlemen, why the sales are so high, when I speak of $9,000 from here to Canada, is that through two months the railway men always make excursion rates. We can go to the Canada for almost nothing—as I was saying, we have been to Canada during two months for $2. There is nothing strange, then, if the Canadians will travel and will go there. More than one third of the business is done by people buying tickets here and sending them to Canada. You take the French Canadian centres, Salem, for instance—the population in Salem comes from Rimouski, about 120 miles below Quebec. They all come from that neighbourhood. What has brought that population to Salem? I should say that two men in Salem have done all the business. They came here and settled, and every month they sent for five, six, ten, fifteen families, and we see them coming. Some will go back, but three-fourths of them will remain here, and it is just the same in other places. A gentleman comes and settles in a certain place and he will get so many others to come there; that is the way it is done and we are selling tickets that way all the time."

Mr. L'Herault (Fall River) said:

"It needs no argument to prove what our friend from Worcester has said, because we can all look back ten or fifteen years. Did we then have any French in Boston or vicinity? Very, very few. No real estate owners. To-day we can count the French Canadians in New England by thousands, and many of them real estate owners."

Mr. L'Herault stated further:

"That the French Canadians in New England are getting naturalized rapidly. Messrs. Gagnon, Gauthier and Gillets' statistics are brought together in a table which shows the total population of thirty-two cities and towns to be 417,877, of which the Canadians are 88,653; of those 2,516 are real estate owners; 13,406 are school children; there are forty Canadian schools, and 4,480 naturalized Canadians. The Canadians holding public offices number 53; Canadian merchants and professional men, 549; Canadian tradesmen, 2,014 Cohoes, Troy and Lowell are also given, indicating, perhaps, still more remarkable results, of which the Canadian population is 109,645, and the Canadian school children, 16,219."

Therefore, Sir, I say that it is clear that this emigration from the Province of Quebec has taken place to a very large extent within a measurably short period, since Confederation; that it has taken place more largely of later years; that it has assumed within a very few years this regrettable character of permanence to which I referred—permanence, I mean, in the settlement abroad of the bulk of those who emigrate—and the situation with reference to that Province is, no doubt, as I have pointed out it is with reference to the Province of Ontario, a very serious one. If this is the state of things, there is no use in concealing it from ourselves, there is no use in shutting our eyes to it. Surely if these are the facts, these facts do deserve the serious consideration of this House on the two points—first, what is the result of our immigration policy? how many do we keep in this country of those we get here at this great cost? Secondly, what is the result of the emigration from Canada during the last few years—what is the condition of things as to that? These two points do deserve our most serious consideration, and it is also extremely plain, speaking with reference both to the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, at any rate, that there ought not to be any further importation of those classes of immigrants, aided by the public moneys, to which my hon. friend's Resolution specifically attracts attention; and nobody who lives in a city or town, and who has watched what has taken place in the cities and towns of these Provinces this winter, but must be quite satisfied, from painful personal experience, that of those classes, there is here at present an ample supply, and that to assist by public money the immigration of more of those classes is simply to add to the difficulties and to diminish the wages, by increasing the supply of labour, of those who are already plunged into very considerable difficulties and very considerable distress.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not propose, at this hour of the night, to enter into a discussion of the subject which has been brought under the notice of the House by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I am sure those of us who have listened to those two hon. gentlemen will have only one regret, and that is, that such a marvellous amount of industry, research and calculation, had not been devoted to a better object than to proving that this country is not progressing, and that the statistics which are furnished by the enemies of Canada are correct. It does seem to me that we might have looked somewhere else than to the Parliament of Canada for the laboured calculations which have been presented here to-night, to prove that Mr. Nimmo is right in the statements he has made as to emigration from Canada, and that the statements of the officers of the Government of Canada, sustained as they are by the reasonable condition of things and by facts as they are known to exist to everybody, are entirely incorrect. But I desire simply to call attention to one class of statistics to which the hon. gentlemen have referred, and which were referred to before by another hon. gentleman in a former debate, namely, the school statistics. Now, the figures as given, at first sight do appear to be very extraordinary, and yet what do I find? I have here the Report of the Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario, for 1883, and I find that, according to that Report, the school population of the Province of Ontario in the year 1873, was 504,869, and in 1880, 459,924. We may therefore assume that during the decade the school population of the Province of Ontario decreased 14,945. Multiplying that number by five, according to the mode pursued by the hon. member for South Brant, to get at the actual population, we find that there should, according to these figures, have been a decrease of actual population during the last decade of about 75,000 people, and yet we have the admission of hon. gentleman, as well as the official Census returns of the Province, to prove that the actual increase was over 300,000. I think, with that one fact, we may fairly assume that there is not much reliance to be placed upon the figures which were given, as an evidence, at any rate, that this country has been decreasing in population. But I find more in this Report of the Department of Education of the Province of Ontario. I find in the report of one of the inspectors some reference to these statistics. Mr. Arthur Brown, who is the Inspector of the county of Dundas, makes this statement:

"It is to be noticed that the Trustees' returns make the number of pupils resident, December, 1882, 423 less than at the same date the previous year. Considering that the number of children enrolled in 1881 was 591 less than the number returned as resident, and that for 1882 the number enrolled approaches within 182 of those resident, I cannot but think that the Census has been defective, and that there are more than 5,397 children resident in the county. I consider the number, 1,499, returned as not attending school 110 days, tolerably correct, so far as those pupils whose names are enrolled are concerned; but there must be quite a large number, 7 to 12 years of age, who have not attended school at all, whose names have not been enrolled, and who have consequently escaped Trustees' notice altogether."

Then he goes on:

"It is noticeable in the supplementary reports that a considerable number of Trustees have reported that they 'have not complied with the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of the amended School Act of 1881, &c.,' and others have conveniently left that part of the report blank. I have before referred to the disinclination of Trustees to make trouble for their neighbours, and the little likelihood that these compulsory

clauses would be carried out, until it is made the special duty of some officer less local than a school section Trustee. If it were made the duty of the township or village clerk, in some such way as is the registration of births and deaths, the carrying out of the requirements, so far as desirable, might be counted upon."

Now, that is the opinion of one of the Inspectors of schools in the Province of Ontario, showing that his own experience, his own contact with the school officials and with the population of his district, lead him to the opinion that the statistics which we have had here cited to us as evidence that this country is not progressing, are wholly, or at any rate largely, unreliable. I have only one word more to say in relation to the general question which has been brought before us. We hear from the hon. gentlemen that the immigration into Canada during the last ten years, and especially during the last five years, has not been nearly so large as represented, and that the emigration from Canada has been very much larger than the officials of the Government of Canada choose to admit; and they tell us that some serious thought must be given to this, and some serious remedy provided for it; and what is the remedy? What do they propose? That some 1,800 mechanics who came to this country, assuming for a moment that they had assisted passages, shall not be assisted in the future. After the long speeches we have heard, after all the statements as to the condition of this country and as to its retrograde character, the solution of the whole question is to be found simply in stopping the payment of assisted passages to mechanics coming to Canada. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) referred to what he was pleased to say was the policy of the Conservative party when they were in opposition—that they were not at all reluctant to point out that emigration was taking place from this country, that they were not at all reluctant to point out that people were leaving Canada for want of employment within the country itself. But the hon. gentleman should remember that when those statements were made they were made in connection with the advocacy of a policy which proposed to give employment to people in the country itself. They were part of the general argument in favour of that policy. Whether it was successful or not has nothing to do with the argument at that time. Is that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to-day? Do they propose to add to the population of Canada by closing the factories of Canada? Do they propose to add to the population of Canada by stopping immigration into this country? Is that the policy which they propose for our acceptance in this country in the future? Because, in the past persons have gone from Canada, and others who came here and remained only a short time and left us, or were counted as coming and never came at all—is that the policy which hon. gentlemen have to offer us as a solution of the difficulty with which we are face to face, according to their statement at this moment? No. The hon. gentlemen offer us no such argument in the speeches they have delivered here to-night, no such conclusion. The only conclusion which they offer in the Resolution which is in your hands, is simply that we shall not hereafter assist a certain class of persons to come to Canada. Why, Mr. Speaker, one would imagine that nobody else had ever assisted such people in coming to Canada. This policy of assisted immigration is not a new policy. If I mistake not, it was the policy of the Conservative party when they were in power previous to 1873. If I am not mistaken, an arrangement was made with the steamship companies for assisted passages by the present Minister of Agriculture when he was formerly Minister of Agriculture. That same policy was continued by the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side. They gave assisted passages; and I find that during the five years they were in office, from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, no less than 6,256 mechanics were brought into this country under that policy of assisted passages; while during the five years of the Conservative Government only 5,446 have been brought into this country. No one will pretend to tell me that the employment of mechanics was greater—aye, was anything like as great during those five years as during the last five years. It is quite true that in the present year there is a certain congestion in the labour market; it is true there are some persons who cannot find employment in their particular handicraft just now in Canada, but every one knows that it is a result begotton of the last three, or four, or at most, six or eight months. It was previous to that time that mechanics were induced to come here; when the incentives to their coming here were presented to them on the other side of the water, there was abundant employment for everyone who choose to come to this country, as, I believe, there will be for every one who chooses to come to this country within a very short time hence. But, Sir, what do we find further? We find that although at that time it was the policy to assist mechanics as well as agricultural labourers, at the present time it is not the policy to do so. I find by the Report of the Minister of Agriculture, laid on the Table this evening, the statement that assisted passages were granted during the year at the rate of £4 for labourers, £2 10s. for female domestic servants and the families of agricultural labourers; and for labourers without families there was a special rate of £3 sterling. I believe it is a fact that latterly there have been no assisted passages granted to mechanics coming to this country, but that those who have come, have come of their own free will; and I have yet to learn that it is in the interests of the people of Canada to shut the doors of this country against those who, of their own free will, may choose to come here and make homes for themselves in this Dominion. Out of the large emigration that is coming to Canada, some 1,800, according to the statistics of last year, were of the class that we are told are not to be induced to come here in the future. Sir, I entirely concur in the policy which the Government has pursued and the policy which the Minister of Agriculture has announced on the floor of Parliament, namely, that mechanics will not receive assisted passages; that assisted passages are to be confined to agricultural labourers, to female servants and to that class of persons who always find employment in Canada, and for whose employment there is abundant opening in all parts of the country. Sir, I believe that this Resolution which has just been introduced and which, as every one can see who knows what is going on outside, is intended simply for the purpose of creating an impression that the Opposition are singular in their policy of preventing assisted emigrants from coming to Canada, while during the five years they were in office, when there was scant employment for the people of the country itself, they were giving those assisted passages—I say I believe this Resolution will have little influence in this country, and that the motives of the hon. gentlemen presenting it will be readily understood by the people. An hon. gentleman beside me has just called my attention to the policy of the Local Government of the Province of Ontario. In the Report of the Department of Immigration of that Province, for the year 1883, this passage occurs:

"The assisted rates of passage for emigrants during the year have been as follows: Farm labourers and domestic servants, £3; children under twelve years, £2; infants under a year, 10s.; other classes of emigrants, £4. The regular (unassisted) rate has been £4 4s."

That is the statement of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario. We know that in Toronto there has been some difficulty in consequence of some immigrants not being able to get employment. They have been chiefly Irish immigrants who came to this country, and I find, in reference to them, this statement in the report of the Minister of Agriculture.

"Mr. Hodgkin, accompanied by Father Nugent, on behalf of Mr. Tuke's Committee, also visited Canada with the same object in view,

These two went to Manitoba, where they made arrangements with the Catholic authorities for the settlement of a certain number of families in that Province. All these gentlemen also visited Toronto, and reported that they had made arrangements with the Ontario Government, assisted by the Catholic authorities, for the distribution and settlement of a number of Irish families within the Province of Ontario."

So that, while the friends of these hon. gentlemen in Ontario are inviting those immigrants to come here from the other side, and offering all kinds of inducements, all kinds of promises, for the purpose of securing immigration to this country of this class of persons, hon. gentlemen on the floor of Parliament, when they find a temporary glut in the labour market, when they think some little capital is to be made out of a Resolution of this kind, propose the Resolution which is now in your hands, and have supported it with speeches of which, I venture to say, no Parliament in the world ever heard the like from members of it against their own country.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr White) expresses regret at the leader of the Opposition spending so much time in endeavouring to prove that the returns made by Mr. Nimmo, of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington, were correct. Sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition never mentioned the name of Mr. Nimmo; he never referred to the returns of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington, but he did present to the House an unanswerable argument, and showed most conclusively that the natural increase of Canada has been absorbed, to a large extent, by emigration from this country, and that not only had we lost a portion of the natural increase of our population, but had also lost a number equal to the entire emigration to this country for the last decade. The figures laid before this House, I repeat, by the leader of the Opposition, proved this beyond peradventure. They showed that the natural increase of this country would be at least 20 per cent., and that on the basis of that of the United States, it should be 22 per cent. They showed that we do not maintain that natural increase, that the population of this country was less at the last decade, with ordinary natural increase added, than the population of the decade before, and that, consequently, we have lost many thousands of the natural increase. Sir, whatever may be said with regard to the number of immigrants brought to this country—I think my hon friend, the Minister of Public Works, said the number was something like 750,000 in the last decade—the higher the number that is stated by this gentleman as coming to this country the more conclusively do they prove that the emigration statistics of the United States, with reference to emigration from Canada, are correct and are not overdrawn. I have no doubt that the statements made by the Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) with respect to immigration into Canada, are overdrawn. He claims that in 1882 the number was 112,000, while the British trade returns gives as the immigration from the British Isles to Canada, 40 441. The hon. gentleman claims that in 1883, 133,000 persons settled in Canada, while, as the leader of the Opposition has shown, the British trade returns show that the number of those leaving the British Isles for the Dominion was only 44,130. It may be true, and it is true, no doubt, that there has been an increase in the school population in Canada. It may be true that there has been an increase in the population of Canada; but that increase, as shown by the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) amounted, in the last decade, to only 17 per cent., and it has been shown by the leader of the Opposition, that the natural increase, without reference to immigration, should have exceeded 20 per cent. There has been a disagreement as to the statistics, with respect to immigration between Canada and the United States, as between the Canadian and American authorities. There has been, so far as I am aware, no interchange of views between the authorities of the two

countries, no correspondence by the Department of Agriculture with the Bureau of Statistics in Washington, no attempt to reconcile the discrepancies between the statistics collected by the respective parties. It is true, an American ex-official of rather shady reputation was summoned here the other day, a gentleman, if I may characterize him as a gentleman, who has been discharged from his situation in an American Custom house, since which time he has been filling the high position of brakeman on a railway, and that gentleman did give evidence which militated to some extent against the figures of the American immigration statisticians, but I think proof has been furnished to-night, in the speech of the leader of the Opposition, that the statements made by the American authorities. with respect to the number of immigrants entering the United States from Canada during the last ten years, has not been overdrawn. I do not believe we can account for the disappearance of the population, that is, our natural increase, in any other way. It is not plain that the immigration to Manitoba and the North-West has been, all told, more than 230,000. The Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) claimed, in his speech not long since, that prior to 1880, it was 64,000, and subsequently, 169,000 had gone in there. Adding those numbers together, they do not equal the number who have emigrated to the United States, and the total does not make up the difference which would appear to exist in the population of Canada, if we admit the natural increase at 20 per cent., and add the immigration which it is claimed came into this country. With respect to the question of emigration to the United States, the leader of the Opposition alluded very briefly to some statistics, as to the number of Canadians shown to be in that country, by the Census of 1870-80, to the death rate which would diminish that Canadian population, and he drew from those figures and statements the inference that the statements of the American authorities, with respect to immigration, were not overdrawn. I will deal with this question a little more fully, showing how the results are arrived at. The following table will make this clear:—

Canadian population of the United States as per Census of 1870, without Newfoundland	490,041
Canadian population of United States as per Census of 1880	712,368
Increase in 10 years	222,327
Annual death rate per 1,000 in England for the last 37 years, 22; in United States, say 20.	
Canadian population in United States 1st June, 1870..	490,041
Immigration, 1870	40,911
	530,952
Death rate, 1870—20	10,619
Population, 1st January, 1871	520,333
Immigration, 1871	47,031
	567,364
Death rate, 1871—20	11,347
Population, 1st January, 1872	556,017
Immigration, 1872	30,172
	586,189
Death rate, 1872	11,723
Population, 1st January, 1873	574,466
Immigration, 1873	37,871
	612,337
Death rate, 1873	12,246
Population, 1st January, 1874	600,091
Immigration, 1874	35,339
	635,430
Death rate, 1874	12,708
Population, 1st January, 1875	622,722
Immigration, 1875	26,142
	648,864

Death rate, 1875	12,977
Population, 1st January, 1876	635,887
Immigration, 1876	26,636
	662,523
Death rate, 1876	13,350
Population, 1st January, 1877	649,173
Immigration, 1877	24,065
	673,238
Death rate, 1877	13,464
Population, 1st January, 1878	659,774
Immigration, 1878	27,204
	686,978
Death rate, 1878	13,739
Population, 1st January, 1879	673,239
Immigration, 1879	33,025
	706,264
Death rate, 1879	14,125
Population, 1st January, 1880	692,139
Deduct $\frac{5}{12}$ of 40,911, emigration of 1870, prior to 1st June	17,045
	675,094
Add $\frac{5}{12}$ of 98,317, emigration of 1880, to cover prior to 1st June	40,965
Estimated Canadian population, 1st June, 1880	716,059
Census returns, same date	712,368
Balance of error	3,691
Continuation of calculation on basis of American immigration statistics and death rate of 20 to 1,000.	
Canadian population in United States, 1st June, 1880, as per United States Census of 1880	712,368
$\frac{7}{12}$ of immigration of 1880, 98,317	51,352
	769,720
$\frac{7}{12}$ death rate of 1880, from 1st June	8,974
Population, 1st January, 1881	760,746
Immigration, 1881	118,623
	879,369
Death rate, 1881	17,587
Population, 1st January, 1882	861,782
Immigration, 1882	98,295
	960,077
Death rate, 1882	19,200
Population, 1st January, 1883	940,877
Probable addition in 1883, less death rate	50,000
	990,877

Immigration from Canada, American statistics :—

Immigration,	1870	40,911
do	1871	47,031
do	1872	30,172
do	1873	37,871
		155,985
do	1874	35,339
do	1875	26,142
do	1876	26,636
do	1877	24,065
do	1878	27,204
		139,386
do	1879	33,025
do	1880	98,317
do	1881	118,623
do	1882	98,295
do	1883 (9 months)	49,135
		397,395

Increase of Canadian population from 1st June, 1870, to 1st June, 1880, as per United States Census of 1880.	222,227
Death rate, 20 to 1,000 on yearly population, for a period of 10 years	126,298
	348,625
Immigration, 1st June, 1870, to 30th June, 1880, as per American returns	352,316

Any person who visits that section of country or travels through the country, cannot but be struck with the great emigration which is constantly going on from this country. A person who visits Michigan, or Minnesota, or Dakota, or other portions of the Western States, will be struck with the great number of Canadians to be found there—in fact, some districts of these States seem to be peopled almost exclusively by Canadians; and I have no doubt at the present moment, following up these calculations, on the basis I have shown, that there are between 900,000 and 1,000,000 native-born Canadians in the United States. Now, the hour is late and the House is impatient, and I will not detain them much longer. I believe, with reference to this question of immigration, that the proper policy for this Government to adopt is that which has been followed by the United States Government for many years past. The policy of the United States is to lay before the leading people of Europe the claims that America presents as a home for the immigrant, and to circulate information to the utmost extent possible, to place people in possession of all the facts which would induce them to immigrate, and then to allow them to come or remain on their own free will. The United States has never directly assisted immigrants; it has induced them to come by giving information concerning the country, and the result is that immigrants have swarmed there by millions. If a man does well in this country he naturally assists his friends to come out, and in this way passages are assisted, not by the Government, but by the friends of people at home who are thus induced to come to the United States. Millions and millions of dollars have been sent from the United States by Irishmen to assist their fellow-countrymen to come to that country——

Mr. CURRAN. And to this country, too.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps so; but at any rate it is a proper system, and in such a state of things as exists now with the labour market over-stocked, I hold that the Government can make a better use of their money than in bringing people to this country, to compete with those who are here and unable to obtain employment. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says we only assisted 1,800 mechanics to come to this country last year, but we brought 16,000 labourers, who came here as competitors with the labour of this country, to carry mortar and brick, and to engage in various occupations, aside from working on the farm, so that he will have an increase of very considerably above 1,800, if he sums up those who come to the country to compete with those who are out of employment, and are vainly seeking for employment. I believe the amendment is one which is based on correct principles. It may be possible that in times past it may have been necessary and proper to pursue such a policy as the present, but I believe the time for that has past. I believe in placing before the people of Europe the claims and advantages which Canada possesses as a home for the immigrant, and letting them come or remain as they may themselves decide. The surplus population of Europe is seeking homes, and it will come to this continent, and the question is that we should offer them inducements which they cannot prudently overlook; but I do not believe we should induce people to come here to strive for the employment which cannot be obtained by those who are now in the country by assisting their passages here.

Amendment (Mr. Paterson, Brant) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen, —	Fisher,	Mills,
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Platt,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Casey,	Lister,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Livingstone,	Vail,
Charlton,	McCraney,	Watson,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McIsaac,	Wilson.—50.
Fairbank,	McMullen,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dugas,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Amyot,	Dupont,	McCallum,
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	McDougald,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	McNeill,
Beaty,	Foster.	Méthot,
Bell-au,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Benoit,	Gault,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Orton,
Billy,	Gordon,	Ouimet,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Bolduc,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bowell,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Brecken,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Burnham,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Hall,	Scott,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hesson,	Small,
Carling,	Homer,	Smyth,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Ives,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Coughlin,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Kranz,	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Daly,	Lesage,	Wigle,
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Williams,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Wood (West'land).—101
Dickinson,	Mackintosh,	

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

48 | | |
|---|---|
| To meet expenses in connection with care of Archives | $6,000 00 |
| To meet expenses in connection with Patent Record | 9,500 00 |
| To meet expenses in connection with preparation of Criminal Statistics | 4,000 00 |
| To meet expenses in connection with Census (Revote, $20,000) | 30,000 00 |
| To meet expenses in connection with Dominion Exhibition | 10,000 00 |
| To meet expenses in connection with Health Statistics | 20,000 00 |
| For collecting and compiling agricultural, industrial and other statistics in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and also for acquiring and compiling such Statistics elsewhere (Revote) | 20,000 00 |

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with this vote for Archives?

Mr. McLELAN. Much the same as last year—that is, to continue the researches in London and Paris, and the copying of documents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but there are various classes of documents, and we would like to know if there are any special objects in view.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. McLELAN. They are all bearing on the Dominion of Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true, but generally speaking, there are some particular classes in view. For instance we had the Haldimand papers last year. Is it proposed to do anything with regard to the New England Archives?

Mr. McLELAN. Researches are going on both in London and in Paris.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there anything to be done with regard to the New England Archives?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt that in New England they are going more and more into researches connected with their early history, which is more or less connected with our own. I have received a number of communications on this subject, and I would like to know if the attention of the Department has been directed to the desirability of making researches in the United States as well as in Paris and London. My own impression is that probably we would be able to get more for our money there than in Paris or London, with the exception of a few documents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Especially with reference to the colonial period, the anti-revolutionary period, there is no necessity for our doing that. Their records are well preserved; there is no danger of their Archives being destroyed, and they have a series of literary men who have devoted themselves to those periods, and the publications of their Archives are perfectly accessible to us, so we can well postpone our researches there. Meanwhile the old period in France is getting less and less interesting to Frenchmen every day, and it were well that researches there should be pursued vigorously, and I understand they are being pursued vigorously. So with regard to the English Archives; so that I think we should devote ourselves more to those Archives for some time to come, leaving it to the Americans themselves to deal with the American Archives.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course a number of persons are engaged in the various depositories in which such papers and documents are preserved, in copying manuscript documents, which would be available to historians and others who are interested in the early history of our country; but I believe that during the last year we have had instances of the inconvenience which is being caused by the not unnatural zeal of the persons who are devoted to this work. I maintain that, apart from these things, all other literature upon the subject, that is to say, printed books with reference to the early history of Canada, ought to be in our Library, accessible along with the vast quantity of more modern information which is there. Now, I remember that last year, when a larger vote than usual was granted for the Library, it was done on the understanding that it should in part be devoted, on the suggestion of the Library Committee, to the replenishing of our stock of printed books, referring to the early history of the country. I believe I am not incorrect in saying that more than one effort on the part of the late Librarian to secure this very class of books, which he was directed by the Library Committee and by Parliament to obtain for the Library, were frustrated by the superior zeal of that other officer of the Government, the Archivist, who was before him buying them for this repository, which I never entered, but which, I believe, contains printed books as well as written manuscripts. I think it is ridiculous that two officers under the Government should be competing against each other for the possession of the same volumes. It all arises from our not having determined the limits of the Archivist's work. If we agree that the printed volumes should be in the Library,

and that volumes specially valuable should be kept under lock and key there, a person engaged in researches, and wishing to consult a rare volume, could see it on applying to the Librarian. But if you are going to have these works kept in the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Archives, this will just cause confusion and render the whole collection less valuable than it would be if we had it entire in the Library. I, therefore, ask for more definite information in regard to this vote. Is it intended that any of the money shall be expended in the purchase of books which Parliament declares ought to be in our Library, and for the purchase of which we are granting special votes in order to complete the collection? There seems to be no sense in that; it is quite unreasonable; and for my part, there is no doubt as to the preferable one of the two places. The manuscripts I am not objecting to be kept by the Archivist, but the printed books should be in the Library, and should not be duplicated elsewhere.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, as a general rule, printed books should be kept in the Library; but there are some books which, though printed, are so completely of the nature of Archives, from their scarcity and their antiquity, that perhaps there might be a line drawn. I must say that the books in our Library are not very safe; that there is a very considerable percentage of losses in the Library. Books at all valuable as Archives—scarce books, old books—would be safer in manuscript than in print. But with the single exception I have mentioned, I think historical books should be kept in the library.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it would never do, and the Committee recognized that it would never do, to keep these books on the ordinary shelves. The Librarian was directed to have a special department for them, kept under lock and key, out of which they would only be taken when they were specially wanted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the line taken by the hon. gentleman, and I will take an opportunity of discussing this matter with the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. DAVIES. In the Library Committee this question came up and the Librarian, in making his report, stated that he had frequently failed to obtain rare books in reference to Canada, because another Department of the Government had forestalled him in every market into which he went. It was therefore thought proper to bring this question up in the House, because it was felt to be unseemly that the agent of one Department of the Government, when he went to buy a rare book, should find another agent of another Department of the Government bidding over his head.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is very absurd.

Mr. DAVIES. In the case of a sale of rare books in Toronto, I understand that the Librarian sent an officer there, but the Department of Agriculture had got ahead of him by telegraphing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the books were got, and there was really no competing and no loss.

Mr. DAVIES. The Department of Agriculture paid more for the books than they might, because the two were bidding against each other. This rivalry ought to be stopped altogether.

Mr. MILLS. This fact, I think, is sufficient to show the propriety of the suggestion I brought under the notice of the First Minister, a few days ago, that is, to have the Archives placed in connection with the Library. The principle on which Mr. Brymner is acting is, to seek to make the Department of which he is in charge a complete historical department for the Dominion of Canada. With that view, he is endeavouring to collect there every historical work relating to the Dominion, whether in manuscript or not, so that any one wishing to look up any matter connected with the early history of any of the Provinces, might find everything he desired in that Department. If there was some part of the Library set apart for the Archives, and placed under the charge of Mr. Brymner, these books might be classified and the difficulties of which my hon. friend has spoken could not arise. There would be no competition, for whatever was done for the one would, in fact, be done for the other.

Patent Record..... $9,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes the increase in the vote for the *Patent Record*?

Mr. McLELAN. It is to provide for the increased work. There is an expenditure in connection with every patent issued for engravings, &c. The revenue is increasing in a greater proportion. Since 1878 the number of patents issued has doubled and the revenue has increased from $33,663, in 1878, to $73,023, last year.

Criminal Statistics..... $4,000 00

Mr. MILLS. I have in my hand a volume of these Criminal Statistics, and I am certain that if any member of the Administration would look at it, he would see that it has really no value whatever, that the information is altogether unreliable and the classification very imperfect. In Essex I find 685 persons charged with crime. The number acquitted is 85, leaving 600 convicted, but the list shows only 575 convicted, so that there are 25 unaccounted for. Take the classification of sentences; the number of persons does not correspond with either of these numbers. One of the purposes of a classification is to ascertain the character of crimes committed, whether very serious or comparatively trifling offences. Yet you find, in many instances, a large number of persons said to be convicted and not reported as having been sentenced at all. In Frontenac, out of 770 charged with crime during the year, 242 were acquitted, which would leave 528 convicted. Yet there are only 520 convicted, and less than 300 reported as having been sentenced. In Huron, the number of persons charged with assault is 168, of which seven were acquitted, leaving 161 convicted, yet the number reported as convicted is only 158, and the number sentenced is eight, leaving 153 unaccounted for. With regard to larceny, sixty were charged and twenty-four reported acquitted, leaving thirty-six as convicted; yet only twenty-nine were reported convicted, and thirteen sentenced, leaving twenty-three unsentenced. In the case of drunkenness and disorderly conduct, ninety-one were charged with the offence, and none acquitted, yet we have twenty-six reported sentenced, leaving sixty-three not accounted for. For infraction of by-laws, 148 were charged and two acquitted, leaving 146 convicted; but 143 are reported as convicted and sixty-four sentenced; thus, eighty-two are not reported at all. So that the classification of these is wholly worthless. Then, in the county of York, I find 375 charged with common assault, 136 acquitted, and 239 convicted, but the number reported convicted is only 224, and the number reported sentenced 135; thus, eighty-four are unaccounted for. Murder—six charged and three acquitted, leaving three convicted. Three are reported convicted, but none are reported sentenced, and the punishment in no case is stated. The number charged with drunkenness and disorderly conduct in that county reaches 3,373, of which 1,487 are acquitted, leaving 1,786 convicted but only 1,737 are reported sentenced or forty-nine altogether unaccounted for. Misdemeanours—seventy-nine charged and twelve acquitted; sixty-seven convicted, yet only fifty-three are reported as convicted and twenty-nine as sentenced, leaving twenty-eight unaccounted for. I might go through the whole of this volume, and in scarcely a county will you find a report at all reliable. The classification, such as it is, is altogether

worthless. There have been several thousand dollars paid for a collection of statistics which are not of the slighest use to anyone. If the officer had the slightest idea of his duties he would, if he received imperfect returns from any county, send the papers back with orders to fill up the blanks correctly. It is impossible that this book ever passed through the hands of any hon. Minister, for if he had looked at the book at all, he would have seen its defects at once. This vote is one that ought not to be taken till the Government are prepared to see that the classification of statistics is made in such a way that it will be of some value. I bring this matter before the House to show how little attention is paid to this important production by the Minister who is responsible for this work.

Mr. McLELAN. The returns are made by the clerks of the courts, and on those returns the report is made. I am sorry the hon. leader of the Opposition is not here to have the benefit of the hon. gentleman's criticisms of this Bill. The Statute is directly followed out.

Mr. MILLS. There is no defect in the Statute. It is in the returns made up here. Let the hon. gentleman turn to page 30. Take the case of a single county, the number of misdemeanours reported is thirty-one, the number of persons acquitted is two, leaving twenty-nine as convicted. The number reported convicted is thirty. Would the Statute assist in correcting a mistake of that kind? In the case of sentences, there are only five reported as sentenced, and the classification is all blank.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt there is carelessness and incompetence, but it does not rest with the Department here. The officers who make these returns are not officers of the Dominion Government. They are not under the control of the Dominion Government. They make such returns as they please, or as the great Mr. Hardy or Mr. Pardee will allow them to do, and the officers of the Department of Agriculture have got to take these returns and make the best of them, and publish them as they receive them. He says they may send them back and say they will not have them, but what means have you to compel these gentlemen to make these returns, unless the hon. gentleman has influence elsewhere, to have it made an offence punishable by the Ontario Government. There is no other way to make these men do their duty. The Minister can only publish the returns he gets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But we pay considerable sums of money to a variety of people for such services, and, upon my word, I do not think we ought to pay money to these people for incorrect returns. I see about a score of people, more or less, all of whom, in 1883, received payments for services. I see that $2,248 was paid to three persons—Mr. Woods, Mr. Kingston, and Mr. Watts—for services in compiling statistics. Are these clerks in the Department?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; they compile them when they are sent in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think they ought to have called the attention of the Minister to the inaccuracies which my hon. friend has pointed out. I do not see the good of paying these other parties, whom I presume to be parties serving the municipal authorities and the Ontario Government, these sums of $200, $188, $100 and $75, for returns, if the returns are so utterly worthless.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there is a great deal of truth in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think they should be paid if they do not choose to furnish correct returns. If you have no other means of compelling them, you can stop the supplies, as I wish we could in many cases.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. CASEY. If you cannot get the information, why vote the money? I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing the error is at all in the reports furnished, because the report shows, on the face of it, that the figures which have been given, whatever they were, are utterly muddled. No matter what sort of imperfect returns have been got, they have been so muddled in putting them into this report, that they are not consistent with themselves, and the columns do not add up correctly. Those are faults in the classification by the clerks of the Department, and do not arise from any imperfections in the returns.

Mr. McLELAN. As far as the Statute is concerned, it is all right. Instructions are given for these returns, but the errors are the fault of the Clerks of the Peace in the respective counties, and I speak more especially with reference to the Province of Ontario. It must be with them, and with them only, that these mistakes can possibly be. It is not a mistake in addition, but in the returns. So many persons are charged with certain crimes, and, if they are found guilty, it is only for them to say they are found guilty, and to give the sentences as recorded by the Judges. Of course, there are certain instances where criminals are found guilty, and, on account of their age, are let go, with a view of being sentenced whenever called upon, and that would make a difference in the numbers. The only thing I regret in connection with the matter is, that a larger amount is not expended, if necessary, to make returns of the respective crimes with which criminals are charged throughout the country, and the circumstances under which they are charged, with the view of assimilating the sentences as far as possible. Now there are in this country burglaries committed in certain parts under exactly similar circumstances, where the criminal in one part of the country gets three years in the penitentiary, and in another part gets seven or eight years in the penitentiary. If these returns were made properly, and the circumstances given, as far as they possibly could be, we might have an assimilation of sentences.

Mr. LISTER. Are these returns got from the Government office in Toronto?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; they could not be got there.

Mr. LISTER. Direct from the Clerks of the Crown?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. So far as these returns are concerned, I do not at all see the use of this Government publishing the report for which this money is charged. Each of the Provincial Governments publishes a return, and I have never heard any complaints of the accuracy of the returns published by those Governments. This report is a waste of money. The administration of justice is in the hands of the Local Government, and they have proper means of collecting returns and statistics. I have no doubt that, if the returns made by the officers throughout the Province of Ontario are examined, it will be found that the mistakes have taken place in the office of the Department here, that the bungling has been here. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to speak of Mr. Hardy and Mr. Pardee, but if this Government was as economical and as honest as that is, it would be good for the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that the hon. gentleman is the best judge of that. We will not take his opinion on that. However, that is not the question. The hon. gentleman complains of our having any criminal statistics at all, but he had better ask his leader why we have an Act on the Statute Book, as the hon. gentleman passed the law under which we are compelled to have criminal statistics.

Mr. BLAKE. I was responsible for passing the law, but I am not responsible for the hon. gentleman's neglect in collecting the statistics.

Mr. DAVIES. The law is very good, but the question is whether, as it is carried out, it is worth $4,000 a year. If the statements made by my hon. friend to my left are correct, the statistics are worse than useless, they are misleading. They are only valuable when they are correct, and enable the law-makers to draw deductions with a view to improve the law. I am inclined to think there are defaults in the Department. I turn to my own Province, and I find returns given from the counties there. We have no municipal officers for the county, so the returns come from the different magistrates, and therefore they have to be added up and subtracted in the Department here, and I find egregious blunders, unpardonable blunders, in the addition of these figures. We have no municipal officers, so the mistakes which appear in this book of returns, *quoad* the Province which is within my own knowledge, must be made by the departmental officers, who are alone responsible for them, and I presume the other blunders can be accounted for in the same way.

Mr. McLELAN. I suppose in the hon. gentleman's Province it is the same as in other Provinces. I do not think the magistrates in the localities give the names of each of the parties separately and the crime and the sentence. They say there are so many guilty of assault and they add that up, and the same with regard to the other charges. In the Province of Ontario, I know that the Clerk of the Peace makes returns of so many persons charged with burglary, and he adds them up; so many charged with robbery, and he adds them up; so many charged with other crimes; and, instead of the calculation being made in the Department here, it is made in the office of the Clerk of the Peace in the Province of Ontario. So that he is the person who is responsible for the mistakes, if there are any.

Mr. DAVIES. We have no such persons in the counties of the Province which I come from, as Clerks of the Peace, who make one general return for the county. You have returns made up by the stipendiary magistrate and by the Clerk of the Crown of the cases tried in the Supreme Court, and you have returns from the magistrates of the cases tried by them. They are not added up before they leave Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MILLS. It is quite obvious, looking at these returns, that some of the officers make full returns and others leave blanks, and that whoever makes up the returns in the Department here makes up these statistics and puts them down as they are received here, where there are said to be a certain number of offenders charged with crime and a certain number convicted, and we find that the number convicted do not correspond with the difference.

Mr. McLELAN. That is because a certain number may be charged in a year and not all tried within the year, and their convictions will come in next year.

To meet expenses in connection with Census (revote $20,000) $30,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry the Minister who is specially charged with the Department is not here; that, of course, cannot be avoided. There is a great feeling of dissatisfaction in the way the Census has been done; the third volume does appear to me to be very inaccurately put together. If it be correct, we have some rather extraordinary results brought out as to industrial establishments. For instance, I find that ten years ago apparently $78,000,000 were invested as the total capital; that 187,000 hands were employed, who produced $221,000,000 worth of products. We find now that we employ $135,000,000 of capital and 255,000 hands, but that we only produce $309,000,000 worth of products. I do not suppose that the productive value of capital has decreased in that ratio, but I just call the Minister's attention to that, as a very strong illustration of the doubtful character of the statistics, either in one Census or the other. It may be possible that the Census of 1871 is unreliable, or that that of 1881 is unreliable.

Mr. BLAKE. When may we hope to have the final volume of the Census?

Mr. McLELAN. It is in the hands of the printer, and has been for some time. We hope to have it before the close of the Session, and that will be about fifteen months earlier than the third volume of the last Census was issued. The first volume of the last Census was issued in 1873, the second in 1874, the third in June, 1875. This volume will be issued in March, 1884, about fifteen months earlier than the corresponding volume of the last Census, and at a less cost by $47,785.

Mr. WELDON. Very gross blunders seem to have been committed regarding the city and county of St. John. My attention was called to it, in regard to book-binding. In that Province we have returned, of capital invested, $221,000, with 911 hands employed, and $971,000 as the total value of the products. Yet there is not a single one put down for the whole Province, though in the city and county of St. John there are several, and two of great importance, of which one has been established since 1882.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like on this subject to say something myself. I have looked a little into the matter, and I did it somewhat pleasantly, and I did it for this reason, that while the Census show many figures that somewhat strengthen the economic position I take, I think there are so many inaccuracies, especially in the third volume, that though the figures look rather gloomy to my hon. friends opposite, I confess they are very cheering to myself, and there is a little consolation in the thought that perhaps the whole thing is unreliable. There are some glaring discrepancies, though perhaps some of them may be capable of explanation. For instance, the vessels registered in the Province of Quebec are actually 285 less in 1881 than they were in 1871. In New Brunswick, the number is just one more, while in Ontario there are 105 more, and in Nova Scotia 443 more. I suppose there might be an explanation given, because there is an increased tonnage, but I should judge from the figures that there must be something wrong. Another point is that mentioned by the hon. member for South Huron, and which I alluded to myself in the debate on the Budget. If the Census are to be accepted as correct, they show that $2 of capital invested in our manufacturing industries now are only producing what $1 did in 1871. If that is correct, it will have a deterrent effect upon capital being invested in manufacturing industries. The impression that this volume is unreliable is strengthened by the withholding of another volume which is confessedly inaccurate. We can hardly imagine the extent of the evil results that flows from publishing such information that is not authentic, and from which calculations must be made and deductions must be drawn. We are not responsible for it, and are not to blame for it; but it seems to me that censure must fall on some one, whether on the inside or on the outside staff, I shall not say. I know that the populations are in many cases incorrect. I believe that in my own city a great mistake was made, for judging by the returns annually made, there is a discrepancy of a thousand or more, and it is quite probable the same occurred at other places. If this is so, it may account for some of the population we have been speaking of earlier in the evening; but if we were to impugn the veracity of these statements, we would be told that we were declaring the statistics unreliable, and announcing this fact to the world. As to which horn of the

dilemma to take, I do not know. Taking either one, we are forced to a conclusion to which no one is disposed to arrive.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister in charge has informed the Committee that the last volume is in the printer's hands. We received that information some weeks ago. I understand that all the Census staff is still retained in the Department; what are they engaged in doing? I noticed a statement in the *Mail*, by Mr. Kingsmill, in which he says the work of the Census branch was completed six months ago. The House is entitled to some explanation in regard to this particular matter. It is well that we should look into the manner in which this work has been performed. The volumes are wholly unreliable. Taking sea-going vessels, I find the following statement:—

SEA-GOING VESSELS.

	1871.	1881.
Verchères	10	1
Vaudreuil	5	0
Portneuf	62	39
Berthier	25	6
Lincoln	38	8
Welland	3	0

BARGES.

Quebec	134	63
Portneuf	12	0
Lincoln	7	0
Welland	20	0

STEAMERS.

Welland	18	0
Lincoln	9	0
Huron	9	1

When we look at public improvements in agricultural districts, we find the same discrepancies exist. The number of houses and buildings in some of the counties was less than in 1871. In Waterloo, South, there were 3,308 barns reported in 1871; there were 3,194 in 1881. In Wellington there were 5,132 in 1871, and 4,731 in 1881. And so we might go over the list, showing that, instead of the number of buildings increasing with the increase of population, the number diminished as the population increased. The same discrepancies are observable in every department of these statistics.

Mr. WELDON. What has been done in regard to the city or county of St. John, respecting which it was admitted that a mistake had been made.

Mr. BLAKE. We have been told by the Minister and by the acting Minister that the final volume is expected to be distributed before the close of the present Session—that is 14th April. Why then do we require to vote the large sum asked for.

Mr. McLELAN. After the three volumes were issued, in 1875, another was published, compiled from the three. It is intended to pursue the same course with respect to this Census, and I am informed that a considerable number of the staff have been retained for that work, while others are employed in different services.

Mr. BLAKE. How many are still employed?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the number.

Mr. MILLS. How many have been dismissed?

Mr. McLELAN. Quite a number of them have been dismissed and some of them have been employed in other services. There were also quite a number kept for the purpose of compiling the other volume.

Mr. BLAKE. In regard to the return made for the city and county of St. John, we were told that we must not rely on the statements—that they are wrong and would be corrected. I presume further enquiry has been made and that the acting Minister will be able to say what the errors are. Did he find that they arose from culpable negligence on the part of the local officers? I am afraid the returns are equally defective in a number of other cases.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not know that it was admitted.

Mr. WELDON. Yes; it was admitted, and a statement appeared in one of the volumes.

Mr. McLELAN. I am informed that the correction desired by the hon. gentleman will appear in the special volume.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the enumeration, I desire to ask, has the Minister the means of giving us any information as to the number of persons in the several Provinces who were put down as not being at that moment residents?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, I say this Census is not worth the paper on which it is written. We have a number of people who are residents in other countries and who may or may not return to us, and I think some sort of record should have been kept whereby they could be checked.

Mr. McLELAN. It was only those who were temporarily absent.

Mr. DAVIES. I know, with regard to Prince Edward Island, that the person who took the Census informed me that his instructions were to ask the head of the house whether any of his family were absent, and whether he believed they would return again at any time, and if he believed they would return, he was to put them down as residents.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say that only a few weeks ago I was speaking to a man who is prominent in Manitoba politics, and he said that the Census of that Province was not to be relied upon, because a number of Ontario people who had gone to that Province were counted as being residents of Ontario, and therefore the population of Manitoba was less than it should have been.

Mr. MILLS. I know, with regard to one item, that is the manufacture of staves, there is one establishment in Wallaceburg which turns out more than are here given to the county of Kent, and I believe there are several more in that county which turn out more work than is credited to the whole Province.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid it is as clear as daylight that this Census has been compiled with such horrible inaccuracy that none of us can venture to make any calculations which are based upon its figures. Now if there is one thing more than another which should be carefully and accurately taken, it is this Census—this decennial stock-taking of the nation. Here we have been asked for $400,000, in different estimates, to get an authoritative statement of the population and other statistics of the Canadian people, and yet, after such gross mistakes as hon. gentlemen have pointed out, it is shown that this money has been wasted, and worse than wasted, and information of the most valuable character that we could have had, information which would have been of the greatest use to us in the future, has been left out of these volumes. For example, in the Census which is taken in England and Ireland, the classes of the houses are given—houses which are of one, two, or three, or more than three rooms are classified. I remember calling the attention of the Department to the desirability of having this information, but no attention was paid to the suggestion, though all sorts of insignificant information is given—or attempted to be given, for I fear it is not accurately—and this enormous sum of money has been

spent, and we have not even got an accurate enumeration of the number of people in Canada when the Census was taken.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think there is any disposition to make this a party question; but it is a matter much to be regretted, that this decennial stock-taking of the nation, as it has been called, is not reliable. There is no doubt, if we are to compile information of a reliable character, one of the first steps to be taken by the Department of Agriculture is, to lay plans now for the rectification of these mistakes. The Minister of Agriculture takes credit for the fact, that the last volume of the Census is to be issued three years after the Census has been taken, but I really do not think that much credit would be taken in any other country, for celerity of that description. In 1880, the Compendium of the United States Census, the tabular statement of the information compressed, was issued the following year—I think within less than twelve months of the time the Census was taken, and I think within two years all the tables were issued.

Mr. McLELAN. You did not get any of them this last year.

Mr. CHARLTON. But the Compendium containing all this information in abstract form was issued promptly, and it detracts very much from the value of the Census return to wait for two or three years before getting it; and even in this case, when you do get it, it is found to be utterly unreliable, which, I should say, is something to be sorry for, at all events. I do not speak in any party sense, but it is in the interests of all parties that these returns should be full, complete, and reliable, and I hope that the Department will so arrange their staff that that evil will be remedied in future.

Mr. WELDON. I find that it is not only the statistics of the city of St. John which are at fault. Taking the edge-tool factories, I find that on page 444, these factories turned out 48,160 of such tools, while on page 568, we find that edge-tools have disappeared altogether, and they are not to be found in New Brunswick at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it is only proper to ask that if there be blame in the office staff, with regard to this work, which is admittedly so incorrect——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not admitted at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think it is denied. I think the hon. gentleman himself would hardly venture to contend that they are correct. I fancy that the deductions from these figures would tell more against the position taken by the Government on a number of questions, than they would tell in their favour, in many instances. I would like to know if there is any reason to suppose that we may expect a better compilation in future. Has the same staff been retained, or might a change be made by which the work could be checked, and a better result secured?

Mr. DAVIES. I had not intended to speak, as I thought it was generally admitted that this Census was incorrect by both sides of the House; but as the hon. gentleman seems to deny that proposition, I will call his attention to the figures on nearly every page of the Census with regard to my own Province. I take the column headed potteries, and I find that for my own county no potteries are mentioned; but I know, as a matter of fact, there is a respectable pottery there, in which I have myself some capital, and which has turned out a large amount of ware.

Mr. COURSOL. Since when?

Mr. DAVIES. A good many years ago. I find the same omission with regard to book-binding. There is a good book-bindery in connection with the Summerside *Journal*; but there is nothing here of that industry at all. The whole thing, so far as I have examined it, with reference to the industries of Prince Edward Island, is totally, disgracefully inaccurate.

To meet expenses in connection with Dominion Exhibition $10,000 00

Mr. DAVIES. Before that vote is passed, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in charge of it what he intends to do with reference to a memorial which I understand has been addressed to him by the people of Prince Edward Island, asking that the exhibition should be held next year in that Province. During the past three or four years Prince Edward Island has sent a very large and very creditable display of horses, cattle, sheep, pigs, and farm produce of all kinds to the exhibitions held in Montreal, Halifax and St. John, and I believe in these articles, carried away a good many of the prizes. A strong effort has been made by the local authorities to induce the Government to have the exhibition held there next year. Very respectable sums have been subscribed by the municipalities and promised by the Local Government. I think it has been urged as an objection, that the Island being distant from the mainland, it would not be possible for the exhibition, if held there, to be a Dominion Exhibition, owing to the difficulty of transporting machinery and other heavy goods thither. But that objection is lessened in force by the fact that though you call it a Dominion Exhibition, it is not in reality a Dominion Exhibition. When held in the Maritime Provinces it is purely a Maritime Province Exhibition, so far as agricultural products are concerned; and wherever it is held, it is found that the distance from the remote parts of the Dominion are so great that the exhibition is practically, to a large extent, a Provincial one. Unless there are insuperable difficulties in the way, I think the next exhibition ought to be held in Prince Edward Island, where very strong efforts will be made in every respect to render it a great success. Of course, it would be no more than a Maritime Province Exhibition, but a Maritime Provincial Exhibition could be held as well in Prince Edward Island as anywhere else. I think the memorial sets forth the reasons very fully in favour of the exhibition being held in that Province.

Mr. McLELAN. The memorial has been received, but no decision has been arrived at.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been customary, when this vote has been taken, for the Government to announce where the exhibition, for which it is made, is to be held. That information has never been refused until now. I observe that this vote is retained at the figure to which, if I remember rightly, it was raised last year. I think the original vote was $5,000; but it was raised last year to $10,000, because the exhibition at St. John was a Centennial as well as a Dominion Exhibition, and it is now kept at the increased amount. I mentioned, early in the history of this vote, that I was of opinion that it would not be a successful vote; but I thought that once it was commenced, it was reasonable that it should be continued until one round of the Provinces was made; and I do not therefore propose to object until the exhibition visits the different Provinces in turn. But if it be the case, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has said, that the exhibitions, as a matter of fact, are Provincial and not Dominion Exhibitions, so far, at any rate, as animals and agricultural products are concerned, we are practically only making a grant in aid of a Provincial exhibition every year. I would like to know if this increased vote is going to be kept up; and we ought to know, if not to-night, at any rate upon Concurrence, the decision of the Government as to the locality at which the exhibition is to be held.

Mr. McLELAN. The policy of the Minister is to devote a great part of this vote to the transport of products, so as to give the exhibition a Dominion character. A very great part of last year's vote was used for the transport of pro-

ducts from Manitoba, and a considerable portion of the balance for the transport of articles from the more distant parts of the Dominion to the city of St. John, and I presume that the intention of the Minister is to use a considerable portion of this sum in the same way.

Mr. BAKER. I think that Prince Edward Island has no cause of complaint if the exhibition is not held there. I think by right of priority British Columbia can claim it. That Province is a little further off, but I think we are as much entitled to the exhibition as Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WATSON. British Columbia is too far west and Prince Edward Island is too far east. I think Manitoba is entitled to have this exhibition. The Prairie Province could produce a very good exhibition, and I think that it would be in the interest of the country to hold it in Winnipeg. The claim of Manitoba should certainly be considered by the Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose it will hardly be possible to make the Dominion Exhibition quite as good as we would like it, because the live stock display is a very important part of it, and it cannot be expected that people will trust their live stock to a long journey. But I think that if the Minister spends the money in the way of transporting goods, the object of the vote will be as fully accomplished as possible. In bringing men together from long distances to attend these exhibitions, we are perhaps recompensed for the money expended.

Mr. HESSON. It seems to me that the time is come when we should do away with this vote altogether. Our western fairs and exhibitions at London, Guelph and Toronto are greater successes than our Dominion Exhibitions, and dispense with any necessity for the latter.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not desirable to do away with this exhibition, because, confining it altogether to the matter of animals and productions, very great advantages have been derived from these exhibitions. When the exhibition was held at Montreal, the Island went to great expense in transporting stock to Montreal, and our farmers found a good many imported breeds there which they had not on the Island. All those exhibitions have the result of bringing about an interchange of stock, and lead to the introduction of new breeds into outlying places.

Mr. BLAKE. Why continue the double vote of last year, which was made double for reasons connected with the St. John Exhibition?

Mr. McLELAN. It was found that this sum was required, in order to give this exhibition a Dominion character.

To meet expenses in connection with Health Statistics..... .... $15,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. $20,000 were voted last year, and but a small portion was expended. It is proposed to revote $15,000 for the coming year. Arrangements have been made with the health officers in the different parts of the Dominion to make returns connected with the public health of the cities, and all the principal cities will have officers. The salary in Montreal is $451, in Toronto, $315, Quebec, $256, Halifax, $190, St. John, $165, Charlottetown, $128, Winnipeg, $119, Victoria, $114. The returns, printing, stationery and other expenses connected with this work, will require a considerable amount, and it is proposed to obtain returns from second-class towns. In any case, the amount will not exceed $15,000. The object is to obtain the classes of disease, the sex and age, and whether single or married, of those who have succumbed.

Mr. WILSON. By what method will you collect these statistics?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a different system in almost every city, and the officers will do the best they can to get information.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the intention to collect statistics of the causes of disease?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. They will be mortuary, not health statistics?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. I am satisfied that the statistics are not copied from the Ontario report. Those are very carefully prepared.

Mr. ORTON. I think, in connection with this matter, something might be said. The money has been expended so far in collecting mortuary statistics. Now, with regard to the public health, these statistics are comparatively of little value, but it is important that the Government of this country should attend more thoroughly than they have in the past to the public health of the people. We find to-day, in some of our cities, epidemics existing to an alarming extent. In the city of Winnipeg, typhoid fever and diphtheria, and other diseases, have prevailed that can and ought to be stamped out. When diseases occur among animals—foot disease or pleuro-pneumonia—we find the Government at once on the alert and prepared to stamp out such diseases which occur among cattle, but we find our fellow-countrymen, some of the very best of our citizens, cut down daily by diseases that can be very easily prevented. The importance of this matter has been suggested by the medical men of the Dominion frequently to the Government, and it has been urged, during this Session, upon the Government, that it would be proper and wise to appoint medical officers throughout the Dominion, to report at least once a month to the Central Bureau, with regard to this class of diseases, so that the Government might be in possession of the actual facts in connection with the prevalence of disease throughout the Dominion. It is very true that the municipalities are under the control of the Local Legislatures and that they alone can put into operation any laws that are required for the preservation of the public health, but there is one fact in connection with this, that if health officers were appointed throughout the country by the Dominion Government, their reports would have very great weight. Not long ago some actions were brought against the corporation of Winnipeg for gross negligence in regard to public health, and damages were recovered from the municipality for sickness which could have been easily prevented. If these reports were made regularly to the Government by properly appointed medical officers, the municipalities would be on the alert, as they would find themselves subject to damage if they neglected the public health, as they have in the past. If a hole occurs in the streets, or a grating is broken, or injury occurs to a horse, or any individual is injured, they are liable to damages, and they ought to be also liable for neglect of the ordinary means of preventing epidemic diseases, such as typhoid fever, diphtheria, and other diseases which are easily preventible. I hope the Government will consider favourably the suggestions made by the medical men of the Dominion. I do not believe that more would be required than the sum which is in the Estimates this year, to carry out effectually a system of supervision of the public health by the Dominion Government. If medical officers were appointed, even in every constituency, to make a report once a month to the Central Bureau in Ottawa, the Government would be in possession of the condition of the health of the whole people, and it could be done at a trifling expense. I believe medical men could be found who would willingly give a thorough and complete report once a

month for a small sum. It was estimated by the medical men that twelve reports in the year could be easily furnished at a cost of $24 for each medical officer.

Mr. BLAKE. How many officers, do you think?

Mr. ORTON. In that case, I suppose as many officers as there are members in the House of Commons. That was one suggestion. There are small villages and towns in almost every constituency, and there might be some little alteration in regard to the basis, but on that basis the cost would not exceed $20,000 a year. There is a sanitary journal printed in Ottawa, which the Government subsidized to some extent last year, and I believe the Department is taking into their consideration the propriety of again subsidizing that journal, and also one to be printed in French, in regard to this important matter of public health.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I wish to correct an error into which the acting Minister of Agriculture has unwittingly tumbled. Nothing was done in regard to the collection of mortuary statistics, in Victoria, last year, although the city of Victoria was mentioned in the list of names given by him. Although our mortality is very small, we are desirous that the rest of the Dominion should know the health and the state of our climate, and we think an officer should be appointed for that purpose, as in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. McLELAN. In the margin, it is stated that the position was not filled.

Mr. MILLS. Who is at the head of this Mortuary Branch now?

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquiries and let you know.

For collecting and compiling agricultural, industrial, and other statistics in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and also for acquiring and compiling such statistics elsewhere.....$20,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. This was a subject we discussed a little, last time, and I presume, as this is a revote, the Minister has not done anything. It is a very important vote, and met with cheerful acceptance from this side of the House last Session. I am sorry that nothing has been done, and I should like to know, as I suppose some plan has been adopted, what the plan is for expending this money.

Mr. McLELAN. The statistics are proposed to be gathered through the officers of the Government of Manitoba, and through the officers of the Department of Agriculture, resident in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and to be returned monthly.

Mr. BLAKE. If that is all, why was it not done? We gave the vote a year ago.

Mr. CARON. It has been done.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it has been done without any expenditure, and you do not want any more money.

Mr. McLELAN. There has been an expenditure of $2,840 during the past season?

Mr. BLAKE. With what result?

Mr. McLELAN. The returns were laid upon the Table of the House some time ago.

Mr. BLAKE. If $2,840 has produced the result, what does the Minister want $20,000 for?

Mr. McLELAN. To enlarge the system, and get more frequent and more correct information, if possible.

Mr. BLAKE. I stated when this vote was taken last time that I thought the Minister who had brought down a proposal which was going to involve a present charge and the creation of a new branch of his office, should lay before Parliament a plan or system upon which he intended to expend that money; that it was his business to have matured that plan and brought it before us, so that we might understand whether his proposals were workable and could meet with our commendation. The hon. gentleman who is Minister of the Department declined to bring forward any plan at all. It appeared to be wholly experimental, though he has had a year, and in one case two years, to work upon. Now we get no more information on that subject at all. We do not understand intelligently what the matured plan is. Amongst the things I would like to know in regard to the item agricultural, industrial and other statistics in Manitoba and the North-West, is it intended to expend any portion of this money in procuring any statement with reference to emigration into that country, or the population in Manitoba and the North-West Territories?

Mr. McLELAN. Not under this vote. I will explain to the hon. gentleman that all the Provincial officers were employed in making these returns, and that a certain number of the officers of the Department had also been employed in making monthly returns. These have been laid on the Table in manuscript. It is proposed that some system will be devised during the next year, and that the present returns and those of the succeeding year will require the whole of the sums asked for for their publication.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the item under the asterisk, "for registration of births, marriages and deaths, Quebec" which is said in the margin not to be shown in last year's Estimates?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a Statute existing under which this sum is paid and under which these returns are procured from the Auditor-General. They have always been paid for and not shown for in this form; they are shown in the Appropriation Accounts.

MILITIA.

58. Public armouries and care of arms, including pay of store-keepers, caretakers, storemen, and armourers..... .... $52,000 00

Mr. CASEY. What supervision is exercised over the location of the armouries? Is there any inspection to see whether they are fireproof or not?

Mr. CARON. The greatest possible supervision is exercised over them. In the small towns, the armouries are generally connected with the drill shed. In Montreal, Quebec and other large cities, they are under the care of our armourers.

Mr. VAIL. Are the arms in a better condition than they formerly were. The General in command reported that, particularly in Quebec, the arms were in a very bad state. When I was in the Department we engaged two or three armourers to do some work on them. I should like to know whether there is any report on the state of the arms in the rural districts.

Mr. CARON. Since the hon. gentleman has ceased to be Minister of Militia, there has been a wonderful improvement. If he will refer to the Report laid on the Table he will find that the armouries have been looked after very carefully, and by competent men.

Mr. CASEY. Are the arms insured?

Mr. CARON. No; the Government are their own insurers.

Mr. CASEY. The Government, I think, would find it to their advantage to insure them, as many of the drill sheds are old wooden buildings.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. Minister has not yet stated whether the arms were found to be in good order. No

doubt the hon. gentleman was very glad to be able to make that statement, because it gave him an opportunity for spending money, and of which the Committee has not yet received a satisfactory account.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman well knows that inspections are made twice a year by the Brigade-Majors, reports are sent in, and I am able to say that those reports are satisfactory.

59. Allowance for drill instruction..... ..... $40,000 00

Mr. CASEY. This is practically the allowance for captains.

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I have no hesitation in saying that as a general rule this allowance is a farce. There is no drill given in the rural battalions except those which are called upon to go to camp, from year to year, and in that case instruction is given while they are in camp, and the officers are paid to do it at one time. I confess that it was largely owing to the absurdity of having to sign receipts for cheques received for instruction, when no drill instruction was given, when no drill instruction was expected, that I was induced to resign my position on the force. This money is simply an allowance to captains, which is intended to be used and which it is known will be used, for some other purpose. In my case it was handed over for the purposes covered by the previous vote, and it went to the sergeant who looked after the rooms. Some captains gave it towards the band fund, and in some cases it was given for purposes altogether different from the drill fund. If it is intended as an assistance to the officers, in meeting the expenses which they are called upon to incur, I think it should be so stated; but to give the money nominally for drill instruction, when it is known that no drill instruction is given, is so absurd that I think it should be discontinued. I do not say that the money should not be given, but I say that it should not be given under this head. If the hon. gentleman gave it ostensibly as an allowance for officers, or for the care of rooms, or to the band fund, instead of its nominal object, I should not object to it.

Mr. CARON. Under the regulations which have already been followed, I think it would be a great injustice to deprive the rural battalions of the drill instruction required. The hon. gentleman knows that companies going into camp receive $40, while those not going into camp receive $20. I think this is money well invested, because they require the instruction.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that the money is used for a certain purpose. I do not propose that the money should be taken away, but I say it is not used for drill instruction, because no drill instruction is given.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). The hon. member for Elgin and myself reside in adjoining constituencies, and in the rural constituency for which I speak, they are drilled regularly, and they are in such a condition that they are able to fire without killing a cow. I am also happy to state that, from time to time, they select men from their company to go and compete with adjoining companies, and that they are in an excellent state at the present moment. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, that even in the battalion to which he belonged, the efficiency is much better than when he belonged to it. I think it is desirable that the money should be expended, and expended in this way. A good deal of pains is taken with the men, and the men take a great deal of care in rendering themselves as efficient as possible. I say, however, that I do not think the men have been as well clothed latterly as they should have been. I say that, taking the amount voted into consideration, the Department should have furnished better clothing. The volunteers, as we know, take great pride in being as neat as possible, and if their clothing is worn out, they do not take the same trouble to keep themselves in an efficient state as if they were better clothed. Taking into account the amount expended, however, there is no doubt that it produces as good results as any money spent in the Department.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman speaks with great positiveness as to the Militia in the rural districts. The hon. gentleman lives in London, and I do not know that he has any special facilities for knowing the condition of the volunteers in the rural districts.

Mr. MACMILLAN. Except that I take the trouble and you don't.

Mr. CASEY. Except that none of the rural companies have drilled, except at the regular annual drill.

Mr. MACMILLAN. Take the case of Dorchester, and a number of other places.

Mr. CASEY. Well, I cannot say as to that. I only know the peculiar circumstance that that information never reached me, although I live near those points. In fact, in my constituency, there is not, and never has been, regular company drill, and I have never heard that any other rural districts have it, so that the county of Middlesex must be a perfect oasis of drill amidst a wild desert of inefficiency. The hon. gentleman has been pleased again to resurrect the celebrated cow. I have allowed it to be resurrected several times this Session without saying anything about it That cow has been dead now three or four years, and I am afraid that she is really not in a very odoriferous condition to be resurrected. But, in all seriousness, this money does not really secure drill instruction, which is secured in the camps, and in those almost alone, so far as the rural districts are concerned, and this money is actually paid for a different purpose from that for which it is put down.

Mr. CARON. It is paid on the certificate of the Brigade-Major.

Mr. CASEY. Well, that goes as a matter of course. I know the Brigade-Major to have certified when there has been no company drill; and he looked upon the rule with reference to it as a legal fiction, which everybody understood, and it is so looked upon by the officers of the battalion. It should be put under its proper heading.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have no desire to oppose this vote. While there might be a good deal of exception taken to it, I do not think it is the most objectionable vote taken in the Militia estimates. I rise to give my explanation of the case of the Middlesex battalion referred to by the hon. member for East Middlesex. From my personal knowledge, in the ten years in which I have had some acquaintance with the battalion in question, I have never known a single company to turn out, except in the years when they were called out for battalion drill. I have had the honour to hold a commission in that battalion for about ten years, and I think I would have known the fact had a company turned out for drill at any time during that period. But it is known that the money expended is not supposed to represent the actual amount of drill which is undergone; it is supposed to represent the amount of exertion the captain puts forth to keep his company in order, and the purpose mentioned for which this sum is voted is only the ostensible purpose, and not the real purpose. The companies never turn out for drill, other than at the times when they are mustered to drill in battalion, and it is well that the Committee should know it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Last year, I took occasion to question very seriously the manner in which this money is paid, and I do so again now. There is a great deal of unfairness

about it; it is given irrespective altogether of whether the officer commanding a company earns it or not. The man who does his duty is placed on the same footing as the man who does not. This evil could be remedied by adopting a regulation that when a battalion goes to camp, as every battalion ought to do every year, a short examination should be made by some staff officer, appointed for the purpose, to ascertain whether the officers of companies had attended to drill during the year, according to a certain proportion previously fixed upon, and whether he had brought his men to the camp in a proper degree of efficiency. This could be done without any loss of time, and without any trouble or expense. There ought to be payment according to results, not only with regard to the officer commanding a company, but with regard to the men enrolled in it, and those men who have attained a certain standard of efficiency should not be placed on the same footing as those who are recruits. The great evil of our force is its want of stability. What we want is not to bring a certain number to the camp, but that the men will remain in the force for the term for which they are enrolled. If that were done, the force would attain both greater efficiency and greater stability. No officer should be entitled to this grant for drill instruction, who has not done anything to earn it during the year. There are captains of companies who never see their men, and know nothing about them from one year's end to the other, but who are placed on the same footing as those who keep their men together, and see that they have a certain amount of drill during the year. The Minister of Militia could regulate this matter by a Departmental Order, to the effect that no money shall be paid to any officer who goes to the camp without having performed a certain standard, be it high or low, which he lays down. In that way, a distinction will be drawn between the officer who does his duty and the one who does not.

Mr. VAIL. I am not disposed to find much fault with this vote. As the hon. member for West Elgin points out, it is really not pay for drill instruction. It is considered rather as a sort of perquisite for the captain of a company, who is subject to some expense and is intended to be an encouragement to him to keep his company up. I think we might fairly allow this vote to pass, because it is money spent in the interest of the force, and is of some value.

Mr. FISHER. Although the returns may be quite correct as to the number of men who come up for drill instruction, injustice has been done, in some instances, to certain individuals, in regard to the payment of this sum. The hon. Minister of Militia, a few minutes ago, said that the companies' corps in the rural districts were drilled. In the district from which I come, it is not known that the rural companies are drilled, except on such occasions as they go to camp. In the instance of a battalion in my own county, which went to camp last summer, this pay has been with held from three captains of companies of that battalion, in consequence, I believe, of the recommendation of the Major-General in command, Major-General Luard, which is contained on page four:

"36. (11th) *Pay.*—The sad weakness of many of the companies attending the camps, in spite of orders issued, establishes the necessity for doing something to induce men to act up to their promises at enrollment and attend camp when ordered. To give more pay is one method. As this has already been done as regards officers and non-commissioned officers, I hope it may also be done for the men. When it is remembered that a dollar a day is by no means a high wage for a labouring man, and that the rural militiaman who comes to camp has frequently to pay a substitute on his farm, an increase to the present pay of the Militia appears reasonable. Another method might be to stop drill pay from Captains whose companies do not come to camp in fair numbers, say two-thirds of total establishment. Ample notice, say four months, should also be given as to the date of the camp, so that the men may make arrangements for their labour at home to be done by others during their absence."

I find that, as I said, the pay of three captains of the battalion was stopped, I believe, in consequence of the fact that they came to camp with small companies. I understand from the hon. Minister of Militia that that is the case. I think that is an injustice to those officers. In the case of two of them, with whose work I am personally familiar, I know that they spent from a week to ten days before the drill commenced at St. John's camp in doing their utmost to get the men to come to camp, but at the time the men were earning $1.50 per day with board at home and could not be induced to go to camp for 50 cents per day. Some men who had enlisted for the service and were bound to go, ran away and could n t be found simply because they could get better wages at home than they could in camp. It is, consequently, an injustice, because the Department will not pay the men sufficiently to attend camp, that these officers should be made to suffer. The work they performed was really heavier than if they had drilled their own companies at home. If this is the only reason for stopping this pay, and it is the only reason I can see by the report, such injustice should be remedied and those officers should have their pay given to them, as it was not their fault that the companies were short at camp.

Mr. CASEY. I think this money should be paid under the heading for which it is actually used. It should be given as a gratuity to the captains of the companies and be stated as a perquisite, so that the House should know what this money is paid for.

Mr. FISHER. Has the Department adopted the recommendation of General Luard as a General Order.

Mr. CARON. The very case to which the hon. gentleman referred proves the view I have taken is the correct one. He said that three captains who did not turn out full companies did not receive the money which is guaranteed by the Government in that case. This shows that we make a difference between companies that are drilled up to a proper standard and those that are not. I think that is quite right.

Mr. FISHER. The other companies in that same battalion had not gone through any drill whatever till they came into the camp.

Mr. CARON. We have the certificates.

Mr. FISHER. That may be, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that in my county no company belonging to that battalion has done any drill whatever except in the camp.

Mr. CARON. I will look into it.

Mr. FISHER. Moreover, this is a gratuity in regard to the captains, and if it is to be given to one it ought to be given to all these companies that were short of a few men; it was not that their drill was bad or that their captains did not know their, drill; nothing of the kind; they simply found it impossible in consequence of the small pay given, to get the full complement of men.

Mr. CASEY. This shows the evil of which I was speaking, of having a legal fiction of this kind, which has deceived even the Minister. He has been actually under the impression that drill instruction was given. On this occasion there was a special report of the Major-General, and in consequence of that report, this drill instruction money was docked. But there is nothing to show that other companies have been equally deficient and still this drill money was given.

Mr. PAINT. I have been fifteen years an officer in the Militia, and a captain who cannot keep his company together does not deserve to have a company or to receive this drill money. I never had any trouble in keeping my company together with full numbers.

Mr. VAIL. I observe that the Minister of Militia did not expend the whole $40,000 last year, but only $37,000. If the statement made by my hon. friend behind me is correct, that some companies have been paid that did not perform any

more service than those referred to, and the Minister has some the money in hand, he should enquire into these cases, and if they are entitled to it, pay them.

Mr. FISHER. I can assure the hon. gentleman who spoke just now that, if those officers to whom I have alluded were wealthy men, they would have been glad to keep up their companies and supplement the miserable pay the Government of the country is giving to the Militia; but being, unfortunately for themselves and the service, not rich men, but men who work and earn their living from day to day on the farms on which they live, they are not in a position to do so, they are not in the position that city volunteer officers so often are. The consequence of such action as the Government has taken on this occasion is, and will be, that these officers will resign, their companies will be disbanded, and probably the whole regiment.

Mr. CASEY. The member for North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) brought up an instance of a company which appeared on parade at the Cobourg camp. He said: "He finds that some companies——"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is not in order, as he is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. CASEY. The fact has been brought to the notice of this House and the hon. Minister, that a company appeared at the Cobourg camp with one man and the full complement of officers, and that this man was utterly incompetent in the way of drill, for he was unable to perform the first operation in the way of forming fours, and this company——

Mr. DALY. I rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. member for East Elgin is talking to the question before the Committee.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. member for East Elgin was not speaking.

Mr. CASEY. I have called the attention of the Minister to this fact, that the company appeared, being a unit. I want to enquire of the Minister of Militia if the captain of this unique company was docked of his drill pay in consequence of the peculiar appearance put in.

59. Drill pay, and other incidental expenses connected with the drill and training of the Militia.....	$250,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What disposition does the Minister of Militia propose to make with respect to the troops that he will call out this year under this sum, and how many does he propose to employ?

Mr. CARON. This vote is required for the payment of annual drill of city corps and brigades of garrison artillery, with pay or rank without rations. About 9,000 men and 505 horses, twelve days drill at headquarters, $82,380; brigade camps, &c., pay of rank and rations, forage and transport, 1,222 horses, 10,000 officers and men, at an average of $1.10 each, $11,000 per day, $132,000; transport, at an average of $3 each man, $30,000; contingencies, such as rents of camp grounds, erection of rifle butts, &c., about $5,620; making for 17,000 officers and men and 1,727 horses, for twelve days' drill, $250,000.

Mr. VAIL. You do not drill half the force.

Mr. CARON. A little more than half.

Mr. VAIL. You have 45,000 men.

Mr. CARON. No; 37,000.

Mr. LISTER. Have any steps been taken to ascertain the number of men who drill this summer who drilled two years ago? As I understand the men are enlisted for three years, and are drilled biennially. It would be important to ascertain how many men appear a second time for drill.

Mr. CARON. We have done so to a certain extent, and we have had some reports sent in, stating the number of recruits, and the men who have been drilling for two successive camps.

Mr. LISTER. Can the Minister state what is the proportion?

Mr. CARON. I cannot now. It was not general, but we did get reports, and I mean to have it ascertained to a greater extent.

Mr. LISTER. I think it is understood that very few who go out once go out a second time. The way the volunteer force is at present, as far as the Active Militia is concerned, not taking into consideration the infantry companies and the batteries, it is a perfect waste of money. We have had evidence this evening that through the country the compaanies are not drilled at all. The only drill the militiamen receive is such drill as they get at the battalions, and, owing to the small pay the volunteers receive, it is in many cases impossible for the officers to fill up their companies, and if they do succeed, a very large proportion of the companies are filled up by young, inexperienced men, who have never drilled before, and probably never will again, and the whole money spent on these annual drills is actually thrown away. This is growing to be a very large charge upon the country. From about $500,000 a few years ago, it has grown to be something over $1,000,000. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, under the management of the Minister of Militia, we are not only having an Active Militia force, but the nucleus of a small army, adding very considerably to the cost to the country. I say it is a perfect waste of money. If the Militia were called upon to-morrow it would be impossible to get sufficient men to make an effectual defence of the country, and this will continue as long as the present system continues. I can only repeat what I said last Session, that, previous to 1878, gentlemen opposite told the militiamen and volunteers throughout the country that, if they returned to power, the pay the men were receiving would be increased. I do not now know how many men voted for them on that account, but that was the promise. We know that many of these men are clerks in stores, receiving all of them greater pay than this. It is no inducement whatever for those men to turn out to camp, and if they can evade the service at all, they will evade it, and new men are put in to fill up the companies. Those men never go out the second time. The twelve or thirteen days' drill given to them is not sufficient at all to give them any information as to their duties as soldiers, and they have no drill at home, and the consequence is that our volunteer force to-day is a body of raw recruits who actually know nothing at all. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher) called attention to the fact that the pay the men were receiving now was quite inadequate. I might say the staff officers have had their pay increased, and every other officer in the Militia service, except the volunteers themselves. Now, Sir, I recognize the fact that in order to increase the pay of the Militia as we now have it, would necessitate a considerably larger vote than we are making, but I think it would be much better to double the pay the men are now receiving, and reduce the force to 15,000 or 18,000 men, and in that way we would offer sufficient inducement to young men to join the Militia force, and get them to go out, at all events, during these drills. I think, also, that men ought to be drilled every year; that biennial drill is not sufficient; that by the time they have been called out the second time, the chances are that they have forgotten the instruction they received the first drill. I could not support any movement towards increasing this Militia expenditure, but I believe it would be well for the Minister to consider the propriety of reducing the force and increasing the pay, and to offer other inducements to men to remain in the service and become proficient. Another point I wish to mention is, that the arms the men

now have are ten or fifteen years behind the age. They are of no use, compared with the modern arm with which soldiers of other countries are armed. Another point is in relation to the medicine furnished to the troops. At the camp at London last season all the medicine could be bought up for $5. I know, as a matter of fact, that men who are receiving only 50 cents a day had to go to the city and pay more than $1.50 to buy medicine for themselves. The officers did not have it, and it was not there for them. The officers have spoken to me on the subject, and I think I have only to mention the matter to the Minister to have that fault remedied. When men are taken away, as these volunteers are, to London and other places, the change in living, the season of the year, and many other things, combine to bring on sickness of a temporary character. They have to be attended to, but unless the medicine chest is ample and well supplied, these men have to pay for what is required out of their own pockets, or the offices have to pay it for them. I have been spoken to on this matter both by officers and by men, and I feel sure that I have only to bring it to the notice of the Minister to have it attended to.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This is the most important item of the Militia vote. I agree with a great deal that has been said by the last speaker. We know there is no member of this House more thoroughly alive to the needs of the men and the force than the Minister himself. I am certain that if he had it in his power he would lose no time in taking measures that the whole force, or a great majority of it, should be drilled every year, and until that is done it must be admitted that a great deal of our money is wasted. With regard to the pay of the men, I may remark that it is impossible to pay men who join the active force the same ratio of wages that is paid to those in civil pursuits, nor do I think it is necessary for us to do so, because I believe there are many men who are willing to enter the force and remain in it for much less pay than they would get in civil pursuits. But the great evil of the present system is this, that the recruit and the drilled man are placed upon the same footing. What we can do without incurring a much greater expense is to place the drilled man upon a better footing than the recruit. As I said on a former occasion, with regard to the allowances given to captains of companies, we ought to give payment according to results—that all the men who go to camp and who have attained a certain degree of efficiency should get increased pay as compared with those who have not attained that efficiency. The same examination would test whether the captain had, during the year, qualified himself to receive an allowance, and would also test the number of men in his own company who were entitled to receive pay as efficient. That is done in the old country, where every man in the volunteer force is placed on the same footing, and after he has attained a certain qualification he is entitled to a certain capitation grant. That might be done in our force. Every man who goes to camp, and who can show by examination before staff officers that he is in a certain position as regards annual drill, should be placed in a better position than the man who has just come to-day and may go to-morrow. We want more stability in our force, we want to give it more reality, and in order to induce the men to remain in the force, we must put the man who has attended last year, and who is willing to attend this year, and who intends to attend next year, in a better position than the man who merely joins to-day because it happens to suit him and will be away next drill day. The force can be made more efficient in this respect by putting every corps, when it comes to camp, through a certain course of examination, testing not only the officers but the men, and if a certain proportion have attained a certain degree of efficiency, the captain should get a better allowance, because it will be evident that he has done something to earn it, and the men who have attained that degree of efficiency ought to get additional pay as compared with those who have not. That will also give an extra inducement to men to join the force. The cause of weakness is not so much the amount of pay as the unfair way in which it is distributed. Then we ought to arrive at that position in which the whole force will be drilled every year. There is undoubtedly a great waste of money at present. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the consideration, that while the old Provinces at present are naturally expected to bear the chief burden of defence of this country, we are forming great Provinces in the west where the maintenance of a certain force will become not only desirable but necessary. We cannot therefore expect the force of this country always to remain in the same proportion to the population that it is at present. Therefore, if we are further to incur a greater expenditure upon Militia, we must apportion it according to population, and if we extend our force, as we must do in the North-West, we must also look for a certain diminution of it in the old Provinces, all of which tends to a rearrangement of our forces in regard to the amount of money to be expended. Until we arrive at the conclusion to make such an expenditure as will drill the whole force, our system must be considered very incomplete. One of the greatest troubles of the officers commanding regiments is, that they never know when their regiments will be called out for service. Upon that point there ought to be no doubt. Every officer commanding a battalion ought to know that upon a certain day in a certain month his regiment will go to camp. If that is understood, when employers of labour make contracts, they will know beforehand that such a man belongs to the force and that at such a period he will have to loose so many days in camp. But now, when a man makes a contract at so many dollars per month, and when the man comes to him and says that he must go to camp for a certain number of days, the employer very likely will object to losing his services and may think that he has been unfairly dealt with. But, the man is under orders to go, and he has to go or else he is responsible for the penalties. But, if it was known beforehand that he was going, then no such misunderstanding could arise; both could be aware of the fact and make their contract accordingly. I have been asked by several persons connected with my regiment: "Are we going to camp this year?" I can give them no answer on this point. But there ought to be no uncertainty. It ought to be known absolutely that a certain corps is going to drill at a certain period. I desire also to call the Minister's attention to the fact that a large amount of money might be saved by a reorganization of the military districts. The second military district in which I am, extends from the north shore of Georgian Bay to Lake Erie. Men are called on to spend an unnecessary amount of time in going to and from camp; it is contrary to all strategetical considerations, and great inconvenience as well as loss of time arises. Another consideration is this: Under the present system, the rural and city battalions are separated from each other, not only as regards drill, but in other respects, so as to place them on an entirely different footing. Country battalions never see suburban battalions, and *vice versa*. This should not be, and camps should be so arranged, and might be so arranged, that when a district is called to go to camp, the rural battalions should be called on to take part in the movements. In that way a certain sympathy would be called forth between them. The great thing, however, to be arrived at is, absolute certainty as to the time and duration of the drill, so that both employers and employees, when they make a contract for labour, can understand at what time the camp will be held, and that every man belonging to the camp will be expected to attend.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suggest that the item be passed, and the remaining discussion be postponed until Concurrence, and with that understanding no more items will be proceeded with this evening.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECEPTION OF REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that, as the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills will expire to-morrow, the same be extended until Tuesday, the 1st April next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE *DEBATES*.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in moving the adoption of the Third Report (page 1,022) of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the *Debates* of the present Session, said: This report simply recommends the payment to Mr. Mathewson, who is one of the type-writers in the reporting office, of the sum of $130 for the Session for the work of taking care of the caligraphs. He is a man of very great experience, of some mechanical genius, and he has been employed in that work, and I believe has saved much more than this amount. The report also recommends the obtainment of another caligraph, in case of any accident to any of them, as there is now the exact number which is required for the amanuenses.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what is the prime cost of a caligraph?

Mr. WHITE. I really cannot state. I think it is something over $100.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought it was something like $70 or $80, and, if so, it appears to me that we are paying for repairs the price of two caligraphs every year.

Mr. WHITE. $100, I am told, is the price of the caligraphs; but they are a very delicate machine and liable to get out of order, and, consequently, somebody is needed on the spot who is able to repair them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Might I ask the chairman of the Committee if I read the report aright, which recommends that a new arrangement be entered into with our reporting staff?

Mr. WHITE. That is another report.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. COURSOL. Do I understand that the translators are included in this report?

Mr. WHITE. This is not the report to which the hon. gentleman refers. I am going to move the second report in a moment.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Scriver, that the Fourth Report (page 1,022) of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Report of the *Debates* of the House for the present Session, be adopted. This report is of a somewhat more serious character. It recommends that the reporters be created permanent officers of the House, and that they get an annual salary of $2,000. Now, I am well aware that when we commenced the *Hansard* we obtained the services of the reporters at $1,000 a year—or, rather, for the Session—the understanding at that time being that the reporters would find employment during the recess of Parliament by which they would be enabled to supplement the $1,000. It is due, however, to say that the leading members of the staff, those who were really the most valuable members of the staff, always protested from the first that that salary was not sufficient, and they accepted the position in order to establish on a permanent basis this system of official reporting, and to illustrate by their work that such a system could be made a success. Subsequently it was found that the services of those gentlemen could not at all be retained at that salary, even with the aid of such outside work as they could get during the recess, and the Committee recommended an arrangement by which a progressive scale would be adopted, that is to say, they were to receive $100 extra, each Session, until the sum reached the maximum of $1,500 a Session, the payment being for the Session. That arrangement was found, however, to be practically inoperative; because, for instance, when we obtained the services last year of Mr. Richardson, one of the reporters, a gentleman who has had a very large experience and whose skill as a stenographer, as well as his general information—which is really almost as important as mere stenographic skill—made him a very desirable reporter, in order to secure his services we had to give him the larger sum. I may say the work of reporting the debates here is really very much more difficult than the ordinary work of reporting for newspapers. A mere mechanical stenographer has very little chance of success; and I believe I am right in stating that even the $1,500 has failed to secure applications from those who have had the largest experience as newspaper reporters and who would be most valuable at the table. Now I think the House will admit that if we are to have a system of official reporting at all, it is very desirable that the gentlemen who are engaged in that work should be of such skill, of such general intelligence, and of such general information and education, besides being good shorthand writers, as would enable us to have, at any rate, a reasonably correct report as the first report submitted to the House. Members of the House know that in the past, it has sometimes been a very serious matter with them, to find that, not the whole of the report, but certain takes—which is a technical term—were so confused and incorrect that really members were not represented as saying at all what they intended to say, and sometimes unfortunately an impression might be derived from the reports which was the opposite from what they intended to convey. Under these circumstances it becomes of the greatest consequence that the gentlemen who are engaged at these tables should be men of undoubted skill, and that we should pay them such a sum as would enable us always to secure the highest skill in the stenographic art. In the first place it was thought when a smaller salary was paid that these gentlemen would be able to obtain employment during recess; practical experience, however, has shown that there is very little

of that kind of work to be obtained. A system of law reporting by official stenographers has now been established in the courts both of Ontario and Quebec, and I suppose in the Lower Provinces, but I do not know how that is—and a good deal of the work which the official reporters at this table might formerly have done they are now precluded from doing. Then it has been complained by the regular newspaper reporters—and I think that complaint is not altogether foundationless—that the official reporters who are engaged in this House during the Session were in the habit during the recess of taking work at really a mere nominal cost, greatly to the prejudice of the regular newspaper reporters and greatly to their injury; and I think that that complaint has very good ground to rest upon. I am quite well aware that this means a considerable increase to the cost of official reporting, but if we are to have official reporting at all it is quite clear we must secure the best possible talent, and I have no hesitation in saying—and I say it as having some practical knowledge of matters of this kind—that I do not believe that there is to be found a staff anywhere in the world, in any legislative body, who have done their work better than the staff we have at the table at this time. It must be remembered that mistakes will sometimes occur, but it must also be remembered that many members do not speak very distinctly or loudly, and that sometimes they speak in the midst of noises in the House, which render it very difficult for the reporter to catch precisely what they are saying; but speaking of the reports as a whole I believe they will compare favourably with similar work done anywhere.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. I think we cannot do better, if we are to have these official reports, than to adopt this report. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the question as to whether we should have official reports or not is, of course, an entirely different question; but we have to remember that unless we have official reports, sitting, as we do, in the city of Ottawa, we must make up our minds to have no full reports of the proceedings of Parliament at all. Certain hon. gentlemen, leading members of the House, might be able to get their speeches published in full in the party newspapers on either side, and tolerably full reports of the proceedings on particular occasions might be made; but so far as the House at large is concerned, we would practically shut ourselves off from having reports of any kind whatever—whether that would be an unmixed evil or not is, of course, another question. But it does seem to me that, building up as we are the history of this country, our discussions in Parliament from year to year, forming the record of our doings, it is worth to the people of the country the sum of money involved to keep up these reports. In the report which was presented a statement made by the stenographers themselves was embodied, as that contained in fact the whole argument upon the subject. It will be seen that the amount now proposed to be given is rather less than the salaries prevailing in most of the States of the American Union. The House of Representatives have seven official stenographers, each of whom receives $5,000 a year; and in the United States, as everyone knows, the House of Representatives does not sit at night as a general rule, and the practice prevails there of gentlemen handing in their speeches, which does not obtain here, thus relieving very much the actual labour of the stenographers. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. COURSOL moved in amendment:

That the report be not now adopted, but be referred back to the Committee with instructions to amend it so as to ensure to the translators of the *Hansard*, salaries more in accordance with the work they have to perform.

He said: In proposing this amendment to refer the report back to the Committee, my intention is not to advocate a repeal of the suggestion contained in the report respecting the stenographers salaries—far from it—and it is also not my intention that anything should be said or deduced from my language or motion that might be considered as unfavourable to the present staff of reporters. Everyone knows the admirable manner in which the reporters have done their duty. They are all men of intelligence and education, they are perfect gentlemen, and well up to their duty, and the work they have given to the House and the country is a credit to themselves and those who employ them. So far as regards the augmentation of their salaries, I have full confidence in the judgment of the members of the Committee selected to deal with this question, and I am willing to support them. I am always prepared to pay whatever amount is fairly earned; and my object is not, as I have said, to oppose any recommendation regarding the reporters, but to secure justice to other employees in the performance of their duties on the *Hansard*—I mean the French translators. On the 17th of this month, while presenting this report, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), chairman of the Committee, made this remark:

"I am quite satisfied that some other method will have to be adopted, because the present method is going to be expensive. I think the Committee will probably see whether something cannot be done before the close of the Session, and to recommend some other method to the House.

This is the first year in which the staff of translators have been regular officers. Let us see what the staff will cost: one chief translator at $1,000; four translators at $800, $3,200; two translators, appointed lately, who are to receive $800; proof reader, $400; in all eight employees receiving $5,400. This means an increase of $,400 if we look at it from the standpoint of the amount paid in 1881. Since that year it has been found that by the contract system the work was not properly performed, that the *Debates* were not regularly issued, and it was therefore decided, and I believe judiciously so, to have the work done by an official staff. If it was proper to have the work done by contract we might as well say at once that nearly all Government work might be so performed; for there are very few offices in the Civil Service, the work of which might not be done by contract. Why was that not done? Because though money might be saved the service was inefficient. In 1875 the reporting of the *Debates* was given out by contract at a cost of $4,500. An official staff was afterward appointed and that system of reporting the *Debates* of the House has given satisfaction and no one probably is willing to ask for its repeal. But the expenses of that staff have been increasing, and they amount, as I will show presently, to $18,130. As regards the translation the increase is only $1,400, and yet it is considered enormous by those who would be prepared to give up the system. This year the cost of the reporting will be as follows: Chief reporter, $1,500; six reporters, $1,300 each; one at $1,100, eight amanuenses at $150 each; proof-reader, $800, making a total of $12,400. The proposal before the House is to have eight reporters at $2,000 each; eight amanuenses, at $150 each; one proof-reader, at $800, one machine repairer, $130, making a total expenditure of about $18,130, being an increase of $5,730 or $330 more than the whole cost of the translation. If you deduct from the $20,000 which is voted for the expense of the *Hansard*, $18,130 to be paid to the reporters, very little will be left for the translation work. The petition presented by the reporters in their legitimate desire to have an augmentation of salaries, contains the following statement:—

"It is perhaps hardly necessary to point out that our work is of a character commonly described as 'skilled' or 'expert,' and bears no comparison whatever with ordinary clerical or departmental work.

Yet we find that such officers as Clerks of Committees, Translators, Clerks of Votes and Proceedings, Journal Clerks, &c., are paid salaries from $1,500 to $1,800 per Session. It is unnecessary to enter into a comparison between the arduous and exacting nature of our work and the merely routine character of theirs."

I hope the translation of the *Hansard* is not comprised in that routine work. Everyone knows that the translation from English into French is work of a most difficult nature. In order to have the English language translated properly this work must be done by men of education, by masters of the language, who are able to give the genius of the language. The translator has to deal with questions of science, art, political economy, civil engineering, and other questions. If he is not well trained and is not a man of education, he cannot possibly make a good translation; and I believe it is a matter of as much interest to the French people of this country to have the *Hansard* well translated, as it is to the English population to have the English edition efficiently prepared. It is just that the English speakers should be well translated, and their remarks placed before the country in language which will do honour to the country and themselves. We have selected a translating staff, and why? Because it is composed of men of education, nearly all of whom are journalists and men of literature, and we know that, as in the case of the hon. member for Cardwell, journalists are always ornaments in this House, men who distinguish themselves by their talents and acquirments; and no doubt many of the young men of the translating staff, if they had seats on the floor of the House, would do honour to themselves. I think it is but fair that the translators should not be left in that position. I think that these men who were brought here a year ago should not be set adrift and left out in the cold because it is necessary to supplement the salaries of the reporting staff. I admit without hesitation that the *Hansard* reporters ought to be well paid. I am aware of the labour they perform, for we are day by day witnesses of the great work devolving upon them. The translators are kept closed up in their rooms, they have a great deal of important work to do which cannot be done by the help of machinery, which is not done by sound, or in a mechanical way, but by their own labour, and they have to continue that work for months after the Session is over. It is impossible for seven men to do all that work, which is done by the eight men who are on the reporting staff, aided by their amanuenses and by mechanical appliances. Now, Sir, I hope, and I have no doubt the House will see to it, that the French translators shall be properly dealt with, and not left in a position which will compel them to abandon their duties—duties which they like, and which they expected, like the reporters, would make a career for them, so as to render it an object to them to make themselves perfectly masters of their work, so as to make a living upon which they could depend. As to the contract system, I object to it as applied to the French reporters, while the English reporters are appointed on an official system. I would ask that equal justice be done to all, and I have no doubt that the House will see that it is done.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the motion he has made as an amendment to the report, because the question of the translation of the *Debates* is, at this moment, engaging the attention of the Committee, and they hope soon to present a report expressly upon the subject, when the motion will be more applicable to the report itself. The hon. gentleman seems to draw a distinction between the French reporters with the English reporters. There are two French reporters standing exactly in the same position with the English reporters, and they are to receive the same salary.

Mr. COURSOL. I do not mean the reporters, I mean the translators.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). So far as the translation is concerned that is rather a different subject from the reporting, and I think it would be better to discuss it on a report relating to that matter. There are on the Committee three French gentlemen who are thoroughly familiar with what is required with regard to the French translation, and as they are present I think I may say that it has always been the desire of the Committee to meet their views both as to the appointment of the translators, the remuneration they are to receive, and all matters connected with their work. I think the hon. gentleman may fairly leave it to the Committee to consider the whole question and to make a report upon it, because it is quite clear from the experience we have had with the present system, with the present number of translators—we may have to increase the number though we may continue the system—the present number will not enable us to do what is the earnest desire of the Committee should be done, that is, to give to the French members of the House their corrected, translated report at as early a date as possible. One of the misfortunes of the system was the want of a sufficient number of translators, and I believe the French copy is now considerably behind. I am sure that cannot be the desire of anyone,—it certainly is not the desire of the Committee. The Committee desires that the French copy should be in the hands of the French members at the earliest possible moment, and I am sure the House can trust the Committee, constituted as it is, to take up the whole question in such a way as to do fair justice to the translators, and what is perhaps more important in some respects, to the French members of the House. I hope the hon. gentleman will consent to withdraw his motion as an amendment to the report and allow the report to go. We will have a meeting in the beginning of the week when the whole question of the translating will come up, and we will then be able to discuss it.

Mr. COURSOL. After the explanations of the chairman of the Committee I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. DESJARDINS As one member of the *Debates* Committee, I may be allowed to bear testimony to the correctness of what has been said by the chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Cardwell We have always been met with a full and earnest desire to do justice to the French part of the system by those connected with the Committee. As has been said, the question of having a permanent staff was discussed years ago, and this year that system is on its trial. It has been found that the four translators who were appointed at the beginning of the Session were insufficient, and two others were added, and besides the assistance of the French reporters has been secured in the work of translation. Now, we have already recommended $2,000 more towards the expense of the French translation than the same work could be done under the contract system. We expected that by adding to the cost and changing the system we would obtain more effective work, and that the French members would receive more satisfaction by the more prompt and regular issue of the French translation. That, however, has not been done yet. The last report the House adopted was to meet that requirement, but we are only trying an experiment, and if it is found that six or seven members of this staff are not sufficient I am sure the Committee will be disposed to meet the exigencies of the question.

Mr. AMYOT. I would have much preferred if the whole question of *Hansard* had been brought forward at once. I do not see why any difference should be made between the reporters and the translators. The translators require to be as capable men in their occupation as the stenographers themselves, and I find from the figures that the French translators are not treated in the same way as the official reporters at all. I find that the French proof-reader gets only

$400, while the English corrector gets $800. I do not see why there should be that difference.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman will allow me to explain. The English corrector of proof is a very different officer; the French corrector has simply to correct the proofs, but the English corrector has to get up the index of *Hansard*, has to prepare copies for members, and all that kind of work, which is entirely different.

Mr. AMYOT. There seems to be a certain way of showing why we are treated as inferiors. I do not see why our translators, who are here all the Session, who are the most capable men on the press, should only get $800, and the only remedy which is proposed to that is to increase the numbers. I think the number is sufficient at seven, because they are translating every day as the sheets go before them, but the salary does not seem to me to be sufficient. I concur entirely in the recommendation that $1,000 be paid the stenographers. All capable men should be well paid, and I say that the translators require to be capable men and they should be well paid. I admit that the Committee is very active, but they seem to be afraid to make any suggestions favourable to the French translators, when the question comes up here or before the Committee. I would have preferred that they should have asked the decision of the House on the whole matter, and not come here at one time with one class of men, and another time with another class. But after the assurance has been given that these translators will be treated well, I have no objection to the withdrawal of the motion. We must understand that in our Province the French *Hansard* forms part of our history, too, and when we speak here we want to be able to see our sentences not badly or erroneously translated, but so translated that it will not require to be compared with the English version to find out what we may say. We want the *Hansard* service well performed. I think Canada is rich enough and respects itself enough to have a fair, correct, and good translation of the *Debates* here. Now we must remember that if we rise to speak in English, it is out of deference to the House, even though we run the risk of annoying members by making mistakes, and getting laughed at and snubbed a little sometimes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. AMYOT. But we risk speaking in English so that we may be understood by all our fellow members.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will risk myself in speaking English, but I do not think I will be snubbed. I agree with the hon. member for Cardwell that the stenographers, the shorthand reporters, as we call them, should be well paid, because their work is of a very arduous nature, and they must not only be able men, but men acquainted with the matters brought before the House. A man may be a good shorthand reporter; but unless he knows the history of the country, unless he is familiar with current events, and with the measures brought before the House, he will not report correctly. Therefore, these gentlemen require to be well educated; they must be good scholars; and they should be well paid, especially when we see during what long hours they must be at work in the House, and in their office, in order to give us the reports of the *Debates* on the following day. But, on the other hand, I must say that the translators require also to be good scholars. A good translator must know history, geography and all that takes place; he must have the education of a gentleman, and therefore he must have studied many years before he is competent to come here and translate well. Therefore, the translators cannot be put on a lower level, so far as capacity is concerned, than that which the shorthand reporters should occupy. Under these circumstances, I think their case should be looked into and examined; and I think it would be more satisfactory to all, if, instead of moving the adoption of the report now, my hon. friend from Cardwell would withdraw his motion, leaving the report before the House. Then let the Committee in another report bring the whole matter before the House, so that we may consider the two reports together. I think that would be more satisfactory to all; and I think my hon. friend will see that we should do that. Otherwise, there will be a feeling that the French translators have not been looked after as well as the stenographers. I think the cases of both classes of officers should be considered and dealt with by the House at the same time.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think, in justice to the Committee, it ought to be understood that no complaint has come from the translators of their being insufficiently remunerated, and that the present translators are receiving a greater remuneration than some of them received under the contract system. I am not disposed to institute any comparison as to the amount of work performed, the difficulty of the work, or the qualifications required by either class of officers; but certainly, so far as the mere labour is concerned, that of the translators is not so severe and exacting as that of the reporters. We learn from the gentleman in charge of the translators, that they are occupied eight or nine hours a day, and that they do their work during the regular hours of the day, whereas the reporters are at work until a late hour of the night or an early hour of the morning.

Mr. BLAKE. After the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that no representation has been made to the Committee by the translators that their remuneration is inadequate, I think the Minister of Public Works will see that there is no reason for postponing the consideration of this report. It has nothing to do with the question of the remuneration of the translators. A representation has been made to the Committee by one portion of the official staff; the Committee have considered it; and they make a report upon it. Their recommendation is either right or wrong; we should either grant it or refuse it; but it in no way depends on the question whether there ought to be an increase of the emoluments of the staff of another branch of the service, who, as it appears from the statement of my hon. friend from Huntingdon, have up to this moment made no suggestion that they ought to get more money. Now, so far as I am aware, public servants are not inapt to point out their rights. If they think they ought to have more remuneration, we are pretty sure to hear it; and as the Committee have not yet heard from the translating staff, I think they are not in the least to be blamed for not having dealt with that matter. I agree with the hon. member for Cardwell and with other hon. members who have spoken as to the high qualifications which are essential to the proper discharge of the duties involved in that branch of the service with which we are now dealing, as well as in that branch to which allusion has been made, the translation. There is no doubt that high powers are required in respect of each. The character of the labour, the extent of it, whether it is day or night work, whether one is so severe as the other or not, the character of the special training required, and other considerations may arise in deciding what the proper side of remuneration is. For instance, if I were dealing with this question I would like to enquire what the relative amount of work performed by the translators is to that performed by the ordinary translators of the House, who I think are worked almost the whole year round. Not that I wish to institute comparisons. I think it is a pity that we should lug in a discussion on this other topic. It has nothing to do with the present report. The present report has to do, not merely with English officials, but with French officials also. It has to do with the whole stenographic staff, English and French,

and in a manner in which the Committee has thought just. The case of another portion of the official staff is stated by the hon. member for Montreal East, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse. Well, the Committee say that they are quite prepared to consider that case and to deal with the whole subject. Let them deal with it; but let us, I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Public Works, dispose of the case which is now before us.

Mr. BECHARD. My hon. friend from Bellechasse, if I understood him correctly, said that the members of the Committee seemed to be afraid when the question of the French translators came before the Committee. I think my hon. friend is mistaken; we are not afraid to take up that question. What should we be afraid of? The English members of the Committee have always been most courteous to the French members. But last year we adopted the present system of translating the *Debates*, because we thought that under it the work would be more efficiently done than before, and this year we are making an experiment of that system. For my part, I think it is a great improvement upon the system we had last year. We have a better translation. It is not a question as to whether we shall have the *Debates* translated or not. I believe that is a settled question; it is admitted that the *Debates* must be translated for the benefit of a large portion of the people of Canada, and that being the case, care should be taken to have the work done by the best men. To do the work of translation properly, the service of literary men of the highest order are required. When you read a book translated from English into French, you must notice that it has been translated, not by the first comer, but by a man of ability and great literary power; and the same observation holds good with reference to works translated from French into English. In choosing, last year, the translators of the *Debates*, we selected men who are in the habit of writing often their own language, who write in the newspapers, and who, therefore, could be relied on as men most capable of performing this work with the greatest efficiency. To be an editor of, or a writer on a newspaper requires great ability and a thorough good education; and I repeat, therefore, that the translators of the *Debates* must be men of great ability and learning, and, possessing such qualifications, they ought to be well paid. This question has not come before the Committee. We are making the experiment of a new system, and when we find out the precise number of translators necessary to do the work efficiently, I am sure the Committee will be united in the opinion that the full number necessary should be appointed, and I am also confident there will be no great division of sentiment in the Committee as to the rewarding in a worthy manner those gentlemen who are appointed to translate the work. It is true that no petition has been received from the French translators for an increase, but should the application be made I am sure the Committee will give such application the greatest consideration.

Mr. CARON. I do not see that any attempt has been made to criticise or blame the action of the Committee. The Committee may have been very judicious in acting as they did, in increasing the pay of the stenographers; no doubt at all the class of men employed reporting the *Debates* certainly deserve very good remuneration. I think also the suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Public Works that the report be laid on the Table until the other matter can be considered at the same time. It may be that no representations or complaints have been made by the French translators officially in the Committee, but I know that representations have been made by the translators that the remuneration they are getting is below what it should be. My hon. friend has referred to the requirements of the translators in order to fill their position as it should be filled. I must say that the French translators are perfectly qualified for the work; and it seems to me that when the question of increasing the remuneration of the other branches of that service is considered, the claims of the French translators should also be considered. I have no doubt, by allowing the report to stand over, their claim, when the matter is brought under the consideration of the Committee, will be considered and justice done.

Mr. BERGIN. I was very sorry to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). In those remarks, he did great injustice to the members of the *Debates* Committee. The whole Committee without exception have been anxious, from the beginning, that every justice should be done to the French translators and the French stenographers, and to such an extent have we been governed by this feeling, that upon almost every occasion we have left the selection of the French stenographers and translators to the French members of the Committee, knowing full well that they were the best judges of the qualifications of these gentlemen. The hon. member for Bellechasse seemed to think that no other interest should be consulted in the translation of these *Debates* than the French interest. Does he forget that most important speeches are made here in English, and that the gentlemen who make them are interested in seeing that the reports of their speeches go correctly translated to the people of Quebec—that our French brethren should understand perfectly what we do here, that no weak or incorrect translation of what we say should be presented to them, for we are anxious to stand well in the eyes of the people of Quebec and not to be misrepresented through any paltry cheese paring on the part of the *Debates* Committee. We have acted throughout with the determination to do full justice both to the English and the French members, and if we have erred at all, it has been perhaps in going beyond what we were absolutely required to do in the interests of the French population. I do not regret, but on the contrary, am most pleased that we did so act, and I think we deserve credit instead of being charged, as we have been by the hon. member for Bellechasse, with being actuated by any other spirit.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). After the statements of the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia, I presume that the sense of the House is that this report should lie on the Table to be dealt with when we bring up another report. I rather regret that decision; I think the two subjects are entirely distinct; there is no connection between the two in any shape, but, as the mouthpiece of the Committee, I would like to know if I am correct in assuming that it is the sense of the House, in adopting this suggestion, that the French translators should be paid a higher salary than they are now paid, because that is rather an important question for us to understand. At this moment we have, I believe, applications from three or four gentlemen, each of whom, I think, is quite or about as well qualified for the work as the present translators; that is to say, all have had the same press training, all have been in the habit of writing constantly their own language. These gentlemen are applicants at this moment for employment on the translating staff, and the Committee have never heard from the translators any suggestion that they are dissatisfied with the remuneration they are receiving. The translator before the last who was appointed, Mr. Remi Tremblay, who is an exceedingly valuable translator, who translates with great fluency both from French into English and from English into French, was a Sessional translator when he was appointed to this position, and as a Sessional translator his remuneration would have been a little over half what he gets for the work he is now engaged on. At the same time, if it is the sense of the House that the French translators should be paid a higher salary than that which has been already recommended to the House and adopted by the House, it is im-

portant that the Committee should know that when they come to consider this question. I believe it will require, at the very lowest estimate, eight translators to give the reports as quickly as they ought to be given. The statement made to us the last time we discussed this question was that the translation of three pages was about a good day's work, and in our long sittings we have about thirty pages of *Hansard*. To get those thirty pages translated would require ten translators, to do the work immediately, but that is not the average, that is of course an exceptional night. When we are in Supply, when we are not engaged in formal debates and lengthy speeches, the *Hansard* does not extend to thirty pages, and probably seven or eight translators would do the work. The two gentlemen employed as French stenographers are to receive the same salary as the English stenographers, but that is because of the peculiar skill they have, which is a very rare skill, I am sorry to say, even with French journalists, that of being good stenographers, and entitles them to the same remuneration as the English reporters. As a matter of fact, they do much less work at the table, but that is an incident of our condition here. I believe last Session there were only about sixty pages of French speeches in the whole of the *Hansard*; that is, sixty pages of speeches delivered in French and reported by the French stenographers; but, as the weakest link is the measure of the strength of a chain, so it requires that there should be more than one reporter, because we may have a night when the debate would be generally in French, and one reporter could not do the work. However, if the sense of the House is that this report should lie upon the Table, and that we should bring in another report increasing the salaries of the French translators, the Committee will probably consider that as an instruction, and will bring in a report in accordance with it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It seems to me that the Minister of Public Works made the suggestion he did under a misapprehension of the facts. He took it for granted that the Committee had not considered some question which had been submitted to them for their consideration; but it appears, from the explanations which have been given, that the thing was one not requiring consideration at all, that this report was complete in itself, and, unless the Minister of Public Works still persists in his view, I would object to the withdrawal of the motion; and I would object to the Committee taking an expression of opinion from two or three members as one that absolutely necessitates the raising of the remuneration of these men. The question is one that ought to be considered on its merits, after due consideration, and not forced on the Committee by the expression of opinion of some hon. members. Unless the Minister insists, I personally object to the withdrawal of the motion.

Mr. ROYAL. It is quite likely that what the chairman of the *Hansard* Committee said a few days ago about the French portion of the *Hansard* staff, connected with what I deem to be a very unfortunate paragraph in the report of the stenographers, led to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) and seconded by the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). What I understood the chairman of the Committee to say was that that portion of our business was under consideration, that nothing definite had been decided upon yet with respect to the conditions under which we were to place the staff of French translators. Now, what I think to be a very unfortunate portion of that report is the third paragraph, in which the stenographers state that:

"It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to point out that our work is of a character commonly described as 'skilled' or 'expert,' and bears no comparison whatever with ordinary clerical or departmental work. Yet we find that such officers as Clerks of Committees, Translators, Clerks of Votes and Proceedings, Journal Clerks, &c., are paid salaries varying from $1,500 to $1,800 per Session. It is unnecessary to enter into a comparison between the arduous and exacting nature of our work and the merely routine character of theirs."

No doubt, comparisons are odious, and in this case the shorthand reporters might just as well have left out that paragraph of their report. However, I look upon this paragraph, and some few words the chairman of the Committee said the other day as having led to this discussion. For my part, I believe that the work of translation requires a great deal of special training, not only that special training which is necessary to stenographers—and I agree with all the hon. members who have preceded me in passing high eulogies upon the staff of our reporters, but I believe that they may stand upon their own merits, and I believe the French translators may as well stand upon their own merits. As to the French translators we have just now, I believe that none could be superior to them, but of course you must remember that this is the first year that the new system has been tried, that it is an experiment, that in fact nothing has been decided yet as to whether the system that we have pursued from the beginning of the Session is to go on or not. Therefore, while we state that this matter is under the consideration of the Committee, no member of this House must think that any member of the Committee is ready to share in any injustice being done to any portion of the staff of reporters or translators, and we have the statement of the chairman of the Committee, and the assurance of other members of the Committee, that justice will be done to the shorthand reporters as well as to the French translators. It is unnecessary for me to add anything to what has been said as to the merit of the translation which must go to the country. Being in fact the political history of this country, it is essential that the speeches that are delivered in this House should go to the country correctly and justly and fairly translated, and for that purpose it requires on the part of the translators a good education, it requires them to be scholars in fact, as the hon. the Minister of Public Works has stated. Now, with regard to the suggestion thrown out by the Minister of Public Works, although I look upon this report as being entirely different from the other, yet, if it is the sense of the House that the report should stand until a supplementary report settling that question of the French translation of the *Hansard* should be brought up, of course I have nothing to say; but I state that most unfortunately it is this third paragraph of the petition of the stenographers, that has led to this debate, and to the motion of the hon. member for Montreal East, which was afterwards withdrawn.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps I may be allowed to say, with reference to the remarks which fell from the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), that I think it is utterly impossible for him or the Committee to assume that this House has expressed an opinion one way or the other, whether this report lies on the Table or goes through, on the subject of whether the salaries of the translators should remain where they are or should be increased. Certainly, some hon. members have said they ought to be increased, but I am quite sure that the mass of the members of this House have not the information which would enable them to arrive at a proper conclusion on the subject; and the statement the hon. member made that he had before him three or four applications from persons equally competent to perform the work at the same salary, is calculated to throw doubts, at any rate, at the statement which has been made that the salary is inadequate. I hold myself entirely unpledged on the question, and shall deal with the report in regard to the French translators on its merits whenever it is proposed. But, whether this report goes through or lies on the Table, I protest against its being understood that we have indirectly or informally given an instruction to the Committee that it is our opinion that the salaries should be raised. We leave it to the Com-

mittee to initiate that, to consider the whole subject, and to bring forward those facts which are necessary upon which to form a decision; and I dare say that we shall be able, as we have hitherto been, to adopt their views. But certainly we do not intend to usurp their functions in a perfunctory manner like this, and to chalk out their work for them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I spoke first I did not mention the third paragraph of the petition of the reporters, because I thought I should not do so at that moment; but as my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Royal) has just mentioned it, I may say that I regret very much that that paragraph was there, because it made a comparison which would necessarily lead to a discussion which had better, perhaps, have been avoided; therefore, after having said these few words on that paragraph I need say no more in reference to that point. I observe that the Committee recommend an increase in the salaries of the official reporting staff to $2,000 per annum, but to take effect next year only. That makes a difference, certainly, and a very important one, because there is plenty of time before the end of the Session to bring up the subject of the translators, and to do justice to them if they are not properly remunerated.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Therefore as this increase is only to take effect next year, I do not see the same objections to adopting this report now. I may say, however, that I would be glad to have from the Committee a comprehensive statement of the position of the whole translating staff, showing us exactly how we stand in reference to that staff, and then we would be in a better position to come to a decision. I do not say whether their salaries should be increased or not, but representations have been made to me, as well as to other members, that the staff is hardly paid enough. Some time ago I called the attention of the chairman of the Committee to the fact that these French translators were obliged to remain here a couple of months after the Session, and that we should consider that fact when we came to fix their salaries. I now understand from members of the Committee that the number of translators has not yet been determined, and that probably they will have to increase the staff by one or two members in order to meet the requirements of the translation into French. I think it is very important that the Committee should consider that matter before this Session ends, and that they should bring in a report informing us how the whole case stands. Besides that the members of the Committee, one and all, have expressed their desire and their determination that justice should be rendered to the staff, and in particular to the French translators. I think with that assurance on all sides we should not insist any longer on delaying the report, but allow it to be adopted.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I wish the position of the Committee to be well understood by this House. We have almost been accused of treating the French translators differently from the reporters. Well, I must say this, that the House must remember that when we first gave the contract for translation we had to pay $2.50 per page to the contractors. Then one or two years ago we applied for tenders, and one of the tenderers offered to do the work for $1.75 per page, and the expenses were brought down to the sum of $3,500 upon that basis. The contractor went to work, he had his own staff and did the work in his own way, and the result was that we had a good translation. When we came to consider the question of securing the permanency of the officers of the staff, we took the contract sum we had been paying as the basis of expenditure we would have to incur in making that staff permanent, and we engaged as chief translator the gentleman who had contracted to do it at $1.75 a page, and we distributed between four translators the amount the translation had cost the year before, so that if the salary now looks to be a low one it is not the fault of the Committee, but the fault of those who offered to do the work for the price mentioned in order to secure the contract. The Session has not closed yet, and we have still under consideration the best means by which the translation can be done as regularly and as punctually as possible. We have added two translators to the staff, and now we are confronted with a motion saying in effect that we have dealt unjustly with that branch of the *Hansard*. Well, I think that we ought to know what the sense of the House is on the question of the salaries to the translators. For my own part I have no objection to increasing the salaries. I fully acknowledge that the translators are not men of ordinary attainments; they require to be men of great efficiency, and of considerable literary ability, and if the House is ready to acknowledge that fact, and is ready to vote an additional amount, I am ready for my part to recommend that to the Committee. But it would be useless, now that the matter has been brought before the House, to go to the Committee and make a report recommending an additional amount to be paid to the staff, and then to be met by a rebuke from the House.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I regret that the hon. Minister of Public Works has been so easily convinced that he was wrong in his first expression of opinion as to the propriety of allowing this report to lie on the Table for some little time. I would myself very much prefer that it should do so. Some hon. gentlemen have argued that each branch of the subject should be considered on its own merits. Well, Sir, I cannot agree with that view. It seems to me that whatever pertains to this matter cannot suffer in being left a little longer to the consideration of the Committee, particularly as they say they have another branch of the same matter under consideration. This subject does not require immediate action; if the report were adopted it only comes into effect next year. There is no hurry about it; it is not to remedy any existing evil, and no harm can be done by a little delay. Therefore, I think, this subject ought not to be dealt with by piecemeal, more particularly when a comparison of the one with the other might enable the members of this House to arrive at a just conclusion. It is desirable that employees should be judged on their merits; yet we judge the value of labour relatively. We take a certain class of labour, and because it is skilled labour, and is paid so much by somebody else, we are thereby able to decide how much we should pay for it. The chairman of the Committee intimated that it was the opinion of the Committee that the cost of publishing the *Hansard* was too great; and though he made that statement the other day, he now asks that the salaries of a certain number of those employed in the work should be increased—and if a decrease is to take place, in what direction is it to be made, except in that of the French translators? If the first expression of opinion was correct, if the Committee considered it desirable to reduce the expense, it is strange that the present proposition to increase salaries should be submitted. I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to the increase of the salaries of the reporters. I agree with other hon. members in expressing my high appreciation of their labours and the manner in which they discharge their duty; but when there was an expression of opinion the other day that the expenses should be curtailed, and yet a few days afterwards it is proposed to increase the expenses, the matter becomes a difficult one to deal with; and under the circumstances, I think it is only fair that the reports respecting the stenographers and the translators should be made together, in order that we may be able to judge whose salary should be reduced and whose increased. I look upon translating as a work which requires almost as much skill, I was going to say more skill, than

that of the stenographer—I was going to say more skill, but perhaps hon. members will not approve that sentiment. My reason for holding that opinion is, that if a person would apply himself to the task of learning shorthand writing he would become as readily a competent stenographer as another man would become a competent official translator. It is not alone that a translator must be able to speak and understand both languages: a great deal more is required—he must be a writer. The same thing is true with regard to the stenographer but not to the same extent, because he gives a verbatim report, following the speech as it is given; and although the stenographers may do us sometimes the favour —not sometimes, but very often—of correcting our sentences and making them look a little better in print than they were actually delivered, yet they follow as far as possible the sentiments of the speakers. A literal translation from one language into another would hardly be readable. The translator must possess a thorough knowledge of both languages, as I have said, and must be a literary man; and thus it is that, judging the translators on this ground, those officers should be paid more than they are to-day. I do not commit myself one way or the other to the doctrine I have laid down; but when it is proposed one day to curtail the expenses and the next day to increase them, the best course is to have the whole subject brought up at one time. I regret the hon. Minister has taken the course he has done, and I would ask the Chairman of the Committee to allow the matter to stand over, but if he declines, the matters will have to be dealt with separately.

Mr. HESSON. I do not rise to object to the report, and I have no doubt that fair play will be given by the Committee to the French translators. It must be remembered that when the *Hansard* system was first introduced it was proposed that something like $30,000 should cover the entire expenditure. The present estimate requires $20,000, and from the course taken it is clear that this amount must be increased. It is quite possible that if the *Hansard* were abolished, very much of the eloquence with which hon. members favour the House would go unrecorded; still that fact might be compensated in some degree by the saving effected to the country, and it must be remembered that the press fully report everything of sufficient importance to be worth reporting. It must also be considered that the very fact of having an official system of reporting involves delay in public business, because some members talk to be reported. If these points are taken into consideration, you come to the serious question, whether the whole system ought not to be reconsidered by the House. I repeat again that I am satisfied the Committee will not do the slightest injustice to the French employees, and that the Committee will take steps to have a faithful report of the *Debates*; but I hold this view, that we could very well dispense with the whole system of *Hansard*.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I think there are excellent reasons why we should adopt the first suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Public Works, to leave this report on the Table for the moment, and to postpone its adoption until another report is made, with a view to give justice to the French translators. I think that this suggestion should have been followed to the end. In the first place, it is very important, while voting an increase of salary in favour of one class of employees of the *Hansard*, that we should know exactly what amount will be necessary for the maintenance of that office. In fact, it is possible, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, that this House may find the amount so large that we may arrive at the conclusion that it would be better to dispense with the system altogether. I must say that the chairman of the Debates Committee has done an act worthy of credit, when he has complied with the desire expressed by a great many members that justice be done to the French translators as well as to the stenographers. I certainly felt disposed to express my gratitude towards him for having shown such regard for the French members who have stood up in defence of these translators. As to the value of their services, I do not think it has been over-rated by those who have spoken on that question. Besides, I believe that the present system is infinitely superior to that which was followed previously. I refer to the contract system. The translation of the *Hansard*, as it was done previously, did not certainly do justice to the English speakers who addressed the House; very often their thoughts were misunderstood and were put in such uncouth French that it was impossible for people accustomed to read classical French to read these speeches, however interesting they might be in themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been given two reasons why the salaries of the French translators should not be increased. In the first place, it is pretended that they have never asked for an increase. Well, I believe they have not asked for it—according to what information I have on the subject—because it had been intimated to them, in about as explicit a manner as possible, that it was useless for them to make such a demand, as it would not be granted. Then again, I suppose that it is perhaps through modesty; it is well known that modesty is one of the characteristics of our race.

Mr. GIROUARD. Through bashfulness.

Mr. OUIMET. I will not say through bashfulness, as the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) suggests. I do not think that is our weak point, but I say that we French Canadians are not in the habit of putting on our services the value which the English people give to theirs, and perhaps that is the most apparent feature of our inferiority in the estimation of the various races of men who inhabit Canada. It seems that for us the question of salary is always a secondary question. It is only when we see our English neighbours living in prosperity, while we are, comparatively speaking, living in poverty—which is about the position of the French translators as compared to that of the stenographers—that we begin to think that, after all, modesty does not pay, and that it is just as well to do like others and ask for the full value of our services. I think that the French translators were perfectly right in taking this opportunity to estimate their services at their real value. And, as I said a moment ago, although the hon. Minister of Public Works has seemed to give his consent that this report be now adopted, I would suggest that the report be left on the Table, so that we may have a statement of the full amount of the cost of the *Hansard*, both for reporting and for translation, and also that we may be certain—I say that we may be certain—Mr. Speaker, that justice will be done to the French translators. Now, another reason has been given to show that this increase of salary is unnecessary. It has been said: Why should we increase the salaries of our translators when other persons are making application to be appointed translators, and are willing to give their services for the same salary as that which is already given to the present staff of translators? Well, Mr. Speaker, if that argument is worth anything it ought to be applied to the stenographers; and I am sure that if we should let the public know that for the sum of $1,500 we are ready to take five, or six, or a dozen, or perhaps a couple of dozen stenographers, I am certain that we should receive applications so numerous, that the Committee would have great difficulty in making a choice. I say this argument is not worth anything, and should be set aside. The value of the services of the French translators must be rated according to the ability of the persons employed, and I say that in order to have competent translators we must pay them well. Besides, I am convinced that the present members of the staff of translators are worth infinitely more

than the sum of $800, which is paid to them, and there is an enormous disproportion between that sum and that of $2,000, which is to be paid to the stenographers. If I wished to make comparisons of this nature, I would say that the value of those who are reporting the speeches is far superior to that of those who make the speeches; inasmuch as the members of Parliament—and we have a great number, and we might have a still greater number if we made application to get more—are only receiving $2,000. Well, I think this would be rather over-rating the relative value of those who report speeches and of those who make them. Well, Mr. Speaker, on the whole, I shall once more suggest, and I shall ask as a special favour from the Government, and from the Chairman of the Committee of the *Hansard*, that the adoption of the report of the Committee be postponed till to-morrow or the day after, so that the House may have before them all that which is necessary to judge both as to the cost of the *Hansard* and of the equitable remuneration which ought to be granted to the different members of the *Hansard* staff.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The chairman of the Committee must be pleased that the report has been unanimously endorsed by all the members who have spoken. I merely rise to ask a question on one point, and it is this: If I understand the report aright, it says that this increase shall take effect from next Session. I had thought that the advance had been given because of the efficiency that had been manifested by the staff, more particularly this year, though also no doubt in past years. If the work of the staff during the present Session has warranted the Committee in making this recommendation, I cannot understand why its operation should not go into effect this year. Perhaps the Committee have some reason which those outside of its number are not aware, and as to this point, members would like some explanation.

Mr. COURSOL. After the explanations given by the chairman of the Committee and the different views elicited from hon. members, I feel that the motion I made has had its effect—that whenever this matter comes before the Committee again, the question of the French translation will be treated with that fairness which we all expect should be applied. I would not have made the motion, except for the remarks which fell from the chairman of the Committee, that another method would have to be adopted before the close of the Session in regard to that work, meaning thereby that the Committee would in the future have the work done either by contract or by some other system of which I am ignorant. It was in order to secure to the translators permanent appointments that I rose, and I hope this discussion will have the effect of leading the Committee to decide not to abandon this experiment, which has only been in operation a year, but to give it a thorough trial in the future, so that we will be able to decide whether the translation is well done, and whether the cost is excessive. As it is now, it is only an experiment which costs the country $1,400 more than was asked under the contract system, while the reporting has increased from $12,000 or $13,000 to $18,000. Under these circumstances I feel it my duty to withdraw the motion, but I hope the Committee will as early as possible bring in a report on the question.

Amendment withdrawn, and Report concurred in.

RESIGNATION OF F. X. O. MÉTHOT, ESQ.

Mr. MÉTHOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform you that my intention is to resign my seat as a member of this House; consequently, I now resign my seat as member for Nicolet, in the House of Commons.

Mr. OUIMET.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the House will allow me to express the regret felt by the Government, and felt also, I am sure, by the House, at the idea that the hon. member for Nicolet is going to leave us. He has always shown himself very attentive to his duty, and I do hope that his successor will be as valuable a member as he was himself.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the adoption of the Fifth Report of the Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament. He said: I may say that this report is one which refers to the method of carrying on the printing of Parliament. It recommends no positive action, it simply submits certain papers which came into the possession of the Committee and reserves the matter for consideration. It does recommend, however, the extension of the present contract for one year, in order to give time to consider the whole question, which I suppose, the Government intend to consider, according to one of their reports, and a statement made on the floor of Parliament. The contracts would terminate on the 31st of December, this year, and in order that there may be time to consider the whole question and either continue the contract system or adopt the system of a Government Printing Office, the Committee recommend the extension of the contracts for paper and printing for one year from the 31st December next.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are separate contracts?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Report concurred in.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the adoption of the Sixth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament. He said: This report simply recommends the printing of a number of papers, and an addition of $200 to the salary of young Mr. Botterel, which was unanimously adopted. He is now getting $600, and is said to be of great use in the distribution office. It also recommends an addition of $50 per Session to the salary of the Sessional messengers in the distribution office, making them the same as the salaries paid in the Senate. They were paid the increased amount by special vote last year, and it is now proposed to make the addition permanent to these two Sessional messengers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there any difference between their salaries and those of the other Sessional messengers?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As I understand the salary of the ordinary messengers is $200, and this increase makes the salary of these two men $250 as they are considered to be more constantly employed. They go up and down like buckets between the printing office and the House, continuously.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I hope the hon. member will allow the motion to stand as it will involve some discussion as to the payment of these salaries?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Of course if a Minister says it should stand that is sufficient. Still this is what they received last year, by a special vote, and it is the sum which is paid in the Senate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that this will involve consequences elsewhere. If we are to increase the salaries of these messengers why should we not increase the salaries of all the other messengers who are here permanently, and who are asking and sending communications for such increases? I would ask the hon. gentleman not to

ask Concurrence in this increase now, so as to give the Commission time to look into the matter, and to see whether it will not affect other salaries as well.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think it is not a matter which the Commission can take into consideration, as the officers are not under the Commission.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know that, but still the consequence might be as I have said. These messengers are in a certain branch of the Department, and if we begin to increase them the same thing will occur as to others. The question as to the others came before the Commission, and the arguments used were exactly those used by the hon. gentleman that in another House an increase had taken place. We thought that under the circumstances we should be guided by what we know of the work in this House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman in the avalanche of enquiries and petitions which would come down on them. The experiment might be made of reducing one or two, and let us see if they will all ask for a reduction.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The argument used by the hon. gentleman applies only, however, to the Sessional messengers; it does not apply to the officer in the distribution office, Mr. Botterel, who is now receiving $600, and to whom $800 is recommended to be paid. I therefore suggest that we adopt the report—because it is clear we must adopt it in some form—as it recommends the printing of a lot of documents, and we might strike out so much of it as applies to the Sessional messengers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am afraid you have done the mischief, anyway.

Mr. WHITE. I would move that the report be adopted except the last paragraph.

Mr. SPEAKER. I doubt if you can do that. It is unusual to propose to adopt a report in part. It is generally referred back in such cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE. An amendment could be moved.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I move in amendment, that the report be adopted, except the last paragraph.

Amendment agreed to.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT LANDS IN THE COUNTY OF RICHELIEU.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether the Government has, by sale, grant, location or otherwise, disposed of the lands belonging to it in the County of Richelieu? If so, what are the lands; what is the extent of each lot; to whom was it disposed of; what are the conditions of each such grant, location or sale; what are the prices paid in each case, and when and how were the amounts paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I regret to be unable to give the information asked for by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) in the question he has just put. It would be considerable work, and I think it would be far better for him to put a notice on the paper among the notices of motion. We shall give him the information he asks.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if the House has no objection, I shall change my question into a motion, and I shall present it when notices of motions are called.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) There is no objection.

POSTAL THEFTS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether, early in 1883, J. R. Vantassel, then postmaster of Parry Sound, stole a post letter containing $1,000, or thereabouts, of Government funds? Whether he also misappropriated any, and if so, what sums of post office order money and of revenue cash? Whether any, and if so, what steps have been taken to bring him to justice? Whether, since these transactions, an Indian letter-carrier between Little Current and Parry Sound, who robbed the mail, has been prosecuted, convicted and sentenced?

Mr. CARLING. Information was received that a letter had been stolen. Enquiries were instituted, but it was not until the postmaster was told that any statement he should make would not be used against him, that the inspector learned that it was he himself that had taken the letter. In consequence of this, and as there was no other evidence against him, no criminal prosecution has been instituted; but the Department of Justice has been directed to take civil proceedings against the postmaster and sureties. So far as it is known, he did not misappropriate any other sums of post office order money, or of revenue cash. An Indian letter-carrier was arrested and sent to Barrie for trial for robbing the mails. He pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to five years in the Kingston Penitentiary.

THE POSTMASTER OF STAYNER, ONT.

Mr. WILSON enquired, Whether J. H. McKeggie is now postmaster of Stayner, Ontario? If not, when was he removed and why? Has another been appointed to the place? If so, what is his name and what is the reason for the change?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. J. H. McKeggie is not now postmaster at Stayner. He was removed on the 1st March, 1884, because he had ceased to reside at Stayner, and was carrying on business at Barrie. Mr. W. B. Saunders was appointed to succeed him for the reason stated on the 1st March, 1884.

CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE HUGHES.

Mr. WILSON enquired, Whether the Government have taken any steps to enquire into the charges preferred against the official conduct of D. J. Hughes, Judge of the County Court of Elgin; and if not, whether it is their intention to do so, and when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am advised that the petition that was sent in in this case was not signed, and it was sent back to the Committee from whom it was supposed to come, with a proper notice. But a copy of it was kept, and was sent to Judge Hughes for his information. That is the position in which the case now stands.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. Minister did not answer the latter part of the question—whether the Government intend to take any steps to enquire into the charges.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We cannot have any intention to do anything, because we have nothing before us.

AN EXAMINER FOR BRANDON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk) enquired, Whether the Government have received a petition from the residents of Brandon, Manitoba, and vicinity, asking for the appointment of an "Examiner" at Brandon, under the regulations of the Dominion Lands Act? If so, do they intend to grant the prayer of the petition, and when?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A petition has been received from the residents of Brandon asking that Mr. J. Clementi Smith, Dominion Lands' agent at that place, be appointed Examiner under the regulations of the Dominion Lands Act of 1883. That is with the view of compelling witnesses in certain land cases to appear before him to give evidence. No decision has been arrived at yet.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS FOR BRANDON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk) enquired, Whether the Government have received a petition from the residents of Brandon, Manitoba, respecting the erection of a building suitable for Post Office, Customs Office and Dominion Lands Office combined? If so, what action has been taken, and whether it is the intention of the Government to place anything in the Supplementary Estimates this Session, towards the construction of such a building?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A petition was received from a number of the residents of Brandon on the 26th of February last year, in favour of the erection of a building. Telegrams were also received to the same effect. The matter has been considered, but I am not in a position to say what the Government will do about it.

PROTEST AGAINST MR. TEMPLE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired whether the Government was aware of the following telegram:—

OTTAWA, 17th March, 1884.

"C. W. BUCKWITH, Esq., Fredericton.

"No use of delegation coming while protest standing. I want to help Railway, and was doing all I could to get subsidy. Since Saturday's news of protest, it is impossible to impress Government, and while President of Railway is fighting me in this way.

"THOMAS TEMPLE."

Whether the decision of the Government as to the Railway subsidy referred to in the telegram, is to be in any way dependent on the withdrawal of the protest against the election of Mr. *Temple* for York, N.B.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government had no knowledge of the telegram read by the hon. gentleman having been sent, and the decision of the Government as to the Railway subsidy referred to, will be in no way dependent upon the withdrawal of the protest against Mr. Temple.

Motion agreed to.

SUPERANNUATION OF JAMES HEARN.

Mr. KIRK in moving for copies of all correspondence, papers and telegrams between the Government or any member thereof, and any person or persons relating to the superannuation of James Hearn, late Preventive Officer at Arichat, N. S, and also all correspondence and telegrams relating to the appointment of his successor and the continuance of the latter in office, said: The principle that provision should be made for the superannuation of Civil Service employees who are incapacitated through old age or otherwise from properly discharging their duties, is one in which all parties, apparently, are agreed, but that the present system, as applied to Civil Service employees, is not thoroughly or justly worked out, is, I think, in too many cases, evident. The Government have large discretionary powers in applying the system—powers which may be used to the advantage of employees or otherwise, powers which may be used to their injury, and which may be used to unnecessarily burden the Treasury, and consequently the people. When this system was introduced, it was generally supposed that the allowance which was to be received from the salaries of employees would form a sufficient fund to pay any calls or demands required to meet the superannuation allowances under the Act. This has been found not to be the case. The amount received from this source, does not anything like pay the amount of the superannuations. We find that the average annual increase of expenditure on account of this service amounts to considerably over $12,000 per annum. We do not receive half the expenditure from the fund of which I have just spoken, and we are asked this year to appropriate $200,000 to pay the superannuation allowances for the current year, that is $10,000 more than was voted last year, or than was required last year. I think that the system has been very unfairly and unjustly applied, and, consequently, has worked hardship upon the Civil Service employees in the case of many of those who had been superannuated. Officers, sometimes, I fear, have been superannuated who are quite capable of performing their duties, and we have reason to believe that they were superannuated for the purpose of creating positions for friends of the Government who had given them their support in the elections or on other occasions. This is, I believe, the case especially in the matter relating to which I have made this motion. The appointment of Mr. Hearn of Arichat, as Preventive Officer took place at the time of Confederation, in 1867. He was about that time appointed at a salary of $150 per annum. We have reason to believe he was a good and efficient officer, and as about two years ago, the present Minister of Customs increased his salary to $300, it is evident he was a good officer, or his salary would not have been increased. However, in August last he was superannuated with an allowance of $150, and another was appointed in his place. Mr. Hearn was superannuated, ostensibly for the reason that he was too old to perform the duties properly. I am told—I have not the pleasure of his acquaintance—that he is about 60 years of age, and for a man of that age, is exceedingly active, and that he was at the time he was superannuated quite an efficient officer, and is equally as capable to perform the duties to-day. I am told he is an active member of the Arichat Cricket Club, and I should suppose a man who was an active member of a Cricket Club could not fairly be said to be not fitted, so far as his physical qualities are concerned, at any rate, to perform the duties of Preventive Officer. In the North Sydney *Herald*, which every hon. member here from Nova Scotia knows to be a paper that warmly supports the present Government, and a paper that is a warm supporter of the hon. Minister of Customs, and I find a paragraph in that paper in its Arichat correspondence which says, on date August 15th, 1884:

"James Hearn, Esq., who was recently superannuated from the office of Preventive Officer, is an active member of the Arichat Cricket Club."

I notice that the same paper reports that the Arichat club played a match game about that time with the Sydney cricket club. Therefore, I take it, that it could not be for the reason that he would not be able to perform his duties on account of old age that he was superannuated, and I take it, furthermore, that he was superannuated in order to make place for some other man—for the one who received the office. Mr. Hearn was superannuated, I am told, with an allowance of $150, and another man is appointed in his place with a salary, I presume, of $300. Probably it has been increased; I have no means of knowing that; but certainly his salary is not less than that of the late Preventive Officer. We are told, too, that this officer has been appointed and holds the office contrary to a well-known rule of the Department. I believe it is a rule of the Department that a Preventive Officer or Customs Officer shall not be permitted to hold or retain a municipal office of any kind. I am told that the successor of Mr. Hearn is a Municipal Councillor; I am told that he is more than that, that he is the Warden of the Municipality as well as a Municipal Councillor, and that he holds these two offices in direct violation of the rules of the Customs Department. I am told that the Minister of Customs, knowing the fact, asked him, through the Collector of Customs at Arichat, to resign his offices or he would have to resign the office of Preventive Officer. I do not know if this is the fact or not, but I am told it is so; I am told that the Minister of Customs was informed of the fact that the successor of Mr. Hearn held these municipal offices, and that he was asked through the Customs Collector to resign his position in the Council or the office of Preventive Officer, and that he has done neither; that he still holds the office, and holds it in defi-

ance of the Minister of Customs and the regulations referred to. It appears to me that if there is such a regulation as this, it is scarcely fair to allow a man to violate this regulation in the face of the known facts. It seems to be a custom with the Government here to superannuate men all over the Dominion, and especially down in Nova Scotia, before they become incapacitated from old age. That is the case in my own county. The Lighthouse Keeper of Cranberry Island has been superannuated upon quite a large allowance. His salary as Lighthouse Keeper was $750 a year, and he has been superannuated on, I suppose—I do not know the figures, but I have been told—from $400 to $500 per annum. Mr. Hanlon, the late Lighthouse Keeper, was an efficient officer; he was quite capable of performing his duties, and if nothing unusual happened, would be for many years, but he has been superannuated and another has been appointed. I am not finding fault so much with the superannuation of Mr. Hanlon as Lighthouse Keeper as with the man appointed in his place. A Lighthouse Keeper, especially on an island, ought to be capable of managing a boat. I have been told, and I believe it is true, that, before a Lighthouse Keeper is appointed, he is required to pass an examination and to give evidence that he is capable of managing a boat, and not only performing the duties of managing the lighthouse, but making himself useful in saving lives and property if any wrecks should occur on the shore. I am told that the man appointed in place of Mr. Hanlon cannot row a boat, cannot manage a boat at all, and would be lost if he were alone in a boat at sea; and he is there on the island without an assistant or any one to manage a boat. It is well known in Nova Scotia that Cranberry Island is an exposed place, and that Mr. Hanlon and his assistants have been called upon to save property and sometimes to save life, and have most efficiently performed that office; but the present incumbent of that position, I am told, cannot do it; he cannot row a boat at all, and therefore he is incapable of performing the duties of the office to which he is appointed. I do not know, but I have reason to believe, that both these officers have been superannuated, not because they were not efficient officers, but to make places for their successors, and the country is burdened with additional taxation in order that friends of the Government may be remunerated for services performed at elections. In making the appointment to fill the place of Mr. Hanlon, I think the Minister might have found many in the county of Guysboro' to fill that position. The people there, on the shore especially, are all capable of managing boats, and very many of them would have made good and efficient Lighthouse Keepers; but it does not seem that a man from the county of Guysboro' could be found to fill the position and satisfy the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but he sent a man from his own county, the county of Colchester, a man who knows nothing at all about the sea or about boats, and who is consequently thoroughly incapable of performing the duties to which he has been appointed. I do not intend to say anything more with regard to this matter, but I hope the papers I have asked for will be brought down.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to offer a a few remarks to the House on the question now before it. I had the pleasure last year of presenting a statement to the House in connection with superannuations, and at that time I drew the attention of the House to the fact that the country was called upon annually to pay a very large amount under the head of superannuations, also that the amount was largely increasing from year to year. I think that the question connected with superannuations deserves the serious consideration of the Government. I must say I fully expected this year that some measure would have been introduced for the purpose of freeing the country from the increased burden the country is called upon to submit to by the operation of this Act. I find that, during the past year, no less than fifty-seven have been superannuated. I find that these fifty-seven are drawing the gross sum of $29,224.88 annually. That is equal to $511.70 each. Now, it is very well known that those in the Civil Service are called upon to pay into the Dominion Treasury a certain percentage from the salaries they receive. Those percentages that are paid in are far from being anything equal to, or more than a very small percentage of, the amount they recieve after they are superannuated. I find that the sum per capata paid annually to those on the superannuation list is increasing. I find that, of those on the list for 1882, the average amount they received last year for superannuations was $468. I find that this year the average amount paid is $511.70. In the list of those that have been retired during the year under the Act, I find that eight have been granted a gratuity. It is, of course, necessary, when a man is retired, that he must have served ten years before he can be superannuated, according to the terms of the Act. In previous years when those that had served less than ten years were superannuated, a number of years were added to their time, in order to bring them within the operations of the Act, and I find the Government have not adopted that system this year; time has been added, however, to the number of years served by some of those who have been superannuated within the year. But I find the Government have retired eight in all under the Act, and to those eight they have granted a gratuity of $3,147.66, or about $400 each. These men have only served, on an average, eight years, but I see the sum paid into the fund by them, as I have just said, is only $542.96, which is the sum those eight persons have contributed to the superannuation fund during the whole time they were in the Service. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the amount that is paid by them and the amount they have received in the way of gratuity, we find they have actually drawn $6 for every $1 dollar they have paid in. I am quite satisfied that the Government should deal fairly and honestly with the Civil Servants; I am quite prepared to say that they should be treated somewhat liberally and not niggardly, but when you come to consider the fact they have not only received a corresponding amount with what they have paid, in and interest thereon, but they have received actually $6 for every $1 they have paid in, I say that the Government is acting generously at the expense of the country. When we consider the operations of this Act from beginning to end, and consider the fact that these Civil Servants are not only granted a very respectable salary annuity, but are placed upon the superannuated list when they retire from the Service, and that those who are retired under the Act who have served less than ten years get a gratuity, it must be evident that they are very generously dealt with. I said a few moments ago that time has been added to some of those who have been superannuated this last year. I find the Government have added in all thirty-five years to the time of the fifty-seven that have been superannuated within the year. That may be looked upon as a very small number of years to be added, but when we consider how the expenditure under this item is increasing, I think the Government should be exceedingly careful in the manner in which they administer that law; because even that small number of years added has increased the annual expenditure $1,412.50. Now, I say there is no necessity for this practice. I hold that those men are well paid, liberally paid, for the services they perform, and I say that when they are retired and granted allowances in this way, that is all they are entitled to. I can see no reasonable ground whatever why the Act should be interpreted so as to increase the sum that is annually paid out under the operations of this system. Now, I would draw the attention of the House to this fact, that since the passing of the Act 664 persons have

been retired, while 421 are now on the list for this year, drawing a retiring allowance of $215,465.55, or $511.70 each. Now, this is a very large amount. I notice the amount last year was considerably less than this, and it appears to be increasing every year. The amount is growing very rapidly, and when we find on the Statute Book an Act that is so increasing the expenditure of this country, and adding to the burden of taxation upon the people, I think it is wise, I think it is right and proper, that this House should consider whether it is really in the interests of the people of this country that this system should be perpetuated. I really think it is not. I cannot see upon what grounds it can be claimed that it is necessary. The entire sum paid into the fund by those on the retired list, up to January 30th, 1882, was $99 each. I find that 454 have died in the Service, and the gross amount paid in by them was $41,345.39, or $91.07 each. The average age of nineteen of those superannuated in 1883, was forty-eight years. Now, when we come to consider that fact, I think hon. gentlemen must admit that this Act is not being properly administered. I notice that in the return that has been laid before the House, it is said that this is done on the grounds of efficiency and economy. Well, I do not know anything about the efficiency, but I cannot see where the economy comes in. The Government possibly may decide, in some cases of servants in the employment of the country, that it would be as well if they had never been employed; and I dare say that in many cases they come to the conclusion that it is better to do without their services, and let somebody else take their places. A servant incapable of discharging his duties has, perhaps, been placed upon the Civil Service list through some influences outside of the Government, and before leaving has caused a good deal of trouble and annoyance to his associates in the Department in which he has been acting. He is nevertheless superannuated and a sum of money is placed to his credit that he can draw annually and thus live at the country's expense and do nothing. Now, I say that is wrong. Here we have this year no less than nineteen men out of fifty-seven superannuated at an average age of forty-eight years, and these nineteen are drawing an annuity of $9,724.01, and to these nineteen men that sum will continue to be paid every year as long as they live. Now it has also been stated that some years ago a Commission was appointed for the purpose of examining into and reporting upon this Act. That Commission, after holding very long sittings, and making extended investigations, reported to the House that the operations of that Act were in the interests of the country, that in place of losing money the country was actually making money. Well, Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity last year of closely investigating and criticising the statements of that report, and I must say that after a careful investigation I come to the conclusion that it was based on the most fallacious arguments, or pretentions, that could possibly be thought of. On that occasion I submitted to the House two or three names as an evidence that the report was not based upon a correct calculation, and that it is not in the interests of the country that the system should be perpetuated. Now, in order to view this question from a financial standpoint, I will just go over the operations of the Act of 1883. We find, as I have already stated, that fifty-seven have been superannuated, and that to those fifty-seven, $29,224.83 will have to be paid every year so long as they live. We find that to those who have been retired on gratuities, in all, $3,147.66 was paid for that year. We find that to thirty-seven of those appointed to fill the places of those who have been superannuated, the country will have to pay $25,080 by way of salary. Then there were eighteen vacancies on 1st January which had not been filled. Taking the salaries paid to those who occupied those positions before 1st January, we find that $13,490 was paid for the services of those men and will have to be paid when the appointments are all made. It is no doubt the intention of the Government to fill those vacancies, because in the report submitted to House the fact is stated whenever it is the intention of the Government not to fill a vacancy. I notice that three of the sixty-three appointments have been abolished, but the rest will be filled as soon as the Government can find suitable men to fill them, and they will, no doubt, receive the salaries paid to their predecessors. The gross sum is $70,950.54, that is retiring allowances to the fifty-seven officers, gratuities to eight officers, the salaries now paid to those occupying the positions of the retired officers, and the salaries to be paid to the eighteen who have yet to be appointed. The salaries of those who were superannuated and retired on gratuities amounted to $55,538; deduct that from the sum I have already named, and there will remain $15,414.54 as the actual loss to the country under the operations of the Act for the last year. Deducting from that sum $3,147.66 you have as a net loss which will continue so long as those people live of $12,267 per annum. Since January, 1879, 264 Civil Servants have been superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and thirty-two have received gratuities, which gives an increased annual expenditure under this head of $77,705.04. Deducting from this amount the receipts from the percentages paid in by those on the retired list, $4,412.82, and there is a net loss to the country over the amount for 1878-79 of no less than $68,292.21. That is the net loss to this country annually over the amount paid out under this head by the previous Government. The entire amount paid into the fund by those fifty-seven officers superannuated in 1883 was $12,468.53. The gross amount paid to those officers so long as they live is, as I have already stated, $29,324.88. So that the entire sum paid in is not equal to six months' annuity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not understand why hon. gentlemen should say hear, hear. It appears most absurd to me that those Civil Servants should be permitted to draw such large sums annually from the revenues of the country, and should have contributed such small sums, not equal to a-half year's allowance. The Act was brought into force in 1871. In that year the number on the list eligible for superannuation was 2,307; in 1872, 2,522; 1873, 2,742; 1874, 2,951; 1875, 3,091; 1876, 3,142; 1877, 3,160; 1878, 3,259; 1879, 3,330; 1880, 3,516; 1881, 3,582; 1882, 3,777. The increase in the last year was 195. I have here the names with the respective amounts paid in by all those who were superannuated last year; but I do not intend at this late period of the Session to occupy the time of the House in reading the list. I have already stated that scarcely in a single case has an officer paid in a sum sufficient to meet half of the yearly allowance which he is permitted to draw. But in order to give the House an opportunity of judging in respect of this matter, I will give hon. members a few names. The first name is that of F. G. Gardner, Finance Department, who was superannuated last year. The entire amount paid in by him to the fund was $361.16; he receives an annuity of $980. The next name is that of Hon. Joseph Pope, also in the Finance Department; he contributed to the fund only $75, and now draws an annuity of $1,260. The next name is that of Thos. Hector, Auditor General's Department; he paid in $468.89, and draws for the balance of his life $1,155 annually. The next is F. Hunter, in the same Department; he paid in $433.26, and draws annually $900. The next is E. C. Barber, who is also in the Auditor-General's Office; he paid in $474 31, and he draws annually $1,224.66. I find next the name of John Birrs, in the Customs Department, who paid in $286.99, and who has a retiring allowance as long as he lives of $560. Next is Jas. A. Green, also of the Customs Department, who paid in $534.10, and draws annually $1,260 as long as he lives. Next is James Austin, of the same Department, who paid in

$313.70, and draws annually $1,050. I find next the name of J. W. Dunscomb, who paid in $1,046, and draws annually $2,478. The next is A. Brunel, of the Inland Revenue Department, who paid in $1,048, and draws annually $2,400. It will be seen by these figures that the amount which is contributed by these Civil Servants is not at all proportionate to the amount they are granted when they retire from the Service. Now, I hold it is not in the interests of the country to continue a system which bears on its face the most positive evidence that the country is losing annually by the operation of this Act, and that these annual amounts are continually increasing. Where is this thing going to stop? The amounts have been increasing yearly from the inception of the system down to the present time. As stated by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, it has increased $12,000 a year. If it goes on at this rate, the amount will become an exceedingly serious one, and I think it is full time, before it reaches that point, that we should consider the whole question and cut this system short. I find, as I have already stated, that the superannuations this year will cost $215,465.55 for the Civil Service, and $61,106.12 for our Judges, the sum total this year being $276,671.67. Now, I have noticed that hon. gentlemen opposite have taken particular delight in comparing figures with the late Government on many questions that I have heard discussed since it has been my privilege and pleasure to sit in this House. They take particular delight in trying to show that the preceding Government have spent a sum equal to, if not in excess of, the sum they spend. Now, I think it would do no harm to examine the operations of the Act in this respect. I find that in the same period, a period of five years, hon. gentlemen opposite have superannuated no less than sixty-three more than the preceding Government superannuated within the same time; and by that increased superannuation they have increased the annual cost to the country by $32,237.10 over what was paid by the previous Administration. I think it is time, in the interests of the country, that we should seriously consider this whole question. When we consider how our debt is increasing, that every item in the public expenditure is increasing—grants to railways, grants for the construction of short lines, and for other public improvements—we find that the debt of the country is running up to a large amount very rapidly. Now, I say we are here for the purpose of legislating in the best interests of the people, and it is our duty to see that the burdens placed on the shoulders of the taxpayers are as low as they possibly can be in the face of the country's interests. It is our duty in every item to economize as far as possible. We have been too much in the habit, year after year, and Parliament after Parliament, of adding to the responsibilities of the people, and it is becoming a serious question in the interests of the people if this thing is going on. I say it is time that we should call a halt. It is time to consider the question of curtailing even in minor sums. If it is necessary to give grants to railways, to improve our canal system, to encourage the construction of small branches of railway—for which I felt sorry that grants were made last year—let us at least lay hold of the items which can well be dispensed with; let us cut off the small expenditures, at any rate, and show at least some evidence of a desire to curtail the expenditure as much as we can. I say this item of superannuation is one which demands the serious consideration of every one here, and I hope when the time comes to return to our constituencies, let that time come when it may, every man will be solemnly pledged when he return here that he shall support no Government which will perpetuate this system. I say that when the people of the country are properly educated as to the operation of this Act they will pledge every man who represents them to vote against its continuance. It is nothing but right that they should do so, and I trust they will.

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

After Recess.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

On the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution (page 656) of Mr. Foster, respecting the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating Liquors for beverage purposes, being read,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have no desire, Sir, to detain the House more than a few minutes, in presenting an amendment which I propose to move to the Resolutions submitted by the hon. member for King's, N.B. I am sure that the House generally will concur with him in the opinion that the evils of intemperance are very greatly to be deplored, and will agree to any reasonable suggestion which may be made for the removal of those evils and the mitigation of the results which follow from them. Those who have watched the progress of this discussion, so far as Parliament is concerned, will, I think, be somewhat surprised that a motion of this kind should have come before Parliament at this particular time We all remember that before 1873 or 1874 there was a very great agitation in the country, from one end to the other, in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, and that a large number of petitions were presented to Parliament, especially during the Sessions of 1873 and 1874, in favour of such legislation as would entirely prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors. In the Session of 1874, if I mistake not, there were from the Province of Ontario alone, petitions signed by no less than some 340,000 persons, asking for such a law. At that time we had in Parliament a gentleman, whose place as a temperance advocate, I think, I may say, my hon. friend from King's is taking in this House—I mean Mr. George W. Ross—who was looked upon as the leading advocate of this particular measure. In 1875 the question was undoubtedly one of some little embarrassment. So large a representation of public opinion as was to be found in the petitions presented to Parliament caused people to feel that something would have to be done; and, if I am not mistaken, a caucus of members of Parliament was held at which some seventy-five hon. members were present. I am told, however, that of those seventy-five there were only about eight or ten at most who were themselves total abstainers. Although they were deeply impressed with the importance of preventing everyone else using intoxicating liquors, they did not entirely concur in the desirability of prohibition, so far as their own personal habits were concerned. The result of that caucus was that a convention was held in the city of Montreal—a convention thoroughly representative in its character—at which were to be found gentlemen from all parts of the Dominion, who discussed this question of temperance legislation, and finally came to the conclusion that while it was very desirable that prohibition should be adopted, yet it did not appear to be quite desirable that it should be pressed upon the attention of Parliament at that moment. However, Sir, as the result of all that agitation, we had in 1878 the passage of the Scott Act—an Act similar to what was known as the Dunkin Act, which preceded it, passed by the old Parliament of Canada—by which every county or city municipal division in the Dominion was given the power to prohibit within its own boundaries the retailing of intoxicating liquors. Now, Mr. Speaker, that Act was regarded, at that time and until this resolution is introduced now, so far as one could see, as a complete and sufficient answer to the petitions which had been presented to Parliament asking for a prohibitory liquor law. That Act has been on the Statute Book since 1878; there has been no material amendment of it; a number of counties in the Maritime Provinces and one or two counties in the Province of Ontario have adopted it; and I believe by-laws are shortly to be submitted in a large number of the

constituencies in Ontario. I think we may fairly assume, inasmuch as the Act has not been generally adopted, so far as the Dominion at large is concerned, that the people themselves have not shown any such intense desire for a prohibitory liquor law as would justify Parliament at this time in passing the Resolution which has been submitted by my hon. friend from King's, and which, if it passed this House as it stands, would, as a logical conclusion, have to be followed by the legislation necessary to give it effect. I do not understand, Sir, that the business of Parliament is simply to adopt abstract propositions of this kind, and then leave them without any practical result. Our duty is, if we adopt any such proposition, to follow it up by actual legislation. Indeed, as far back as 1854, I believe, some thirty years ago, a Bill was introduced into the Parliament of Old Canada by the late Hon. Malcolm Cameron, providing for the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors. If I mistake not, that Bill passed through all its stages until it came to the final motion, that the bill do pass and be entitled as in the motion, when the point of order was raised that the Bill ought to have been introduced by resolution, and it was thrown out upon that technicality. That was the only attempt made in the Parliament of Canada to pass a prohibitory liquor law, and there has been no Bill introduced since for that purpose. If we agree with the proposition laid down that the evils of intemperance are very great and cannot be done away with without prohibition, I think we ought to do as Mr. Ross did when in Parliament—move simply to declare that so soon as public sentiment is ripe for such a law, Parliament will be prepared to deal with it. We must all admit, I think, that an Act of this kind cannot be effective unless public sentiment is at the back of it. We are here, 211 members of this House. I have nothing to do with the private habits of the members of this House; I think we have never had a Parliament so distinguished for sobriety and decorum as this Parliament is; I think I can say that, after having watched the proceedings of Parliament for thirty-two years, either from the press gallery, or as a humble member. But if every member of this House who is prepared to vote for this proposition would really adopt it in his own person—would say, as for me and my house, we will prohibit intoxicating liquors—I venture to say that the moral influence such a step would have on the community at large, in one sense, would do relatively as much good as the passing of a prohibitory liquor law. We may look at the question as we please, but judged by the drinking usages of the country, it is simply folly to say that there is such a public sentiment outside this House, or such an opinion or sentiment inside this House, in relation to this question, as would justify the passage of a Resolution which ought to be followed by actual legislation. The Resolution, therefore, which I propose to move, is to the following effect; that these words be added to the Resolution already, Sir, in your hands:

"And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

These are the exact words of the Resolution introduced by Mr. Ross in Parliament, in 1875, and I do not think we can be accused of going very far wrong from temperance standpoint, at any rate, when we propose to adopt the words which that hon. gentleman, when a member of this House, thought quite sufficient, according to his intense temperance views. The words at the end may be open to some question, "so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada," but I think it is desirable that those words should be put there, for the simple reason that the recent—as appears to me contradictory decisions of the Privy Council on the subject of the liquor traffic—leave it an open question as to where jurisdiction—I do not mean exclusive jurisdiction—but as to where jurisdiction exists in this matter. Therefore, I think it desirable, if we have the right at all, that we should wait for a final decision on the question which will be submitted, under the Temperance Act of last year, to the highest courts of this country or the Empire before taking action, and I beg therefore to move that the following words be added to the Resolution:

"And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

Amendment agreed to

On the main motion being put,

Mr. BEATY. With reference to the main motion presented by the hon. member for King's, I would like to say a few words in connection with the principle stated in this Resolution. I am not sure that that principle, as a practical question, can be adopted in Canada at present, but I have the idea that there is a principle of prohibition that might practically be adopted, and the country would not suffer in any respect. There is now what is called local prohibition, prohibition in counties or municipalities, which is frequently adopted in both. That is termed local prohibition. The principle which is stated in the Resolution moved by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), is what may be termed total prohibition, for it certainly goes as far as to prohibit the use of every class of liquor of an intoxicating character that is imported and produced in the country—namely: "respecting the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes." I have an idea, and it has been a matter of conviction with me for a number of years, that if we give practical legislation which shall tend in the direction of what I may term, for the want of a better name, "partial prohibition," that is the prohibition of spirits, the prohibition of brandy, rum, gin, whiskey, particularly those classes under which these different kinds of spirits are named, it would be useful. So far as the effect would be felt in some aspects of the question, it would make little difference whether there was a total or partial prohibition. The revenue, for instance, derived from spirits is very large, amounting to nearly $1,000,000, while the revenue from malt liquors only amounts to about $400,000, so that the difference, in respect to revenue, between total and partial prohibition, would be of little importance. As a question of practical prohibition, however, as a question of obtaining public assent to legislation of this character, I think partial prohibition would be received by the country at large very favourably, and would be endorsed by nine-tenths of our people. Speaking for my own neighbourhood, the city of Toronto and the country surrounding it, with which I claim to be somewhat familiar, I am satisfied that at least four-fifths of the population of the whole country would endorse the proposition, for the purpose of promoting what is thus termed "partial prohibition"—the prohibition of spirits—and I may say that I believe it would be adopted by a large class of the liquor dealers throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I was invited, last fall, to a meeting of the liquor dealers, representative men, for the purpose of stating my views in reference to this question; and, after hearing the statement that I then made, they were prepared to adopt it, and ask the legislative power of Canada to make it the law of the land. That shows there is a tendency in that direction. From the forcible and eloquent observations which were made by the hon. member for King's, in reference to the disastrous and serious results which follow the drinking customs and usages of the country, and when we consider the great poverty and misery which result from the excessive use of liquor, we cannot but conclude that some measure should be adopted for the purpose of relieving the country from these ruinous results, and enabling the people at large to be protected against them. I will not, at present, go into the question as to the character of this misery and all

these results, because every hon. member is unfortunately too familiar with them. Our observations in every direction prove, beyond a doubt, that the result of these drinking usages, whatever may be the cause, whether inherent in human nature or in the article itself—whatever may be the immediate cause, the result is very injurious to the community at large. In sentiment, I am prepared to go as far as the Resolution goes, but, as a matter of practical legislation, I am not prepared to go that far at present. There are various difficulties, to my mind, in connection with legislation even to the extent to which I allude—the prohibition of spirits. The first objection we have to meet is the compensation to those who are engaged in the manufacture of this article in the country. I think it is only fair and reasonable, that if legislation should take away from the distillers their occupation and business, they should be, to a reasonable extent, compensated for the damages done to them by such legislation. That is the first principle in connection with these matters. I never felt very enthusiastic about the Dunkin or Scott Act, chiefly because there was no compensation provided for those who were especially engaged in legitimate trade, or, at all events, in legalized trade. I think they ought to be reasonably compensated for such loss as they might suffer at the hands of this Parliament. Now, that is the first obstacle we have to meet—compensation—and yet that would not be a very great matter, because in Canada, at the present day, there are only seven distilleries. Five of those do not amount to much as to value or production. Two of them—the distillery at Toronto and the distillery at Windsor—are very large concerns, and would represent, at least, I should imagine, two-thirds of the whole value of the seven distilleries. It was represented to me a year or two ago that the Toronto distillery represented half the value of the whole then existing distilleries, there then being in the country not less than twelve. Since that time—from what cause I do not pretend to say directly or particularly, but I presume it is from the growing capacity of these two large distilleries—the other distilleries are giving up, and now, instead of twelve, there are only seven in existence, and the probabilities are that, in two or three years at most, these seven will be reduced to three or four, if they are still allowed to go on. The whole value of the property included in this question of distillation would, then, as was represented by one of the Inland Revenue officers, only represent about $5,000,000, and the Toronto distillery would represent about a half of the whole. So the question of compensation would not be so serious a question, involving only—the interest account being taken as the only practical question—an expenditure to the country of about $100,000 or $200,000 a year, as the case might be. There is also the question of revenue, which is probably the most important one, from our standpoint, as legislators, how we are going to meet that diminution of revenue which would actually arise, at the start, at all events, from legislation of this character, the prohibition of the production of spirits. I will give a few figures—not going lengthily into the question of figures—for the purpose of showing what this revenue is and whence it is derived. Taking the year ending the 30th June, 1882, there was brandy imported into this country, 265,608 gallons; entered for consumption, 265,608; the duty paid on that was $385,115.66. Under the name "cordials," 3,280 gallons were imported; entered for consumption the same amount; duty collected, $6,233.04. Gin imported, 359,874 gallons; the same amount entered for consumption, and the duty on that, $476,831.11. Rum, 118,620 gallons imported; the same entered for consumption, on which a duty was collected of $157,263.95. Whiskey imported, 143,281 gallons; and made in Canada, 3,552,817 gallons; representing a total of 3,696,098 gallons; on which a duty was collected of $3,745,343.03. Of other spirits, 1,635 gallons were imported and entered for consumption, the duty being $2,644.52. The total of imported gallons of spirits was 892,298, and made in Canada 3,552,817, making a total entered for consumption of 4,445,115 gallons, on which there was a revenue collected of $4,773,431.31. In 1883, there were of spirits imported under the same heads, 1,044,083 gallons; made in Canada, 3,848,787; total entered for consumption 4,892,870, representing a revenue of $5,273,854.29. Of malt liquors, there were, in 1882, imported 248,391 gallons; made in Canada 11,850,425 gallons; total entered for consumption, 12,098,816, from which the revenue collected was $432,175.14. In 1883, there were imported 346,697 gallons; made in the country 12,587,727 gallons; a total of 12,934,424 gallons, on which there was a revenue collected of $463,876.51. The imported wines in 1882 were 544,967 gallons, from which a revenue was collected of $405,505.10; and in 1883, 607,113 gallons, with a revenue of $437,911.37. So it will be seen, by comparison of these figures, that the revenue from malt liquors and wines is so small that it bears very little comparison with the large amount collected from spirits. But there is another feature—the strength of the liquors which are drunk. Brandy is represented in this country to possess from 85 to 90 per cent. of alcoholic strength; rum the same; gin, 80 to 85; whiskey, 75; beer, 8 to 12; sherry, port and Madeira, 18 to 25, if pure, and 25 to 40, as usually imported; Canadian wines, about the same; French wines, light, 15 to 20 per cent. So we see, by a comparison of the brandy, rum, gin, and whiskey, with beer and wines, that the large amount of alcoholic strength is in the whiskey, brandy and rum, as compared with the beer and the wine. Now, the idea is that this country might go so far as to prohibit the liquors possessing this great alcoholic strength and allow good beer and wine to be sold, as it is now sold, by licensed taverns, in the way in which it is done at present, the adulteration of those beers and wines to be prevented, and the people who may drink them to be protected, so that they shall not be adulterated either by the addition of any alcohol beyond the proper strength, or of any other deleterious drug whatever. In reference to this matter, I have a statement taken from the *Week*, a paper published in Toronto, and I think it is the production of Mr. Goldwin Smith; at all events, I know that he entertains the same view in reference to this question. He says:

"The root of the evil in this country is the production of whiskey. Whiskey is the real poison, and if produced will infallibly find its way, by one channel or another, to the lips of the consumer; so that the only consequence of harassing the respectable retail trade will be here, as everybody says it has been in Maine, the multiplication of disreputable and clandestine taverns. If we want to kill the monster and to do a noble thing at the same time, let us sacrifice the Excise, and having paid due compensation to the distillers, whose trade has been not only recognized but made a source of revenue by the State, shut up the distilleries."

That expresses the idea which I entertain in reference to this matter exactly, and that is the view we should take, if the question comes to practical legislation. I do think that the motion made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), certainly expresses the condition of things existing at the present day; but there is another view to be entertained in this matter, as we know it is the great alcoholic strength of the liquors I have named which is the cause which produces the vagrancy and violence and the poverty and misery which are so sadly seen over the whole land, and especially in cities. We find this to be the result in most cases of men having ready access to these strong drinks. The way would be, therefore, to prevent their reaching these drinks, and, if we did this by a prohibition of spirits, we think that, at all events, it would be action in the right direction; and, whatever might be the ultimate result, it would enable us to understand more particularly whether the idea of prohibition could be practically carried out successfully and safely in the country. I would have moved for legislation in that direction this Session, were it not that there is confusion enough now in

connection with this matter. A dispute is going on between the Federal Government and the Local Governments in reference to this matter, and until that is settled, I think it would not be judicious, it would not be wise, to introduce another element of discord into the country in connection with this trade. We know that whatever its influence may be, this trade has its ramifications all over the country. It affects almost every class of trade in the country, and therefore it must be dealt with in a prudent manner, so as not to create that discord and that disturbance in general trade which would be injurious to the financial and social standing of the country. While I am prepared to support the general principle, the general sentiment, expressed in the Resolution, and while I am prepared to stand by it, at the present moment I think it is not the demand of the country that prohibition, pure and simple, total prohibition, should be enacted as the law of the country; that something less than that might be adopted by this Parliament, and if so adopted, it would prove, at all events, whether the idea is practicable in its application to this country and in its enforcement. Certainly I think there can be no doubt that the principle of partial prohibition would have a much stronger support throughout the country than the principle of total prohibition, because it would secure the support of many men who drink their beer and their wine, it may be, but who would forgo the use of the stronger drinks if they thought it would produce a beneficial result to the country. I have felt it my duty to throw out these hints in connection with this Resolution, in order that the country may consider them hereafter when the question comes up again, as I suppose it may, of adopting some practical legislation, when it becomes a question of practical politics as to whether we shall have prohibition or not, and to what extent.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria). The amendment of my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), if I understood it rightly, recognizes the principle of total prohibition, while it postpones the period when we are to enact a law in that direction, until public opinion has unmistakably shown that it requires it. Now, I cannot allow an amendment of that kind to pass without entering my protest against the doctrine of total prohibition. When the Scott Act was before this House, in the year 1878, having a seat in the House then, I ventured, almost alone, to enter a protest against the passing of such legislation. When the Bill got into Committee, I was followed by a high authority, a gentleman who occupied the Chair which you now occupy, and who, on the floor of the House, used very strong and very forcible words upon this subject, and which expressed much more aptly and eloquently than I can, the objections which I have against the doctrine of total prohibition. The then Speaker (Mr. Anglin) used this language:

"I feel it my duty, as one of the representatives of the people, to say a few words on this Bill. I protest most solemnly against legislation of this kind. I regard it as the most pernicious and injurious character that can possibly be conceived, and also of the most tyrannical character. It is a declaration that it is the right of the majority of the population of this Dominion to dictate to the minority of the people what they shall eat and what they shall drink, and what opinions they shall profess, or even what they shall wear. Tyranny more gross than this it is impossible for man to conceive; and, therefore, do I most solemnly protest against this Bill and against the principle upon which it is based."

I will not go on to read the rest of the brief but eloquent speech he delivered upon that subject, but he pointed out that where total prohibition had been introduced into the Province of New Brunswick, from which he came, after a trial of a year or two it was found to be such a complete failure that the Legislature was specially convened for the purpose of repealing it, and it has stood repealed there ever since. My hon. friend who moved this Resolution is, of course, an enthusiast in favour of total prohibition; it is, if I may venture to use the term, his hobby. But, I do not think it would be right to allow a motion of this kind to pass without entering my protest against it. The addition which my hon. friend from Cardwell has made to the Resolution makes it so innoxious that I think nobody will be hurt by its passing. Therefore I do not think it necessary to say much on the question; but I do feel that it is the duty of any one who entertains as strong and decided opinions as I do, against the constitutionality, against the propriety of the doctrine of total prohibition by legislation, not to allow, even this Resolution, so modified, to pass, without expressing that protest, as I do now. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Beaty), that if we are to have any kind of prohibition, a prohibition of the production and sale of spirituous liquors would, possibly, do some good, in the way of producing temperance and preventing intemperance, and that the public interest would be served by an increase in the production and use of malt and malt liquors, and a diminution in that of spirituous liquors. I find that in the State of New York, with a population of about equal to that of the Dominion, the revenue derived from the production of malt and malt liquors is over $6,000,000; while our revenue from malt and malt liquors, according to the Inland Revenue returns, has amounted, on the average, in the last four years, to only $411,173. Now, that shows that malt and malt liquors are more generally consumed in the State of New York, with its population of 4,000,000, than they are in the Dominion of Canada. The revenue returns from the United States also show that the use of malt liquors has increased in the eastern States while the use of spirituous liquors has diminished; I think, therefore, that it would be for the interests of Canada to have such legislation as would tend to foster the use of malt rather than spirituous liquors. But there is another point of view from which it is important, in the interests of Canada, that this result should be obtained. Malt is the product of Canada, malt is made from barley, that is largely produced, especially in the Province of Ontario. Spirits are made from corn, which is produced in the western States, and imported into Canada. If we can diminish the use of spirits and the use of corn imported from the States for that purpose, we will increase the use of malt, inasmuch as the American market for the manufacture of malt has been, to a great extent, cut off by the recent alteration of the duties in the United States. It is all the more important in the interests of the farming community of Ontario, at all events, that the use of malt and malt liquors in Canada should be increased; and by any legislation which will have that result, we are directly fostering and benefiting the interests of the farmers, at any rate, of the Province from which I come. Then, with reference to the passing of the Scott Act, which my hon. friend from Toronto has reference to. I am informed on very good authority, and I think the returns and reports in the possession of the Department of Inland Revenue will confirm the statement, that in the county of Halton, which has come within the operations of the Scott Act, the use of spirits has immensely increased, while the use of malt liquors has proportionately diminished. That naturally results from the fact that malt liquors are bulky and cannot be carried or handled with the same ease as spirituous liquors. I believe, too, that the Scott Act is greatly abused there; that the practice which naturally prevails of allowing the use of spirits on medical certificates, is abused to such a gross extent that members would be almost horrified at reading the report which is in the hands of the Minister of Inland Revenue, from the officers of his Department, showing that the use of spirituous liquors and the sale of spirits by druggists under the guise of medical certificates now actually exceeds the sale of spirits formerly made by the ordinary licensed tavern keepers. If that be the result of the Scott Act, what is the use of desiring its extension? Are the advocates of temperance furthering their cause before the country by pressing on the people an Act, the practical results of which has

been to increase the use of spirits, the most dangerous kind of intoxicating liquor, and to diminish the use of beer and ale, which is the least dangerous kind? Are they not doing an injury to the cause of temperance instead of a benefit, by forcing this kind of legislation on the public? I do not propose, at this period of the Session and of the evening, to occupy more time in discussing this subject; but I felt it would not be right, entertaining the opinion I do, to record a silent vote either in favour of the Resolution, if it passes without voting, or against it, and that it was my duty, at all events, as one entertaining a deliberate conviction, that this kind of legislation was improper and could not pass, not to allow the present occasion to pass without entering that protest formally, by giving utterance to the opinion I have expressed.

Mr. JAMIESON. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House at any length in discussing this question. I think the advocates of prohibition can very well rest their case on the able speeches delivered by the mover and seconder of the Resolution. However, since the discussion is likely to become somewhat general, I desire to detain the House for a few moments while I attempt to discuss this question. So far as the question of prohibition is concerned, I may say, at the outset, that I am a prohibitionist pure and simple. It seems to me this question will force itself on the House ere long. It may be true that the country is not just prepared for the measure at the present time; that may be true or it may not be true. There are, no doubt, differences of opinion in regard to that matter. I think we can judge the sentiments of the country largely from the votes lately cast when the Scott Act was submitted in several of the counties and municipalities throughout the Dominion. There are many who support general prohibition who are not in favour of this partial prohibition, which seems to commend itself to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty.) For my part, I have not such strong faith in partial prohibition as some hon. members who advocate the Scott Act have. I think, owing to the very great evils of the liquor traffic, widespread as they are throughout the whole Dominion, the only proper remedy to apply will be that of general prohibition. I grant that this question is surrounded by very many difficulties. I suppose the Finance Minister, if prohibition were enacted at the present time, would find difficulty in the meantime in procuring sufficient revenue with which to carry on the affairs of the country. However, there can be no doubt that the difficulty arising from that source would be only a temporary one. I think the volume of capital now engaged, and the labour employed in connection with the traffic in intoxicating liquors, if turned into other channels, would very shortly bring about a state of things which would ensure to the Finance Minister sufficient revenue, even though he were wholly deprived of the revenue from that traffic. We are not discussing the provisions of a prohibitory liquor law here to-night; if we were, I should feel it my duty to state my views at some length in regard to the provisions which such an Act should contain. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) says the great difficulty he has had to meet in examining this question is that of compensation. Although I do not admit the principle for a moment, that parties engaged in the traffic are entitled to compensation, still I would be prepared, speaking for myself, to admit the principle of compensation were a prohibitory liquor law framed and submitted to the country, in order to put an end to contention and agitation which might arise if compensation were not conceded. So far as distillers are concerned, it might be conceded to give them compensation, and also in a few other cases. But to apply the general principle of compensation in a prohibitory liquor law could not be allowed for a moment. I apprehend there are hon. members in this House who will recollect when an army of draymen furnished water for the supply of Ottawa. At present it is supplied by the Corporation through the city waterworks. All those men have been deprived of their employment, and if the principle of compensation were admitted, the Corporation of Ottawa ought to have compensated all those men whose employment was taken away from them by the construction of those works which are of such great importance to the city. But, as I have said, I will be quite prepared to concede the principle of compensation if we are able to get rid of the great evils in connection with the traffic in intoxicating liquors. It has not been contended by any hon. member who has yet spoken, nor do I apprehend it will be contended by any hon. gentleman who may follow me, that the question of the evils of the liquor traffic is debatable. Every person throughout the land concedes at once the great evils flowing from the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and it seems an astounding fact that while we can legislate for the suppression of crime and of almost every imaginable offence, we cannot apply a remedy to this great evil, which is destroying some of the best and noblest in our land, and which is bringing about the destruction of such a vast amount of property. How are we to arrive at the sense of the country on this question. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has paid a very excellent compliment to this House by saying this is the most temperate Parliament ever assembled at the capital. I think we ought to be flattered by the opinion which the hon. gentleman holds of us, and I believe I can add my testimony to that of the hon. gentleman, because before I came here I was told that if I occupied a seat in Parliament I would come in contract with a great deal of drunkenness. Now, Sir, I am prepared to say that in a body of 211 men chosen indiscriminately from the different constituencies of the Dominion, we have, on the whole, a body of men here who are noted for their sobriety.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JAMIESON. Now, Sir, I do not often occupy the time of this House, and I am sure I will have a candid hearing on this occasion. I think we are discussing a very important and a very serious question. I refer to the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who paid a compliment to this House, and I say that his amendment was not in accord with the sentiments which he uttered. I hold, that the character of the representatives sent by the different constituents of this Dominion may fairly and reasonably be taken to be a reflex of the public sentiment upon the temperance question throughout the Dominion; and if it be, Sir, the truth that the constituencies have sent to this House a body of men who are deserving of the high compliment which the hon. gentleman has paid them, then, I believe the country is prepared for prohibition. The next question which will arise, in the event of the Resolution carrying as amended by the hon. member Cardwell, is, how are we to ascertain the sentiments of the people of this Dominion on the question. The hon. gentleman referred to the Montreal convention, a body of men representing the temperance sentiment, the prohibition sentiment, of this Dominion, in 1874. I happened to be a member of that convention, and the question was very fully discussed there as to the proper means of taking the sense of the people upon that question. In my judgment, a very proper mode was arrived at, when the convention, by resolution, gave it as their deliverance that the sentiment of the country should be ascertained by a *plebiscite*. Now, if we ever arrive at the sentiments of the country on this question, I think that is the proper mode in which to arrive at it. I never could ascertain why the Government of that day did not accept the proposition of that convention. I was

informed afterwards by a report of the gentleman to whom the resolution was entrusted to carry to the Government, that the answer of the First Minister of that day was, that it would be unconstitutional to attempt to take the sense of the people of this Dominion in any such manner. I never could understand why it was unconstitutional. I know that in other countries, such as France, the public sentiment of the country on a given question has often been ascertained by a *plebiscite*, and I think this question is of sufficient importance to warrant the Government of this Dominion in ascertaining the sentiment of the public on the question in that way. Now, Sir, we will, no doubt, be told that prohibitory legislation has been a failure in nearly every case in which it has been tried; and we often hear of the Maine liquor law; we often hear that it has not restrained the traffic in intoxicating liquors, but I would ask you, and through you the members of this House, whether any effort to repeal that law has ever been successful. On the contrary, from time to time, the people of the State of Maine, instead of taking a retrograde step on that question, have taken an advance step, by making the law more perfect and stringent. We have had a great deal of legislation in this country for the purpose of regulating the traffic in intoxicating liquors; but, it seems to me that that traffic refuses to be regulated. I am credibly informed that on the British Statute Book there are over 200 enactments which have been passed with a view of regulating the traffic in intoxicating liquors. But, Sir, it has been found there, as it has been here, that it refuses to be regulated, and when we find a traffic refusing to be regulated, a traffic above and beyond the restrictions which the law attempts to throw round about it, it is time that traffic should be prohibited. I know, Sir, that perhaps my sentiments will not meet with the appropriation of all my constituents, but I am speaking my honest convictions upon this question. I am prepared to do justice to those engaged in the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and I trust before this Parliament is at an end, or at least before many years pass by, we will have legislation upon this question, which will put an end at once and forever to the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and in order to do so, for my part, I am prepared to allow any reasonable degree of compensation to those engaged in the traffic—not because I believe they are entitled to it, but just for the purpose of putting an end to the traffic. We may educate our children to the best of our ability, but the evils of the traffic are so great that when they get away from us they may be ruined by the evil influences which flow from it. I will not detain the House longer on this question. I have expressed my opinions upon it, and though they may be perhaps distasteful to a number of those who occupy seats in this House, or if not distasteful, at least in opposition to their views, I believe it is the duty of the people's representatives, of men occupying such positions as we occupy, when such an important question comes before the House, to honestly and candidly state their views upon it, in order that the country and Parliament may know where we stand with regard to it.

Mr. McCRANEY. I had no intention of saying a word upon this occasion; nor should I have risen but for the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), in reference to the operation of the Scott Act in the county of Halton, which I represent. However, I may refer somewhat to the remarks made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beaty). Speaking with reference especially to the revenue obtained from the traffic, he laid a great deal of stress on the fact that we have obtained a large amount of revenue from it; and he went on to show that we were collecting about $5,000,000 per annum from this traffic. The hon. gentleman did not take into account the loss which the people of this country sustain from the use and abuse of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I have repeatedly taken the trouble to go over this matter carefully, and I have satisfied myself that there is no comparison whatever between the revenue this country obtains from the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and the loss sustained by it, through the use and abuse of this traffic. I am satisfied in my own mind, that if you take into account the amount of liquor that is imported and the amount that is manufactured and sold at retail prices, the land used for growing grain, hops and other products used in the manufacture of liquors, the capital and labour employed in the wholesale and retail liquor business, the loss of labour which might be employed in other industries, the destruction of property by land and by water, the theft, bad debts, failures, pauperism, destitution, sickness, insanity and death produced through the traffic, you have a sum of money that will outweigh five times—yea, more—all the amount of revenue obtained from this traffic. And even supposing, Sir, that we do receive a large amount of revenue from it, will any amount of revenue compensate us for, or will it justify, a moral wrong or a social suicide to the people of this country? Will any amount of revenue justify the fact that many of the people of this country are destroying themselves by the use of intoxicating liquors? I have no hesitation in saying, Sir, that the amount of loss to this country—absolute loss—worse than loss—resulting from this traffic, amounts to $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 per annum. Why, Sir, there would be no difficulty in providing for our public works if this traffic were abolished in the country. I am satisfied that there is not a single individual in this House who does not recognize the fact that enough money is lost by the use and abuse of this traffic in the ways I have indicated, to complete all the public works of this country in a very few years. Now, Sir, I come to a statement made by the hon. member for Victoria, Ont. (Mr. Cameron). I am perfectly astonished at the statement made by that hon. gentleman. Where he has obtained his information I certainly cannot tell; but I have no hesitation in saying that he could not have obtained it from those engaged in the traffic in the county of Halton. I state most emphatically that the statement is incorrect—that the hon. gentleman has been misinformed. I state most unhesitatingly—and I am satisfied I can prove what I say on the testimony of the hotel-keepers themselves—that there is not one-tenth, or one-fifth at most, of the amount of liquor sold in the county of Halton to-day that there was before the adoption of the Scott Act. The Scott Act is as well administered in that county as any other Act in force there. We all know that in a small county like Halton there are difficulties in the way of enforcing it strictly; we know that individuals are able, to some extent, to obtain liquor. But, Sir, the statement that there is as much liquor sold as before the passage of the Act is entirely incorrect; and if the hon. gentleman obtained his information from the Inland Revenue officer, it is something new to me. I asked in this House, last Session, for a return, showing the number of certificates that had been given by physicians in the county of Halton to enable persons to obtain liquor, and very few were returned.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I did not state—I wish to correct my hon. friend—that I obtained the information myself from the Department of Inland Revenue; but my information was communicated to me by a party who had himself seen and heard the reports of the officer of Inland Revenue, in the possession of that Department, and I am perfectly willing that the correctness of my statement should be decided by reference to the reports of the Inland Revenue officer, sent in to the Department in the last week or ten days. Those reports, I have no doubt, will confirm my statement that the consumption of spirits in the county

of Halton has not diminished under the operation of the Scott Act, but that more liquor is sold on medical certificates than was previously sold by the licensed victuallers.

Mr. McCRANEY. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would refer him to a meeting of the Dominion Alliance that has just taken place in Toronto, where a gentleman from the county of Halton spoke as follows :—

"Rev. J. M. Cameron said that drinking in Halton had greatly diminished since the Act had come in force. It required a peculiar knock and a special introduction to get a drink. It was a rare thing to see a drunken man in the streets of Milton. The honest farmers got home earlier after selling their grain, while formerly they used to spend their money in treating, which was a prolific source of drunkenness. If the Scott Act was ever voted on again in that county, its opponents would get such a Waterloo that they would never make another at empt to upset it. There was a great improvement in the feeling in favour of the Act. He hoped that it would be carried in the adjoining county of Peel. Their base was safe as it was on the shores of the pure waters of Lake Ontario. (Applause.)"

The statement made by this gentleman I can myself verify. Only a few days ago I met a gentleman who has perhaps the largest interests in the county of Halton, and who was recently a License Commissioner. He is not a temperance man, and I put the question to him: "What do you think—is the Scott Act working well in Halton? Has it diminished the use of intoxicating liquors?" He stated that it had. I asked him, "to what extent do you think it has?" He said: "I am satisfied that there is not one-fifth of the quantity of liquor sold in the county of Halton to-day that there was under license." I asked him how much he thought had been sold before the Scott Act came into force. He said he thought in the neighbourhood of $100,000 worth of liquor had been sold per annum, as there were a large number of hotels—some forty-two; but that his candid opinion was that $20,000 would safely cover all that was now sold under the Scott Act. As for liquor being sold by the hotel-keepers, I have no hesitation in saying that there is very little sold. In fact, so well is the Act respected at the present time, that the hotel-keepers, I am informed, within the last few days, have put up over their hotel doors notices that positively no liquors could be obtained there. I have also the opinion of a gentleman who came from the county of Halton to-day. He stated that the Act was working well, and that when the time came for the re-passage or repeal of the Act, he had no doubt whatever that the Act would be re-passed, as the people were becoming more satisfied with it, and it was working much better than at the commencement. Our people are law-abiding citizens, and I have no doubt whatever that if a prohibitory law were passed by this Parliament and one or two years given those engaged in the traffic to get out of the business, the law would be respected and properly carried out. I will not occupy the time of the House further on this question, but will conclude by saying that I have always been in favour of total prohibition, and am prepared to support any measure which has for its object the prohibition of the liquor traffic; and I would like very much to see a division of the House taken on the question, so that we might see how we stand with regard to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall not take up the the time of the House any longer than I can possibly help, but, at the same time, I must make the same remark that I made a fortnight or three weeks ago in speaking on this subject, namely, that I shall not consider it my duty to shorten my remarks too much. I shall try to do the very best I can in this respect, but I do not consider it consistent with the duty I owe this cause and its friends to omit anything I may consider it desirable to urge in supporting the Resolution. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) has stated that he could not allow this to pass without making a protest against the principle to which it would pledge the House. He stated that he took occasion to protest against this principle in 1878, when the Canada Temperance Act was before the House and that he also took occasion, as I know he did from personal knowledge, to protest against the restrictive parts of the Dominion License Act of 1883. All I have to say with reference to that is, that if the hon. gentleman's protest is no more efficacious with regard to this Resolution than it was with regard to the Canada Temperance Act and the Dominion License Act of 1883, we have a fair chance of carrying this Resolution in the House. The hon. gentleman read an extract from *Hansard*, from a speech delivered in 1878, I think, by a former Speaker of Parliament, and he gave, as I understand, his adherence to certain statements that were made by that gentleman. Amongst others was this: that the principle of a prohibitory law was most tyrannical, and that it allowed the majority to dictate as to what people are to think, eat and wear. I must deny most emphatically that a prohibitory law makes any such provision; it does not state what a man shall think or what he shall not think, what he shall eat or shall not eat, what he shall wear or shall not wear. A prohibitory law has simply to do with the production and sale of intoxicating liquor, and, as such, is as far removed from that kind of law as we can possibly conceive. I have also to set the hon. gentleman right with reference to the New Brunswick law. He stated, as an an argument why prohibition was a failure, that New Brunswick passed a prohibitory law in 1855, and, after it had been on the Statute Books two or three years, it was repealed. As a matter of fact, it came into force in January, 1855, and was repealed in June, the same year, so that it practically never went into force, and there can be no argument made with reference to its effects. He protested also against the constitutionality of prohibition, and was kind enough to refer to me as an enthusiast in this matter, and the rider of a hobby. Now, it somewhat amused me to hear a legal gentleman, in one breath accuse me of being an enthusiast and a rider of a hobby, and then stating in an assembly composed largely of legal men, that he has a very strong opinion against the constitutionality of prohibition. What does he mean by that? That surely can only be determined by a legal tribunal; and is it not within the knowledge of every hon. gentleman here that the constitutionality of prohibition has been affirmed, over and over again, by all the legal tribunals, great and small, in all Anglo-Saxon countries? And when an hon. gentleman, a lawyer, gets up in this House and protests against prohibition as being unconstitutional, he has to protest against the legal decisions of every court, from the Privy Council of Great Britain down to the smaller courts of the British colonies and in the States of the United States. He stated also that it would be a bad thing for the barley growers, if the brewing interest was destroyed. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman and other hon members of this House, that wherever the Scott Act has been introduced and voted, that in the forty counties in this Dominion in which it has been introduced and voted upon, its main support has come from the rural districts, from the farmers themselves. It is not in the rural districts that such a law is unpopular, but it is rather in the cities, towns and villages, in the populated centres, that the vote goes against it. Take, for example, the vote recently given in Oxford county; it was in Woodstock town, where the vote was largely against it; but every rural district in that county gave its adherence, in large majorities, to the principle of prohibition, as therein embodied. The hon. gentleman has spoken with reference to the failure of the Scott Act in the county of Halton; but that statement has been very well refuted and met by the counter testimony given by the representative of the county of Halton, from his place in Parliament. I will, however, just call the attention of Parliament to the grounds the hon. gentleman has taken to prove that the Scott Act has been a failure in the county of Halton. How does he attempt to prove it? He states that in the Inland Revenue Report there is proof that will convince any person that more liquor is now sold in that county, under

medical certificates, by the druggists, than was formerly sold by the licensed victuallers. Has the hon. gentleman read the pages of the Inland Revenue Report? Can he find out from the pages of any report the amount of intoxicating liquors sold in any county of any Province in this Dominion? It is impossible that such figures can occur or be found in the report in the possession of any Department of this Govern ment. What is the whole ground upon which he bases the failure of the Scott Act? Because medical certificates have been abused, is that the fault of the Scott Act? Not at all; it is the fault of some medical practitioners who, I am sorry to say, have not that feeling of honour which generally characterizes the medical profession, and who are willing to abuse the privileges of their profession for a small consideration or for no consideration. The proper way to cure this abuse is not by getting rid of the Act, but by getting rid of the practices which are done in defiance of the spirit of the Act. I am not at all opposed to either the remarks or the spirit of the remarks which were made by the hon. gentleman from Cardwell. I agree in the main with what he has stated in the Resolution. I did not object to it, and would not have voted against that which was added to the Resolution. So much, Sir, with reference to what has been stated; and now, if the House will allow me just a few moments, I will make a few remarks with reference to the right, the necessity, and the efficiency of prohibition, and then leave the matter for this House to decide upon. While I had the honour of addressing some remarks to this House in the beginning of this debate, touching especially the great importance of this subject, touching the scientific aspect of it, and touching the economic aspects of this question, I believe there were very few gentlemen on either side of this House who were disposed to question what I then stated. The whole practical question comes down to a point of difference between gentlemen who are present, when we come to choose the method for getting rid of the great evils which admittedly flow from this traffic. The question is for us to decide as to whether probition is necessary, whether it is right, and whether it has been or can be proved to be effective. This, I say, is the great question. Now, then, I think the necessity of prohibition is very well proved from two or three considerations, which I will give in very brief space. The first is this, Sir: that all preceding legislation has failed to diminish the scope of the evils which result from the traffic, and has failed to minimize those evils, as they should have been minimized. And we must take another thing into consideration when we come to discuss that part of the question; we must take into consideration this fact, that not only has law been doing its work for the last fifty or the last twenty-five years quite effectively, but alongside of law there has been also a very strong and increasing force of education and of the spread of information. It will be patent to the observation and known to all members present that the last twenty-five years especially, in Great Britain, in the United States, and in the Dominion of Canada, have seen a very great and a very increasing revival in the means for bringing this question before the people in mass, for educating them with reference to the effect of intoxicating liquors, for putting temperence instruction into the books, the paper, the literature, and the schools of the country; and the law that has been on the Statute Book in these countries for the last twenty-five years has been most efficiently aided by these moral means amongst the people, which have been working in connection with the law. Take that into consideration, and yet come to the test by results, and what do we find? In Great Britain, we find that, in 1860, the liquor bill was £84,000,000; in 1882, it had risen to £128,000,000. We find that the cases summarily proceeded against for drunkenness in England and Wales in 1860 were, 78,000, and the cases proceeded against in like manner in 1879, were 178,000. We find that, in 1831, the liquor bill *per capita* of the people of Great Britain was £2 15s.; in 1875, it had risen to £3 5s. In 1831, the absolute consumption of alchohol was sixteen pints per head; in 1879, it had risen to seventeen pints per head. What do these results show? They show that, along with all the restrictive license legislation which has been growing in strictness for the last twenty-five years, aided by all the methods of information and teaching that philantropy and religious fervour could bring about, there has been an absolute increase in the consumption, the cost and the evil results which flow from intoxicating liquors. When we come to ask the reason why, the answer is apparent, when we find that, in Great Britain to-day, there are 190,000 persons who sell intoxicating liquors from January until December, keeping open places where facilities for drinking and where inducements and temptations are openly put before the people; and, as long as this takes place, just so long will the law and the moral suasion itself be insufficient to bring about the good results that all good citizens ask for. The very same thing might be stated with reference to the United States of America, and I think the same thing can very well be stated of this Dominion of Canada, that, taking into consideration all this revival of temperance interest and all this diffusion of education and of moral effort, we find that, in the Dominion of Canada, the consumption of spirits keeps about the same, that the consumption of beer is increasing, and that the criminality which comes from the traffi in intoxication liquors, is not decreasing to any appreciable degree, and forms a subject which is challenging attention, and is one of the most important factors in producing the deep and wide agitation which at present is going on in this country for relief from those evils. So, I say the necessity for a prohibitory law is shown by the ailure of preceding attempts at legislation to minimize the evils which result from this traffic or to diminish the scope of that traffic sufficiently to meet the wants and the wishes of the people. But, Sir, we can show that prohibition is necessary, as a result from experience in the trial of law. I wish simply to call the attention of this House to one fact, that is, that the principle of prohibition has already been admitted, has already been embodied, has already been acted upon. Take up any license law you have upon the Statute Book of any country, and what do you find the chief and saving element in that license law? It is the amount of prohibition that you have infused into the law. You say by your license laws, that liquors shall not be sold on Sundays; that is an application of the principle of prohibition. You say it shall not be sold after seven o'clock on a Saturday night; that, too, is an application of the principle of prohibition. You say it shall not be sold to minors; that is another application of the principle of prohibition. So, when you come to find out the grip and grasp of your license law, is in the amount of prohibition you have infused into it, it is in direct proportion to the extent to which you have applied that principle. Now, the people of this broad country have came to the conclusion that these laws are effective, only as they contain this application of the principle of prohibition, and that they have hitherto not done what the country desires to have done. The country's will is, that this shall be made stricter and stricter; that is, that more of the prohibitive element should be imported into the laws, and I make bold to stand up and declare from my place in Parliament, that this free people in the Dominion of Canada will not cease their agitation, and will not be satisfied until the largest application of the principle of prohibition has been made to a traffic which they know is an enemy to the best interests, material, moral, and social, of the people. I say the tendency of the people, the drift of legislation, which comes from the call and demand of the people, is in the line of a complete and total prohibition of the traffic

n intoxicating liquors. More than that, Sir; I wish to point out just a simple fact, which shows how this tendency is making itself felt. Why, I remember when, not long ago, a county by the name of Lennox, not very far from this city of Ottawa, made a turn round with reference to its political complexion, and by a slight majority elected a gentleman who at present sits in this House, that one half of the press of the country heralded it forth that a great change was taking place in the political aspect of the country, and that the change was indicated by this reversal of the vote. I remember, also, when the county of York, in my native Province, by a very significant vote, turned round on its former party allegiance, so to speak, and elected my hon. friend who now represents it here, by a large majority, it was heralded throughout the country by the other half of the press of the country, as indicating a very significant change. Let me call the to other attention of hon. gentlemen of both parties indications of a very significant change. Since the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, has been before the country, it has been submitted in forty counties and cities of this Dominion, and it has been carried in thirty-three of them. It has been lost by a majority in six, while in St. John, the commercial metropolis of my own Province, the vote resulted in a tie and the Act was lost. When I count up the votes upon that Act I find that there were cast in favour of it 45,080, and against it there were 23,606 votes, or as nearly as possible a vote of two to one in favour of the principle of prohibition. Will the hon. gentleman say that that does not sufficiently indicate the temper of the people of this country, that it does not afford a good ground for us from our place in Parliament to say that the principle of prohibition has a strong and entrenched hold in the hearts of the people, and that we are not going beyond what the indications have already given us a right to go. So much with reference to the necessity of prohibition. A word now with reference to the right of prohibition, as that has been called in question. As I said a moment ago, the legal right to enact and carry out a prohibitory law has been confirmed by the highest judicial authorities and courts in all Anglo-Saxon countries. I think, Sir, it is right, and I think so from one or two considerations. Some have stated that it is a sumptuary law, which enacts that you shall not say so and so, that you shall not eat such and such, that you shall not wear such and such clothing. Sir, the principle of prohibition, as applied to the liquor traffic, does no such thing. It simply deals with the public act of the manufacture, importation and sale, an act which is done for the good or to the detriment of the country, and if the country feels that it is done to its detriment, by all the sacred interests which that country guards, and by all the indefeasible rights which inure to every civilized Government, it is not only the right, but it is the duty of that country to have that taken away which is against its best interest. There is the whole question. Is it better for the country it should not exist? then keep it. Is it better for the country it should not exist? then do not put public patronage and public sanction beneath it, to uphold it by the sacred force of public law. Now others say this is class legislation. My opinion is that every kind of legislation you make is, to a certain extent, class legislation. The only thing we have to consider is to what class the legislation applies. If it is for the good of the greatest number, then the interests, financial or social, of the smaller number have to go down before it. That is the question we have to look at. Sir, let us look at the present state of legislation. We legislate to keep the distillery, to keep up the brewery, to keep up the liquor shops in our country, who employ altogether some 11,000 or 12,000 persons. Now, there is another class in this country, and that is the 4,400,000 and over, who do not make and sell liquor. The legislation we have at present is in favour of the 11,000, but it is against the best interests of the 4,400,000. By the legislation I propose, the good of the greater number is sought, and if it is admitted that the good of the greatest number ought to prevail, then the interests of the smaller number must go down. The supreme object of law and the end for which law ought to exist, it seems to me, is simply that the greatest good ought to be secured to the greatest number. Sir, it is said that it is in violation of personal liberty. I, myself, am just as strong an upholder of the principles of personal liberty as any man can well be, but I know that it is apt sometimes to take the form of license, and what we denominate by the sacred name of liberty may become an infringement upon the rights of others who wish to exercise their personal liberty. There is a sphere in which personal liberty is sacred and ought to be kept inviolable. When it travels out of that sphere and infringes in speech or action upon the rights, the happiness, the pursuits, the prosperity of others, then it has to be hedged around, restrained, and circumscribed by what is for the good of others as well. So personal liberty has its sphere thus restricted, and within that sphere it ought to be kept inviolable. Sir, do we not infringe upon what some people call personal liberty in our other legislation. There is, for instance, a law upon our Statute Book which states that I shall not purchase a revolver, fill it with cartridges, and carry it about the street on my person; if I do so I am liable to punishment. Now, why is that? Because it is feared that in a moment of provocation or quick excitement I, having that deadly arm in my possession, might use it to the detriment of a fellow creature. The temptation may occur and I may yield to it, and harm would result. But there the law comes down, and public sentiment upholds it, and says that in the general interest I should be deprived of what I might consider my personal right. So it is with reference to quarantine; so it is with reference to a thousand other things that I might mention. Wherever they infringe upon public rights and interests, the public cries a halt and asks that they should be exercised, only in so far as they are not detrimental to the greatest good of the greatest number. Well, Sir, I think, then, without speaking further on this point, that it is competent to a country, by virtue of that preventive power which it posses es, to shield itself from enemies, within or without, by virtue of that protective power which every people has to look after and develop its best interests. We should carefully take away that which hinders their development. From all these considerations, it seems to me perfectly within the right of a people to prohibit a public act which a majority of them consider to be detrimental; therefore, on those grounds the people may prohibit the sale, or the manufacture, of strong drink which produces an infinity of mischief, counterbalanced by an infinitimal portion of good. I think hon. gentlemen are sometimes very unreasonable in applying canons to test a prohibitory law which they would not dream of applying to any other law upon the Statute Book. A prohibitory law is but the creation of the people's voice, fallible as all other laws are. Now, Sir, do we expect a law to be carried out unless it has a fair chance for its enforcement? Do we expect, in the first place, that law should do more than to minimize the evil against which it is directed? Men cite prohibitory countries and say that notwithstanding the law, people can drink and people can sell, and they quote that as indubitable proof that the law has been a failure. Sir, that is not a fair test for a law. No law proposes to do more than to minimize the evils against which it is directed, and if we are reasonable, as I trust we are, we shall not ask that a prohibitory law shall utterly annihilate the evil against which it is directed, any more than we should ask that any other law should utterly annihilate the evil against which it is aimed. We have laws upon the Statue Book, but we have violations

of those laws in every community. The test to be applied is, does the law minimize the evil and keep it down? If so it is useful and ought to be maintained. So much, then, with respect to the test of law. Recollect that it is not to entirely annihilate the evil but to minimize it, to bring it within the smallest possible compass, that we maintain such laws as advisable; and if you find such laws minimize the evil, they are a success and not a failure. I hope that the same reasonable and fair test may be given to prohibitory laws as is granted by common consent to every other law we place on the Statue Book. With respect to the effectiveness of prohibitory laws, I do not propose to enter at any length into that argument. I merely wish to state that in Great Britain prohibitory laws have existed a considerable length of time, and that the testimony to their good and advantage is unvarying and unimpeachable. There are to day in the ecclesiastical Province of Canterbury 1,500 parishes, in which there is no dram shop, bar room or tavern where intoxicating liquors are sold, and a population of more than 250,0000 is living in those parishes. The Committee of the House of Convocation made a very careful investigation into those parishes, and reported that the results were such as temperance people were led to expect. There are in the British Isles more than 100 estates, covering large areas of country, in which, by the will of the landlords themselves, no intoxicating liquor is sold, and the testimony is unvarying as to the good effect which comes from that restriction and prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors. Sir, the principle of prohibition has been admitted by the British Parliament on several occasions. In 1854 the principle of prohibition was applied to the Kingdom of Scotland for one-seventh of the time, and kept in force since then. In 1878 it was applied to the Kingdom of Ireland; and I notice a very significant fact which has occurred within the last few weeks, that whereas, when that law for Sunday closing in Ireland was introduced and passed the first time, it was as a private measure and excluded five of the principal cities and towns in Ireland. Within the last four weeks the British Government have introduced that measure as their own, and extended its provisions to the five formally exempted cities and towns. I ask no better proof than that practical test which has been given in Ireland, and the practical results which have followed, that the British Governme t, after carefully investigating the matter, are so informed and so sure as to the good effects of it, that they have, of their own motion, made the law their own and extended its provisions to the five exempted towns. I will not call the attention of the House to the prohibitory laws which have been passed and are in force in the United States, and with great success. I will not call the attention of the House at any length to the prohibitory laws passed in this Dominion, which have also had their success. I wish merely to refer to one law, and to quote an authority not unknown to this House with respect to its beneficial effect. In 1875 the Parliament of this country passed a prohibitory law, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and possession of intoxicating liquors in the North-West Territory. That has been kept on the Statute Book ever since, and only this year a very eminent authority, one whom this House will be glad to recognize, Sir Charles Tupper, made the following statement from his place in Parliament:

"It will hardly be necessary for me to allude to the fact that, under an Act which I had the honour of submitting to Parliament when Minister of Customs, in 1873, the Inland Revenue has not much to do, I am happy to say, in the North-West Territories, because, under that Act, we established what is called a Maine Liquor Law throughout the North-West Territories, which prevents the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors in any part of those Territories. The result of that enactment has abundantly justified it. It was with no small degree of satisfaction that I found, when it was proposed to take a section of the North-West Territory within the bounds of old Manitoba, that the people arose *en masse* against it, and protested against being carried into the Province of Manitoba on any other terms than that they could maintain the exclusion of intoxicating liquors, which they then enjoyed in the North-West, and retain that provision when they became part of the Province of Manitoba."

That is the testimony of the Minister of Railways and Canals; a conclusion at which he arrived, after an intimate knowledge of the operation of the Act in the North-West Territory, for seven or eight years. I offer no further remarks, to-night, Mr. Speaker. I leave the Resolutions, and the principle which is contained therein, to the arbitrament of this House, feeling satisfied that if it will pass these Resolutions in the shape in which they are, it will not only have given an expression of opinion, which will have its effect on a traffic always aggressive and always destructive, but it will also hold out a silver token of hope and inspiration to thousands and hundreds of thousands of people who are earnestly and honestly working in this country to suppress a traffic which has brought about a multitude of evils, with no compensating advantages.

Mr. KIRK. I did not intend to say a word on this question, nor do I intend to say much now. We always listen with admiration to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster). On this occasion I have listened to him with a good deal of pain and with a good deal of surprise. I could not understand why he wasted so much eloquence in arguing the question of prohibition when he eliminated, or allowed to be eliminated from his prohibitory Resolutions, anything which was prohibitory in them. I regret that when the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was before the House, and was carried by the unanimous vote of the House, I did not object to it. I was looking to the hon. member for King's to rise and divide the House on it. I regret he did not do so. When he accepted that amendment, he spoiled his Resolutions—there is nothing now left. The Resolutions as now drawn are simply the Resolutions passed by this House in 1875. Has not prohibition sentiment advanced in this country? I think it has. In 1878 this fact was proved, for the Scott Act, which is a prohibitory measure, was passed. It was thought by the temperance people, and I thought so, that it was the intention of the temperance men in this House to press in Parliament this Session the square issue of prohibition; but from these Resolutions prohibition is altogether eliminated. The Resolutions before Parliament to-day are simply milk and water Resolutions, with very little milk in them. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the people call him enthusiastic. Well, I am not surprised at that, when they hear him talk; but when the point comes when action is required, he seems to have very little backbone. I regret this very much, from the fact that I, as a temperance man, looked upon him as my leader. I am sorry I did not as a temperance man, and as a prohibitionist, object and demand the views of this House when the amendment was introduced. So far as the Resolution is now concerned, I, for one, care very little about it. We are no further advanced in regard to it than we were in 1875, and I think the temperance people of the country will feel in the same way with regard to it that I do. Now, I have nothing more to say with regard to this question, except to repeat that I regret very very much that our leader on the temperance question in this House has though proper to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Cardwell.

Mr. FOSTER. Allow me to make an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have a right to make a personal explanation, when such a grave charge has been made against me. If I have not, I will move the adjournment of the House. The hon. gentleman gets up in his place, after the time for action on his part has entirely passed, and he speaks professedly——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Is that an explanation?

Mr. FOSTER. He makes this grave charge——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to make a personal explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. I was just coming to that.

Mr. SPEAKER. You must confine yourself to a personal explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been accused of giving my assent to an amendment tacked on to my Resolution which entirely takes the sting out of it, and with not having taken a division on that amendment. I wish to read the Resolution and the amendment, if I may be allowed to do so. The Resolution is:

"That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

The amendment which now makes part of the motion is as follows:—

"And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

I asked for the principle to be sustained in the House. The House, so far as this goes, has sustained the principle and gone one better by adopting the amendment of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White).

Mr. SCRIVER. I crave permission to say a few words on this subject, though I am just as desirous, as I see most of my fellow members are, to have this long debate brought to a close. As one of the temperance men of the House, I was consulted with reference to the propriety of introducing this Resolution at this particular period. I was opposed to it, because I thought it was not a logical outcome of the conclusion come to by the Dominion Alliance, when they met here some time ago. The Dominion Alliance resolved, in the earlier stages of their session here, that a general attempt should be made to introduce and pass the Scott Act in all counties of the Dominion. After that, at the very close of the meeting of the Alliance, a discussion was raised on the propriety of introducing this Resolution into Parliament. It seemed to me it would not be advisable to do so as it would be a contradiction of the action previously taken by the Alliance; and when a meeting of those interested in the cause of temperance was called here some time ago, I expressed my sentiments to that effect. However, I said if a Resolution was introduced contrary to my views, I should feel bound, as an advocate of prohibition, to vote for it; but I certainly did not suppose then, from the discussion which took place and from the remarks which fell from the hon. member from King's county (Mr. Foster) himself, that he would consent to such an amendment being attached to the Resolution as that proposed by the hon. member for Cardwell. I said to the hon. gentleman and to my friends who were assembled, at that time, that I thought the objection to such a resolution as this was, would be raised at once, that it was simply an abstract Resolution, and unless it was proposed to follow it up by legislation immediately, it would amount to nothing. The reply made by the hon. gentleman to me was, that it was his intention to follow it up by legislation, and yet he has consented now to the introduction of an amendment which proposes to postpone legislation to some indefinite period, to some period when the public sentiment of this Dominion —to be ascertained in what way I know not—shall be ascertained to be such as will warrant the introduction of such legislation. It may be asked of me, why then did you not oppose the carrying of the amendment. I did so; I believe I was almost the only one who cried out "lost" when you put the amendment. I must say that no one in this House was so surprised as I was, that no voice but my own was raised against the passage of that amendment. I regret very much that the amendment was introduced, and that it was allowed to pass the way it was, for I feel, with the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), that the temperance men are placed by it in a very unsatisfactory position.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I move in amendment to the amendment that the following words be added:—

And that this House is of opinion that the public sentiment of the people of Canada calls for immediate legislation to that end.

Mr. BOWELL. Is the amendment in order? Can an amendment to the amendment be put to the House, after the amendment is carried?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. I was asking the Speaker, not the hon. gentleman. I have been under the impression that after moving an amendment to a motion it was within the province of other members to move an amendment to the amendment; but can an amendment to the amendment be moved after the amendment is carried, and when it is not before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is now an amendment to the main motion as amended, and words may be added which are not contradictory to those adopted by the House.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Are not these words contradictory?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think so.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think, with all due deference to yourself, that these words are contradictory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I said I do not think they are contradictory.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Allison (Hants),	Harley,	Platt,
Allison (Lennox)	Hilliard,	Ray,
Auger,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bain (Wentworth),	Innes,	Ross,
Bourassa,	Irvine,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jackson,	Smyth,
Cameron (Huron),	Jamieson,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kinney,	Springer,
Cimon,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cockburn,	Landry (Kent),	Thompson,
Colby,	Lister,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Macdonald (Kings),	Vanasse,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Watson,
Fisher,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
Fleming,	McIsaac,	Wilson,
Forbes,	McMullen,	Wright.—55.
Foster,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Armstrong,	Davies,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Desaulniers,	McCallum,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Desjardins,	McDougald,
Baker (Victoria),	Dickinson,	McLelan,
Beaty,	Dodd,	McNeill,
Béchard,	Dundas,	Massue,
Bell,	Dupont,	Mills,
Belleau,	Farrow,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	O'Brien,
Benson,	Gagné,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Gault,	Paint,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Gigault,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Girouard,	Rinfret,
Bolduc,	Gordon,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Shakespeare,
Brecken	Guillet,	Small,

Bryson,	Gunn,	Sproule,
Burnham,	Hackett,	Stairs,
Burns,	Hay,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Taylor,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hickey,	Temple,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Tilley,
Carling,	Houde,	Trow,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Tyrwhitt,
Cartwright,	Kaulbach,	Wallace (Albert),
Casgrain,	Kilvert,	Wallace (York),
Chapleau,	Kranz,	White (Cardwell),
Cochrane,	Landerkin,	White (Hastings),
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wigle,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Williams,
Coursol,	Lesage,	Wood (Brockville),
Curran,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Wood (Westm'l'd)—107.
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Vanasse) in the seat from which he gave his vote.

Mr. VANASSE. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I have taken the seat of my hon. colleague, Mr. Homer, which is at a distance of six inches from mine.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not removing from his seat.

On the main motion, as amended, being put,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I desire, Sir, to have the attention of the House just for a few minutes. Never since I have entered public life have I voted, nor do I intend to vote, against the principle of prohibition. As early as 1855, I introduced into the Legislature of my own Province one of the most stringent prohibitory Bills that was ever proposed in any Legislature or Parliament in the world. Previous to the introduction of that Bill, we had, as we thought, educated the people of New Brunswick to the point that such a law, if enacted, would be supported and sustained by the people. Reference was made by the hon. mover of this Resolution to the number of petitions presented to the House of Commons in 1877; and if my memory serves me, in the Province of New Brunswick, as far back as 1855, we had more signatures to petitions presented to the Legislature of that Province in favour of prohibition than were signed to the petitions presented to this House from the whole Dominion in 1877. They were brought into the House in the size of rolls of carpet by the hon. members who presented them. We thought that we had educated the people of that Province up to such a point that if a prohibitory law was passed it would be enforced. We had three-fourths of the people of that Province signing petitions in favour of prohibition. That law was passed by the Lower House, by something like two-thirds majority, and it passed the Upper House by nearly the same majority; and it was passed because of the strong arguments and facts presented, and because of the statistics we had collected as to the effect of the traffic in New Brunswick from 1852 to 1855, and which were so convincing that men who differed from us in opinion gave us their support, and enabled us to carry the measure by the majority stated. That law went in force on the 1st of January, 1856. I was contrasting the position I occupied at that time with the position occupied by the mover and seconder of this Resolution. Before that law went in force, I was burned in effigy in many parts of the Province of New Brunswick. On the night of the day on which it came into force, I had the doors of my house broken down by a battering ram, and I did not know but that my life would be taken. I had threatening letters, with death's heads and cross-bones, sent to me; but we carried that law in New Brunswick, and I am satisfied that if such a law was in force to-day, it would be a great blessing to that Province. For six weeks that law was enforced. The saloons and dram shops of that Province were almost entirely closed. Many gentlemen had laid in their stocks beforehand, and had as much liquor as they required; but the drinking saloons were closed, and the result was apparent to every person, even to those who were most prejudiced against the principle of prohibition. But what took place? Some few individuals had the temerity to violate the law. They were taken before the magistrates for trial. The magistrates, though well informed men, were not legal gentlemen and were not very well up in legal proceedings. They tried the cases, and gave their verdicts according to the evidence. Appeals were taken, however, until I might say hundreds of cases were before the Judges on appeal; and through some informality in the proceedings of the magistrates, the cases were dismissed and the magistrates were mulcted in costs amounting in many cases to from $200 to $500. These magistrates were honest men, who were discharging their duties to the best of their abilities, and in some cases have assisted to pay the expenses to which they were subjected. This went on until the magistrates became so alarmed that they objected to undertaking them. The result was that the Lieutenant-Governor—who was hostile to the Bill—brought the subject to the attention of the Government, and suggested the desirability of having a new election, in order to test public opinion, with reference to this law, which had been in operation only about four months, the Council objected to this course. This question, though it was not the sole issue of the elections of 1854, was discussed on nearly every hustings, and many members were elected upon it. At this time some of the friends of the measure were themselves disheartened on account of the expenses incurred in the courts, and because of the increasing number of the violators of the law, who, there was reason to fear, would not be brought to trial. The Governor insisted upon a dissolution of Parliament. The Government resigned because they would not accept the responsibility of this Act. They demanded that the law should have a twelve months' trial, at all events; and declared that if then it was found to be a failure, we would be prepared either to amend the law or to ask for its repeal. We were thrown into an election, and very many of those who had signed the petition went back on us; they voted against this law, and a majority were returned to vote in favour of its repeal. Under these circumstances, and believing as I do now, that if public sentiment is not sufficiently educated to sustain a prohibition law the passage would do harm instead of good, instead of abandoning anything by accepting the original resolution even as amended, I hold that if this motion be carried the cause of prohibition will have made a great step in advance.

Mr. KIRK. We had the same thing in 1875.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not quite sure but that some hon. gentlemen who voted against this proposition to-day did not then vote for the proposition moved by Mr. Ross. That, however, does not matter at present. I believe in prohibition; I believe it will yet come in Canada; but I believe it would be the greatest injury to the permanent success of prohibition were there such a law enacted to-day, because I know, from the experience of the past, that it could not be successfully carried out. I have the courage of my convictions and am prepared to vote for the principle of prohibition, but I have also the courage of my convictions when I say that the country is not yet sufficiently educated to enable that principle to be successfully carried into operation. What did we find in New Brunswick? We found that men who signed the petition for prohibition and advocated it publicly, when it came to the vote, voted for its repeal; and until a majority of the people of the Dominion are practically teetotallers, we will have the appetite of the people, as well as the interest of the men engaged in the liquor traffic, working and conspiring to destroy it. It is because I believe in prohibition that I am prepared to vote for the principle, and to say that when the time comes when it will be desir-

able to have it put into operation, I will be prepared to support a prohibitory measure, not deterred by any question of its effect on the revenue. Of course, the ex-Finance Minister and myself would naturally look to the matter of revenue, but that, in my judgment, is but a feather in the scale when compared to the beneficial effects that would follow the practical working of prohibition. I would vote for it most cheerfully and, as Finance Minister, prepare ways and means to make up any deficiency that would arise if we were in a position to say that if such a law were enacted it would be sustained. I can understand the delicacy of an hon. gentleman voting against the last amendment, as a temperance man and a prohibitionist, because, as such, he would seem inconsistent, and I noticed cheers when my name was called as voting against the immediate adoption of prohibition; but I did so, because I believe it is in the interest of temperance that we should not enact a law that will not be enforced. I speak with the experience I had thirty years ago, and have had ever since 1856. When the convention was held in Montreal, I was written to by one of the leading friends of temperance asking my opinion. I was unable to be present, but I wrote a letter in reply, which letter Mr. Ross read at a convention held in Ottawa. What was the opinion I then expressed? I stated that if they decided to submit the proposal to the popular vote they should not suggest less than a three-fifths vote, because, if carried by a bare majority and without public sentiment behind it, the law would fail and the cause of temperance would be damaged instead of benefited. That has been my conviction since 1855. I do not hesitate to say that the success of the principle of prohibition depends very much on the judicious enforcement of the Scott Act; that is, the judicious selection of the places where the law is to be brought into force. Take my own Province as an illustration, a county where the Act has been in force for some time, but where it has not been enforced; in that county the cause of temperance has been damaged rather than benefited. If we would select the counties of the Dominion in which public sentiment is really strong enough to sustain the law and enforce it, I am positive the result would be such that it would extend widely throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion the advantages of the prohibitory principle, and by thus educating the country, section by section, a Dominion prohibitory law might be put in force and carried to a successful conclusion. Take any county in which the law is in force, but not executed, and you will find that the effect is injurious; but, on the contrary, in any county where the law is practically carried out, the effect is strongly in favour of extending generally the principle of prohibition. I say that I will be prepared to record my vote on any occasion in favour of prohibition, when we can say honestly that the public sentiment of Canada is so strong that we will be in a position to enforce it. But from my experience of what has taken place in the past, I cannot help being convinced that we are not to-day in that position. If a prohibitory law were enacted to morrow, I am satisfied it could not be enforced, and nothing could do more damage to the cause of prohibition than the enactment of a law, followed by its non-enforcement and ultimate repeal. It would then take us a century to get back to our starting point. We must carry prohibition step by step, and that can only be done by the judicious enactment and successful carrying out of the Scott Act, through a careful selection of the counties in which public sentiment is strongly in favour of such a law. In such a way, our people will be educated, step by step, and the day will then not be far distant when Parliament will be able to say, wisely and judiciously, that the time has arrived when the Act can be successfully enforced throughout the whole Dominion. Having a strong feeling on this question, I wish to explain distinctly that my reason for giving this vote is that, at present the public sentiment of the country is not in such a position that we could enforce the law if enacted. I may say I believe that if a vote were taken, a majority of the people would vote for prohibition, but with the social customs as at present, I do not believe that a prohibitory law could be enforced, and I therefore give my vote in what I believe to be the true interest of prohibition and the cause of temperance.

Mr. IRVING. If the statements made by the last speaker be correct, I cannot see the propriety of introducing the Resolution at all. Now, Sir, what are the reasons given by the last speaker why the country is not ready for it? Simply, that a law was passed some thirty-five years ago and repealed immediately without giving it a trial at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. IRVINE. I will stand here until I get a hearing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. IRVINE. I will be heard, or I will stand here until to-morrow morning. I will not go on as long as there is this noise.

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi). If we are going to make a night of it, permit me to ask what motion is before the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER. The main motion as amended. Shall it be adopted?

Mr. IRVING. Five minutes will do me if I get a hearing. The reason the hon. gentleman has given why the country is not ripe for a prohibitory law is that a law was enacted in New Brunswick thirty-five years ago and repealed immediately. The hon. gentleman is very well aware that, when the people of New Brunswick were appealed to enter the Union, which has not been found to be very beneficial to New Brunswick, they declined the proposals then made, but a year or two afterwards they willingly accepted the proposition made to them. However, I will refer to a State where there is a prohibitory law enacted—that is Maine. Maine enacted a prohibitory law in 1851, the law remained on the Statute Book until 1855, and the people of Maine had the law repealed, the law was again enacted in 1858, and it has remained on the Statute Book from then till now, for a period of twenty-eight years. The people of Maine changed their minds and re-enacted the law which was first repealed, and I do not think there is a party in Maine now bold enough to stand up and ask the Maine Legislature to repeal the law which is the law of Maine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. VAIL. We will have to retaliate on this side.

Mr. MILLS. It means a longer Session, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If you want to adjourn at Easter.

Mr. IRVINE. I stated that no portion of the people of Maine can be found to stand up and ask the Legislature to repeal that law, and for the Finance Minister to state that the fact that the people enacted a law thirty-five years ago and found it unpopular, shows they still enjoy the same view in relation to a prohibitory law, is absurd. I will say now what I have said heretofore, that the sentiment in reference to prohibition in this Chamber is not very strong. I do not think it is quite the reflex of the sentiment of the country. It is very true that, a few years ago, when this country was ruled by another Government, the people of this country were very clamorous for a prohibitory law and they did not appeal in vain to the Government of that day, led by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. He gave them what is known as——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentlemen try to keep quiet for a few moments, until we get to a division on the matter.

Mr. IRVINE. He gave them what is known as a local option law, that is, a permissive law, prohibitory in its character when enacted, but left to the people, of course, to accept or reject it. We found last year that that law could be amended, and the Alliance which met in this city a year ago, proposed some amendments to that law, and it is very well known that a Committee was appointed to have those amendments embodied in an amendment to be sent to this Parliament, and we know very well that they never were presented, for the reason, exactly, that the Government of the day, of which the hon. the Finance Minister is a shining light, could not undertake the responsibility of introducing the law in this House to carry it through Parliament—that is, the amendments embodied in the Resolution. So we have abundant proof that the present Government, the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury Benches, are not very favourable to what we call advanced temperance legislation, and I think all that the temperance people of this country ask now is, that we have what we call a fair show: that is, that we have a fair sight, to enforce the Scott Act. But we believe——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. IRVINE. We have a fair exhibition of the temperance sentiment of the House to-night. We know on what side advanced temperance principles are. I said in the outset that I believed the temperance people of this country wanted nothing better than the Scott Act, if it received that treatment which it should receive at the hands of the Government, but we are satisfied from what we know, we have reason to believe, that the present Government are willing to see that law frustrated and wiped off the Statute Book. We know that, notwithstanding that the Finance Minister votes one way and speaks another, the sentiment of the party on the Treasury Benches is decidedly hostile to the temperance movement and to temperance legislation. We know that the temperance question has been the hobby upon which he rode into power, upon which he sits in power now, the hobby which he has always sat upon, in order to advance his own interests.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Mulock,
Allison (Hants)	Fisher,	Paint,
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong,	Foster,	Platt,
Auger,	Gagné,	Ray,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gault,	Reid,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gigault,	Rinfret,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gillmor,	Robertson (Hastings),
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Beaty,	Guillet,	Ross,
Béchard,	Gunn,	Scott,
Bell,	Hackett,	Shakespeare,
Belleau,	Hall,	Small,
Benson,	Harley,	Smyth,
Bernier,	Hay,	Somerville (Brant),
Bossé,	Hesson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Springer,
Brecken,	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Bryson,	Holton,	Stairs,
Burnham,	Homer,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Houde,	Taylor,
Cameron (Huron),	Hurteau,	Temple,
Cameron (Inverness),	Innes,	Thompson,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Tilley,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Trow,
Cartwright,	Jamieson,	Tyrwhitt,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Vail,
Cochrane,	King,	Vanasse,
Cockburn,	Kinney,	Wallace (Albert),
Colby,	Kirk,	Wallace (York),
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Watson,
Coughlin,	Lister,	Wheler,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Kings),	White (Cardwell),
Davies,	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wigle,
Desaulniers,	McCallum,	Williams,
Dickinson,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Dodd,	McDougald,	Wood (Brockville),
Dundas,	McLelan,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Fairbank,	McMullen,	Wright.—122.
Farrow,	Mills,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Daly,	Lesage,
Amyot,	Desjardins,	McDonald (CapeBreton),
Benoit,	Dupont,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bergeron,	Geoffrion,	McNeill,
Billy,	Girouard,	Massue,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Bolduc,	Guilbault,	O'Brien,
Burns,	Haggart,	Orton,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Ouimet,
Carling,	Kranz,	Pinsonneault,
Caron,	Landerkin,	Riopel,
Casgrain,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tassé,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Weldon.—40.
Curran,		

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:

Copies of advertisement calling for tenders for carrying mails from Kamloops to Spencer's Bridge, B.C., dated June, 13th, 1883; also, copies of tenders received for such service; also, copy of contract based on such tenders, and the hours of arrival and departure of mails from both places.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Copies of all documents, statements, &c., of a nature to afford the information asked for by the following questions: Whether the Government has, by sale, grant, location or otherwise, disposed of the lands belonging to it in the County of Richelieu? If so, what are the lands; what is the extent of each lot; to whom was it disposed; what are the conditions of each such grant, location or sale; what are the prices paid in each case, and when and how were the amounts paid? Also, of all documents relating to the subject matter of the said questions, and of those evidencing the said transactions.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As it is likely we shall have a very late sitting to-morrow night, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:35 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY IN THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NICOLET.

Mr. SPEAKER. A vacancy having occurred in the representation, by the resignation of François Xavier Ovide Méthot, Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, in conformity with the Act 41 Victoria, Chap. 5, Section 12, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new Writ of Election for the said Electoral District.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the treatment and relief of sick and distressed mariners, so as to extend the benefit thereof to vessels employed in fishing on certain conditions.

He said: It has been found in practice that a great many fishing vessels, both Canadian and foreign vessels, visiting our coast do not pay any sick mariners' fees until they have a seaman or fisherman sick on board. Consequently, there was a charge upon the mariners' fund in this way without there being any corresponding income. I now propose to allow Canadian registered vessels to participate in the benefits of that fund, on condition that before starting on a voyage they pay the sick mariners' dues.

Resolution considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act respecting the treatment and relief of sick and distressed mariners.

Bill read the first time.

RETURNS RESPECTING MILITIA MATTERS.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to enquire when the return ordered in respect of the purchase of tents in connection with the Militia Department will be brought down. I fail to understand why the preparation of these returns should be delayed so long. Furthermore, in this connection, I am informed that the three tents which were stated to have been purchased by the Militia Department, in answer to a question which I put on the paper some time ago, were not such tents as were required for militia purposes, but were tents loaned out to friends of the Minister of Militia. If such is the fact, I should like to be informed in regard to the matter. I am also informed, on what I believe to be reliable authority, that it is the practice of the Militia Department, to loan not only tents but other property belonging to the Government. I have been informed that a gentleman who formerly held a seat in this House has now in his garden at Sherbrooke, an ornamental war gun which is the property of this Government, and which is used for the purpose of ornamenting his garden. I am further informed that supporters of the Government, have the privilege of borrowing from the Minister of Militia or from his Department, tents, when they wish to go out camping in the summer season, or on shooting expeditions. If that be so, the House should be informed with respect to these three particular tents, which I have been informed were purchased, not for the use of the Militia Department, but for the use of friends of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman has given us a wonderful amount of information, and as far as quantity goes it is certainly very considerable. The only trouble is, that the quality is not equal to the quantity. The hon. gentleman placed upon the paper a question asking me, as Minister of Militia, to furnish him information in regard to some tents. The question was answered, and I think the hon. gentleman must consider that, in the position which a public man occupies as the head of a Department, the answer which he gave was an answer given on his responsibility; and the hon. gentleman must be satisfied with that answer. The hon. gentleman says he has "been informed." The question would be an interesting one as to the person or persons from whom the hon. gentleman gets his information. If I wanted to do what the hon. gentleman has done to-day, I might say I had been informed that the hon. gentleman was getting information from a source from which he could not expect it to be reliable. However, I do not consider it necessary to enquire into the sources from which the hon. gentleman chooses to get his information; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the three tents, which have been purchased by the Department of Militia and Defence, are not ornamental tents. They may be ornamental from the view which the hon. gentleman takes of what an ornamental tent is; but it is a matter of perfect indifference to me what the hon. gentleman considers to be an ornamental tent. The three tents, in respect of which the hon. gentleman placed the question on the paper, are tents which have been ordered upon the recommendation of the officers of the Department as sample tents. They are to be placed in the stores of the Militia Department, and whether the hon. gentleman considers them ornamental or not, they have been ordered for the purpose of getting exactly a sample of what was considered to be the best tents to be introduced into the service; and in consulting the officers of the Department, I thought I was doing what was right and proper to do, and I am sorry to see, from the course which the hon. gentleman has taken, that my ideas have not coincided with the views entertained by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has placed seven motions on the paper for the purpose of obtaining information from the Militia Department. The work of preparing the returns which the Government consented to bring down, was placed in hand as soon as possible, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the return respecting the tents, about which he wanted information, was laid on the Table seven days ago, but so little importance did he attach to the information which he wanted, apparently, to get for a purpose, that the hon. gentleman has not taken the trouble to make himself aware that this information has been brought down. Other information is being sought for, and the returns will be brought down in due course. Hon. gentlemen will understand that when several returns are asked for at one and the same time, more especially with regard to the Militia Department, where the staff is limited, some time must elapse before they can be made ready; but two additional returns will be ready by to-morrow, I hope.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. (Brant). The Minister of Militia is mistaken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I perhaps acted irregularly in allowing the hon. gentleman to proceed beyond asking a question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr. CARON. Mr. Speaker, you allowed the hon. gentleman to go outside—

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I am not going outside the question, but I wish to say that the Minister of Militia is mistaken in supposing that I did not see the return, because I have seen the return which was made to a motion put on the paper, and I say it is only a partial return. I am not so ignorant of the matter as the hon. gentleman imagines, as I have taken some time to look into it, and I know what I am speaking about.

Mr. CARON. I say the hon. gentleman is completely mistaken, and that he has no right to say that the return which was brought down is a partial return. The return is the only one which the Department of Militia could bring down; and I repeat that the hon. gentleman has no right to stand up and state that a return which has been brought down upon the responsibility of the head of the Department is a partial return. Does the hon. gentleman imagine for a moment that I could consent to bring down anything but what is a full report obtained from the information which we possess in the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Militia ought to complain—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking to the point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was about to say, Sir, that the Minister of Militia just now laid down a position which I do not think is a correct one. He thinks a member has no right to complain if a return is a partial one, but I say that partial returns are constantly being brought down by Ministers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am in order, I say. If I am not in order I shall resume my seat, but as I am in order I shall proceed. The hon. gentleman complains because we say that some of his returns are partial, but I say we certainly have a right to make that complaint when the returns are partial, as they frequently are.

RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. From what the Minister of Militia has said, we would imagine that we were upon the tented field, instead of a House of Parliament. I propose, however, to make some further enquiries, which, I hope, will not be received in the same aggressive spirit. I would like to ask about a return with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which we were told would be brought down on a Friday about a fortnight ago. Then I wish particularly to ask of the acting Minister of Agriculture for a return, moved for by myself early in the Session, upon the subject of emigration. I moved for the papers showing the data upon which the emigration for the year was based, and particularly for the railway returns of the passages into and the journeys out from the Province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman knows that gentlemen on this side have challenged the satisfactoriness of those figures, and it is extremely important before we continue the debate with reference to the immigration vote that we should have the return which was moved for at the earliest moment it could be moved this Session, and has frequently been asked for since.

Mr. McLELAN. I called the attention of Mr. Lowe to the matter, and urged him to have it brought down as early as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. I too have something to say about partial returns. I moved the other day for the correspondence between the late Premier, Mr. Mackenzie, and Sir John Rose, in regard to the course pursued by the Government on a certain occasion. The returns brought down are only partial returns.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope the Ministry will take no offence at what I say. As they do not seem to know where to find the missing links, I can tell them. I think the late Premier could furnish them with additional correspondence which is of an important character, and which I wish to be part of the records of this House. I would like to ask the Ministry if they can obtain from the late Premier this additional correspondence which is necessary to complete the return.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I would say that I should be happy to receive any supplementary return from my hon. predecessor, and any information he furnishes me with, which is not in the Department, I would be glad to bring down, if it is not of a confidential character.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I may say that I had a letter from the Deputy Minister of Finance, asking me if there was any information of the character asked for. I wrote him a letter to say that there was some correspondence with the financial agents of the Dominion, in London, through Sir John Rose, but it was conducted by myself as Premier. It was not a Departmental matter at all, and all I could say was that if there was any possibility of getting it I would not object to furnish copies if they were asked for. I received no application from any quarter, and therefore I did not send them,

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume we will get it now.

Mr. DAVIES. I asked the other day for a return which I moved for some time ago, with reference to wages and salaries on the Intercolonial, and which the Minister of Public Works promised to make a note of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware of course that these enquiries had to be made by communication with the Department at Moncton and other places. I asked that the information should be obtained as soon as the return was granted, and I hope to be able to submit it at an early day. With reference to the first question put by the leader of the Opposition I presume he refers to a telegram which I read from the Secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in response to his application. I said I brought down all the information I had, but that I had a telegram stating that they expected by the following Friday to furnish the other information.

Mr. BLAKE. Having failed in other ways to get the information, I put a question on the paper as to four simple points, relating to the cost of four large sections of the line. In answer to the question the hon. gentleman did not read a telegram—though I have no doubt he received one, because he said he had received information from the Company to the effect that they could not comply with all of the return, but this particular information and some other information would be given. The hon. gentleman said he expected to lay it on the Table on the Friday—this was Friday about a fortnight ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will ask again for it.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman will make his officer refer back to the notice papers, as to these four points, I think he will agree with me that there should not be twenty-four hours delay in getting the information.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask with reference to a return which I moved for at an early day in the Session regarding timber licenses - the number granted, the area granted, the applicants, and whether applications were made by tender or otherwise. Though this return was moved for very early, in the hope we might receive the information at an early period of the Session, it has not come down yet. We only received, the other day, a return of the land which was moved for last year, and it also was imperfect. I venture to ask if we may hope for it this Session, as it is important that we should have this information in discussing the North-West Policy of the Government. I think it is very singular that returns of this kind, asked for early in the Session, cannot be brought down.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will make enquiries and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

Mr. CHARLTON. And what about the imperfect return which was moved for last year? It was imperfect as to whether the limits were let by public tender, and also as to the location of those which were let.

Mr. McMULLEN. An order was granted for a return showing the quantity of coal moved over the Intercolonial Railway. I would ask the Minister of Railways when we may expect it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will enquire and inform the hon. gentleman.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed :—

Bill (No. 123) to amend The Customs Act, 1883.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Bill (No. 124) respecting fortifications and military buildings and their maintenance and repair.—(Sir Hector Langevin.) On a division.

INSPECTION OF GAS AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill (No. 108) to amend the Acts respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MACKENZIE. Having received some communications from parties interested in this Bill, I asked the hon. gentleman, privately, if there was any change made in it since the time that some arrangement was made with the gas companies, and I understood him to say that no material change was made since that time. I simply ask the question now, publicly, in order that there may be no mistake about it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I thought the hon. gentleman understood me to say that I had received letters and telegrams from parties interested in the gas companies, and that I supposed the complaint was the same in the letters addressed to him. The complaint, I now find, is as to clause 10, in the Bill; and I thought I explained to the hon. gentleman that that clause should not be in the Bill, that it was there by mistake, and that I intended to have it struck out. I know that is the only objection urged outside against the Bill. I think it should not be in the Bill, because it was not discussed with the persons who came to discuss the provisions of the Bill.

On section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. This clause relates to the quality of gas, and the hon. gentleman stated that endeavours had been made to render the standard such as would be reasonable, having regard to the quality of coal available in different parts of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman, however, made no observation with reference to other raw material from which gas is manufactured, at any rate, in some cities. I rather fancy that the gas in the city of Toronto is not made from coal at all, or the great bulk of it, and I do not know how far the hon. gentleman has considered what modifications are required in the law to make provision for that kind of gas. I do not know whether it is water gas or petroleum gas; but there can be no doubt that there are great defects resulting from that manufacture. There is no doubt that the gas has not as great an illuminating power as gas produced in other places where coal is procured, and there is no doubt also that a great difficulty arises from the apparent formation of some viscid substance in the pipes, which diminishes the supply and gives great inconvenience to the consumer. These are difficulties which we have painful experience of in Toronto; and while this Bill for regulating this particular trade, and making provision for the protection of the public, is being considered, I should like to know whether the attention of the hon. gentleman and that of his officers has been given to the difficulties that grow out of this kind of gas, and whether some precautions might not be taken to protect the public against the evils to which I have referred.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I stated before, one of the objects was to secure the public against poisonous gas, or gas containing substances injurious to health. For the presence of these substances, except through accident or through inevitable circumstances, a penalty is provided. With regard to the power of gas, we propose to fix the standard at 16-candle light. The different kinds of gas we dealt with in this way: By an Order in Council a certain amount of ammonia and a certain amount of sulphur were allowed in gas; but it has been found that some of the gas manufactured in the eastern section of the country contained a larger percentage of sulphur and of ammonia than was permitted under the Order in Council. This was represented by the gentlemen who came to discuss the provisions of this Bill, and I conferred upon the subject with the chief officer in that branch of the Department. The object of the Bill is to secure greater purity of gas and to fix the standard of illuminating power at 16-candle light; and, on the other hand, to relax a little the restriction of the previous Order in Council, as to the presence of sulphur and ammonia, so as to allow a larger percentage of these substances in the gas produced in the eastern section of the country. The other gases to which my hon. friend referred, I do not think are liable to the presence of these poisonous substances.

Mr. BLAKE. What I was inviting the attention of the hon. gentleman to was the question whether, as in the former Act, the intention of the Government and the Legislature is confined to gas manufactured from coal, or whether they have considered the fact that gas is not now manufactured only from coal, but also from other substances, producing different results, and requiring, possibly, different precautions for the protection of the public. I do not know whether precautions would be required as to poisonous ingredients or not, although it is alleged they are, but certainly they are required in reference to other points dealt with by this clause. By this clause the following proviso in the old Act is repealed: "On account of the difficulty of procuring coal of a particular quality, twelve sperm candles shall be substituted for fourteen." I am not objecting to the repeal of that proviso, but simply say that this Act deals with the question as if it were simply a question of illuminating gas produced from coal. While the attention of Parliament is directed, rightly or wrongly, to the obtaining of pure and satisfactory gas, it is important we should know whether they have considered this other process of manufacturing from other ingredients. What I stated to the hon. gentlemen was that there was very considerable dissatisfaction amongst the consumers—certainly on the part of one consumer, the humble individual who is now addressing you—with reference to the character of the supply in Toronto. I presume it is now too late in the Session to make legislative provisions dealing with this subject, but the hon. gentleman may, during recess, see if it is not possible to make his law so extensive as to provide the necessary protection for consumers who have to submit to being supplied with these other descriptions of gas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman raises a question of very great importance, and I do not think I can acquire such information this Session as will enable us to legislate on the subject in such a way that the legislation might be permanent. I think it preferable to allow that to stand over till next year, and during recess I will give this matter every attention, and obtain all the information possible, in order that we may devise means of protecting the interests of consumers.

On section 8,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I propose to substitute the following for section 8 :—

"Every Gas Company shall keep the public informed of the illuminating power of the gas supplied by them, and of its purity as affected by the absence or presence of sulphuretted hydrogen, by procuring a certificate from the Inspector and posting it up in the chief office of the company, from time to time as follows :—

"1. Companies having more than four thousand consumers shall procure such certificate once in each week; those having less than four and more than two thousand consumers, once in each month; those having less than two thousand and more than five hundred consumers, once in each interval of three months; and those having less than five hundred consumers, once in each interval of six months;

"2. Such certificate shall show the average result of the various tests taken by the Inspector under departmental regulations, during the period intervening between the date of any certificate and that of the preceding one, and shall remain so posted up until replaced by the next succeeding one as hereinbefore required;

"3. Every gas company in cities in which the requisite apparatus is furnished by the Department shall obtain during the first weeks of January, April, July and October in each year, a certificate indicating the average quantity of ammonia and sulphur, in other forms than sulphuretted hydrogen, ascertained by official analysis during the preceding three months to have been contained in the gas;

"4. Each certificate of tests shall be posted as above required within twenty-four hours of its delivery by the Inspector and shall remain so posted up until the issue of the next following certificate; and any company failing to comply with the foregoing requirements of this section shall, for each day during which such failure continues, incur a penalty of ten dollars;

"5. Every company shall pay to the Inspector, on the receipt of each such certificate, such fees as may be prescribed by Order in Council, and such fees shall be applied as prescribed by the 35th section of the Act first above cited."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister where he proposes the tests of the illuminating quality to be made—at the headquarters of the company, or at certain consumers' at different points throughout the city, or town, or village, as the case may be?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose the test will be made at the headquarters. The check upon that is the inspection afterwards at different places.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because practically an enormous quantity of the gas supplied is so diluted with air in many cases that the test made at the headquarters affords no criterion whatever of the illuminating quality. Persons residing at a distance from the central office know very well, as the hon. gentleman may find if he makes enquiry, that the gas supplied is very far indeed from possessing the illuminating quality which is required, and, if he could devise a means of checking that evil, he would confer an enormous benefit upon the public.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the average illuminating quality in the Dominion is above the requirements of this Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be at the headquarters, but not at a certain distance. Everybody who resides at a certain distance from the headquarters can corroborate my opinion, that at certain seasons of the year, and certain periods of the evening, the gas varies enormously in illuminating quality. Sometimes it it almost useless.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see any practical difficulty in enlarging the Bill so as to authorize departmental regulations to be made under which the inspectors shall test not merely at the gasometer, but also at certain consumers, at certain distances, as departmental regulations might require. The hon. gentleman might provide that, and, if it it was found that the difficulties were great, he need not enforce it. I do not say that the quality of the gas is different at the houses from what it is at the gasometer, because I do not know, but there can be no doubt that the quality of the gas varies very much at the houses from one day to another, and in many places from one period to another, as far as the supply goes, and if that is produced by the circumstances of distance to which my hon. friend has alluded, then the consumer's interest is to have tested not what the strength of the gas is at the gasometer, but what it is as it gets into his own house and is lighted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman thinks the present Act does not cover that ground, it might be well to provide for it.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. BLAKE. But these tests are to be made under this Act.

Mr. STAIRS. I would ask the hon. member for South Huron whether he does not think the difficulties to which he alludes may not be entirely due to a deficiency in the pressure rather than to the quality of the gas. In Halifax, I have heard it stated that the quality of the gas is quite as good long distances from the works as it is near them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be the cause. I do not know sufficiently well to speak of that, but I refer to what is an unfortunate fact within the knowledge of most hon. members. I have taken the trouble myself at times to test the consumption as registered by the meter, and to my surprise, the worse the light, the larger the quantity the meter marked.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, under the provisions of the clause as amended, I understand it is not intended that there shall be a departmental regulation to control the number of tests and the times at which tests shall be made by the inspectors. I do not think it would be very satisfactory if, in a large city, tests are made very frequently in the week at prescribed or specified times. If they are not made daily, for the purpose of obtaining a weekly average, the fewer tests ought to be distributed over the week, or we will have the experience which everyone knows to exist in regard to public institutions, that arrangements will be made to have it different when the public officer comes round from what it is on an ordinary day.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 10,

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that it be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Mr. COSTIGAN. For the reasons I already stated.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought they applied to section 11?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, to section 10.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it because the gas companies have not expressed their views on it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the subject was discussed with the officers of our Department, and it was found that there is great difficulty in fixing the amount of pressure. It has not been done heretofore, and it was thought wise not to take that subject up this Session, or until we got more information from our own officers throughout the country. Information was received from one of the large cities in a manner which seemed to indicate that the subject was thoroughly understood, but that was after we had agreed to make certain modifications in the whole Bill. I thought it would not be fair to make a radical change in it in the absence of those who had come so far to discuss the matter. I do not abandon it, but I do not propose it now because I think it is too late in the Session to deal with it satisfactorily.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman's explanation is very reasonable, and it confirms the view I stated awhile ago with reference to this character of legislation. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether any attempt has been made by legislation in other countries to deal with this question of pressure, or whether this is the first attempt; and if it is dealt with in other countries, is this proposal, which is now to be struck out—by unanimous consent, I presume—based upon the experience of other countries, or is it a proposal brought forward by the scientific men in his own Department?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This question has been dealt with in England, where there is a law providing for a certain amount of pressure.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 11,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that 35 grains of sulphur to 100 cubic feet is a very large proportion.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have already explained that this extension of sulphur in the manufacture of gas was found necessary, on long experience, and at the same time it will not be injurious to the public health.

In answer to Mr. STAIRS,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only evidence I have of the necessity of shortening the time is the evidence that comes chiefly from our own office. It is based principally upon the experience of the whole country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the departmental regulations for enabling a purchaser to be sure that he gets the quality of light mentioned in the second section? Under the prevailing regulations can any consumer send for the gas inspector and get him to test the quality of gas used by him?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot say at present. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman if he wishes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be desirable. Is there any scale of fees fixed for the inspector?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

CERTIFICATES OF MASTERS AND MATES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 116) to amend An Act respecting certificates of Masters and Mates of Ships, and The Seamen's Act, 1878.

Motion agreed to; and Bill considered in Committee, amended and reported.

EASTERN EXTENSION—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 125) for giving an effect to an agreement therein mentioned between the Government of the Dominion and that of Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill considered in Committee and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is it not intended to make the agreement a schedule to this Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Bill refers to an agreement, and an agreement is mentioned in the Bill. In such cases the usual course is to attach the agreement as a schedule.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no agreement—there was nothing more than an exchange of letters.

Mr. BLAKE. In order to be quite sure, I desire to ask the Minister of Railways whether I quite apprehended his view as to what the practical results to the Dominion would be by the passage of this Bill. As I gathered from him, and endeavoured to repeat after him, the hon. gentleman was of opinion that the Pictou Branch is a remunerative branch by itself, and that the practical result of the running of the railways, the Pictou Branch which we retain by this agreement, and the extension which we are gaining by this agreement, will be to leave us where we stand; that is to say, that the working expenses and the receipts would about balance themselves.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, that is substantially the case. What I mean to say is this: that the loss which was sustained by losing the Pictou Branch would of course leave our financial position in regard to the Intercolonial minus a certain sum of money, and I anticipate the result of this arrangement will be to leave us in as good a position as we would occupy if we lost the Pictou Branch, because we recover the interest on the money provided by this Bill by the revenue we will receive. So that financially the position of the Government will be about the same as it would be if this Bill did not pass.

Mr. BLAKE. And the Pictou branch was lost to us. In a word, taking the Pictou Branch and the extension together, does the hon. gentleman think the receipts will cover the working expenditure; or does he anticipate they will cover more than the working expenses of the two lines?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the amount will meet the interest. I consider that the financial position will be quite as good as it would be if this proposal were not carried, because if we lose the Pictou Branch we lose net profits which are considerable. The cost of acquiring both lines and of operating them will leave us with a net revenue about sufficient to meet the interest on the money expended under this Bill.

Bill read the third time and passed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 120) to amend The Weights and Measures Act of 1879.

Motion agreed to; and Bill considered in Committee, and progress reported.

ENQUIRIES INTO SHIPWRECKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend The Act respecting enquiries into shipwrecks and other matters, as to the power of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to introduce an amendment of the kind suggested in the former suggestion, to the effect that the owner or master, or other party affected, should have some notice.

Mr. McLELAN I propose to make a change in Committee.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. McLELAN moved that after the word "thereon," in the eleventh line, the following words be inserted: "after due notice to the person or persons interested."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WELDON. How are the parties interested to know the result of the investigation in case they happen to be absent. At present the decision is promulgated in open court, and there is an appeal to the Minister. Under this Bill, however, the whole matter might be settled without the knowledge of the parties.

Mr. McLELAN. I provide by the amendment that due notice is to be given.

Mr. BLAKE. But the difficulty is that up to this time, as I understand, the investigation is made, and then the subsequent decision of the court is promulgated and both parties are made aware of what the decision is, and afterwards there may be an appeal to the Minister. What my hon. friend suggests is that there should be some information to the parties so that they would be able to give reasons to the Minister for reversing the decision. It seems to me that there should be some communication to the parties interested as to what the decision of the court is, in order that they may be prepared either to move against it, or that it may be sustained by the Minister, as the case may be.

Mr. McLELAN. We might add that the parties should be furnished with a copy of the opinion.

Bill, as amended, reported.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No 114) for the prevention of the adulteration of Food and Drugs.

Mr. LESAGE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the importance of the measure now submitted to the consideration of the House is so very great and deserves, to such a high degree, to call our attention and to awaken our solicitude, that certain remarks given at some length may not be considered as a digression under the present circumstances, and may aid a certain number of persons in judging of the evil which the hon. Minister wishes to remedy, by presenting this Bill and by taking it under his protection. In fact, it is by aiding ourselves by the light of chemistry and microscopy, these two branches of human knowledge which have been the cause of our making such rapid progress in all modern discoveries, that we are able to trace out, and that without any possible error, all the adulterations which are daily made by men in the different articles which are used both for our daily consumption and to cure or relieve us from the numerous elements of sickness which are surrounding us, like a second atmosphere. Ever struggling on all kinds of grounds to satisfy our daily wants, too often do we scorn to throw a searching look on these principles of death, from which we recoil, nevertheless, whenever we think we recognize them, and which, however, we eat with delight and drink with rapture, on all our tables and in all our banquets. Still, we are better off than these poor young ones who drink death while betraying their sufferings by their cries and by their tears, and finally, in the midst of the weeping family who are trying to find means to alleviate the pain of the young sufferer, die in the arms of the one who, since their early days, has fed them with adulterated, sophisticated and poisoned milk and numerous drugs which, by their dangerous composition, accelerate and help to bring on the catastrophe. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to run over, for a moment, the list of adulterations which are the most frequent, both as regards food and drugs, and I do not hesitate in saying that all my hon. friends will admit that the picture is not overdrawn, and that there lies real danger, that these adulterations contain numerous morbifical principles, and for thousand who have, alas, disappeared in the spring of life, they have sometimes been the cause of a slow poisoning, and very often they explain these numerous sudden deaths whose immediate cause is not indicated. I shall begin with one of these substances which we use the most frequently, and which everybody, besides, uses in great quantity. I refer to flour. Everybody knows, to a certain extent, what is the physical composition of flour generally; but what is not known by everybody is that flour may be adulterated in a great many ways. All flour, in general, is a mixture of starch, of dextrine, of gluten, of sugar, of grease and of grey mineral matters. In flour of first quality, the bran is nearly eliminated; it ought to be odourless, and it has no acrid taste. There are a great many diseases of flour. They are mostly animal and vegetable parasites. We have the *acarus farinæ*, the vibrious of the larva of certain insects. This can be seen through the microscope, and it is an indication of the alteration of the flour. Among the vegetable parasites, we have the various kinds of fungi, which are said to develop symtoms of gastro-intestinal irritation in persons who eat bread made out of that flour; and I say that we can only judge of them by the aid of the microscope. They are to be found especially in cheap flour, which is not the least important as it is the poor man's flour; it is the kind of flour which cost the least. Then we have the ergot, which is found in flour made out of spurred rye. It is easily detected on grain as it goes in to the grist mill, but it is difficult to detect it in flour. It is to be regretted that we have no easy and accurate chemical process by which we could detect the presence of this eminently venemous substance, which gives rise to such serious accidents. Whole communities are fed with spurred rye. A protracted use of it produces intoxication similar to that felt by the drunkard. One of the most remarkable phenomena is the sphacelus or gangrene of the feet and hands, which may spreed over all the limbs. There is a species of convulsions which are called "cereal convulsions," which have been attributed to it, and a number of other diseases and accidents, especially with females. Besides, flour is adulterated with starch made out of barley, oats, rye and rice, and with the fecula of potatoes, beans, peas, and sometimes even by venomous plants, such as tares. All these kinds of starch may be detected with the magnifying glass. Flax seed, Indian corn, and buckwheat also enter sometimes in the composition of bad flour. The mineral matters which are added to wheat are alum, plaster, chalk, and powder of silica. Here, chemistry by re-agents may detect the fraud and protect the community against these adulterated flours. It would be too tedious to enter into the minutiæ of the disease and adulterations of flour. I mention the most important, in the order to show how the germs of death are scattered all around us while we do not seem to realize the importance of this subject. From the water which we are drinking, and which contains so many organic, parasitical and mineral impurities, even to the bread we eat and which we often find covered with fungi, every thing conspires to the insidious destruction of man; we swallow poison slowly—and the more surely for that reason—without employing the means which the Almighty has put at our disposal to struggle effectually against these dangerous and subtile poisons. We have our flour Inspectors, but I do not think their process of investigation is sufficient to protect the public; and I do not think they are qualified, from a scientific point of view, to practically fulfil their duty. When they are called upon to decide on the quality of flour, they examine a sample, and they declare that such flour is of first, second or third quality, without having recourse to the means offered by chemistry and microscopy to determine effectively the value of flour. The microscope by itself, in certain cases, and chemistry with its re-agents, in other cases, are the only means by which satisfaction may be given and confidence may be inspired in the public, especially as regards the lower grades of flour, which, owing to its cheap price, is the food of the poor, who thus cheaply poison themselves, when such flour should have been taken out of the market altogether, as an injurious and unhealthy food. These samples of flour should always be tested by analysis in order to find out the character of the deterioration. I shall now speak about meat. Considered as a nourishment, meat offers such great advantages and is of such universal use that we cannot give it too much attention. Great is the number of poisonings caused by the consumption of unwholesome meat in these times, in which meat taken from cattle suffering from diseases, of cattle whose death has been caused by diseases, is clandestinely offered for sale on our

markets. This practice is so calculated to sow death and sickness among our people, that oftentimes, immediately after a merry repast, people may consider themselves lucky that only one victim dies when the whole family might have been poisoned. The danger here lies mostly in the cities, where all these deliterious products are sold under cover of the incognito. In my opinion, two things are required to have meat of good quality, and it is in the public abattoirs that these qualities might be entirely realized. In the first place, cattle ought to be examined before slaughtering. This ought to take place twenty-four hours before slaughtering, and in warm weather a few hours before that. The weight and certain physical characters which ought to form part of the physical examination of the animal ought to be considered, in order to find out whether or not the animal is fit to be slaughtered. I am aware that this condition cannot exist unless we have a public inspector of the abattoirs, who should not only examine the meat in the stalls but also examine the animals to be slaughtered. There are a great number of animals which are not at all fit for slaughtering; so that in this case, as in many others, there is a matter for consideration. And I am sorry to see that the public abattoirs which Montreal had established within its limits have not met with as much success as might have been desired, for I consider these establishments as being the only means to ensure the consumption of first class meats, especially when there are connected with them duly qualified Inspectors, in possession of the scientific data which are necessary to determine the quality and value of the meat offered on the market, particularly as regards animals which have been slaughtered before importation, as in the case of pork. Moreover, I consider that at the present time, in our large cities the Inspectors have not the qualifications which are required to ensure the necessary protection. Besides, we have the meat which is dealt out by the butcher himself, and here is an extract of a work which deals with this matter and which has been quoted in 1875, before the French House of Representatives by Mr. Mauchère, in reference to the quality of meat. He says:

"The colour of the flesh must be vivid and ruddy.

"The simple touch must give a sensation of firmness and also a light flexibility. The pressure must denote a certain amount of density, a certain resistance of traction. There should be no oozing out of the muscular juice, nor should the hand feel a sensation of cold, of damp, or of oiliness. The palpation of the covering must be sonorous; that of the meat cut into quarters should be rough.

"The fluidity and glairy aspect of the fat are of a nature which ought to determine the rejection of the meat."

And is it not a fact that cattle are liable to suffer from a great many diseases? There is pleuro-pneumonia, cattle plague, anthrax, malignant pustule, diseases of the respiratory organs, sheep's rot, and all the parasitical diseases. Among the most important I shall mention the taenia and cysticercus of cattle and swine, the hydatides of the brain, which are often found among sheep; that special kind of phthisis produced by the strangylus filaria, and lastly, trichina, which produces, especially among people who eat raw meat, that terrible disease called trichinose. Trichina spreads over the whole muscular system of the patients and the parasites become millions with such rapidity that death ensues, accompanied with great suffering. It has often been pretended that the prolongated coction at a high temperature will destroy the vitality of the parasites, and that the meat which contains them may be eaten with safety. I think it is preferable to leave that practice to the Germans who have recommended it. When it is remembered that 60 degrees of heat do not always kill trichina, it is a matter of material importance that cattle suffering from parasitical diseases should be prevented from finding their way into our markets. We have even now on the market certain preparations which are considered very good as articles of diet for the sick, and which I think ought to disappear, for they owe their popularity to the misuse of the credit of a great name, which was the means of starting this industry. I refer to extracts of meat which have been prepared to utilize the meat which is lost in such great quantities during transportation. These extracts are offered to the public as valuable food, as a good substitute for meat, but they are only concentrated broth, devoid of gelatine or fat and, according to Mr. Provost, physician of the Lariboisière Hospital, at Paris, the extract of Leibig, taken in great quantities, constitutes a poison. He has come to that conclusion after experiments made on dogs, which, when fed on it, died more rapidly than if they had been deprived of food altogether, owing, probably, to chloride of potassium and other salts of potassium contained in that extract. If it has less effect on men, Mr. Speaker, it is because we use it in smaller proportion, or not so often, and if we are sick we are attended to by a good physician. All these facts, and a great many others too numerous to mention here, require the care and vigilance of our legislators, who should avail themselves of all possible means of preventing the numerous cases of diseases and the frequent cases of death which are due to the sale of meat, a source of danger the greater as the use of meat is so general, and as too often the price is looked at more than the quality. Again, I say that the compulsory establishment of abattoirs, with competent Inspectors connected with them, and obliged to visit the markets, are two means by which we can remedy the many dangers which beset our path. Confiscation, fine, imprisonment, as in cases of misdemeanour, ought to be applied, according to the degree of guilt proved. Now I shall speak of another substance which forms a very important part of our alimentation. I shall say a few words on the adulteration of milk, this substance which is so very nutritious, this nourishment which is so very complete, whose digestion is so easy, whose use is so very universal for the rearing up of very young children. The physical characteristics of good milk are too well known to make it necessary for me to enumerate them. Here, however, as in everything connected with trade, the dealer has found means to falsify considerably. Milk is still pure in the country places; we cannot complain on that score; but in cities there are certainly good grounds for bitter complaints. Perhaps the cause of the numerous cases of poisoning and deaths of children lies here. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, in a very few words, what are the different adulterations and falsifications of milk which occur in cities among milk dealers. The analysis of milk is easily made, but it is important that it should be made rapidly, and very often a complete analysis requires a good deal of time. It will be sufficient to take its density by means of Quevenne's densimeter, which gives just the quantity of water added on an average, the more so if it is skimmed milk. The different falsifications of milk are mostly: first, the addition of water, easily detected by means of the densimeter to which I have referred; sometimes its blueish colour might indicate the presence of water, but good care is taken to whiten it with bicarbonate of soda, starch and other substances. But by taking the density there can be no mistake. Then there is the skimming. This is a very common practice, and it is double profit, for the whey is sold and the butter is kept in kind. Sometimes horse brains are pounded and added to milk, to imitate the appearance of the cream of which it has been robbed. To discover the substitution of other substances for cream, Marchand's lactobutyrometer is used, and to dectect the addition of pounded brains, all that is required is to let this cream raise, and to keep it for a few hours. It soon putrefies and gives a characteristic smell, altogether different from the acid smell of altered cream. Then there is the addition of sugar, gum, caramel, gelatine, &c., which are deetected by the density. The condition of the animals has on milk an influence which it is difficult to appreciate chemically, but which reveals itself by the effects

produced on consumers. Purulent milk coming from an inflamed gland, may give children aphtons and stomatite diseases. Animals suffering from epizootic eczema may by their milk transmit a great number of diseases whose remote causes are not always known, and which must have their source in the use of such milk. In the last Medical Cyclopædia, I find that in England milk had been the vehicle of germs of typhoid fever, of scarlet fever, and other contagious diseases. The milk had been adulterated with water contaminated by typhoid dejections; the milk had also been contaminated by persons who were recovering from scarlatina and who were employed in the dairy during the period of disquamation. Cheese belongs to this class and is used in great quantity. Occasionally cheese has been found which was mixed with fecula and bread crum to develop mouldiness in it. Cheese of that stamp is so eagerly sought after. Sometimes it is washed in arsenical water or in a solution of sulphate of copper, in order to save it from the attack of worms, but all of these guilty practices are easily found out, for iodine water will easily point out these two first alterations, and the methods employed to discover copper and arsenic are such that the presence of these two bodies is easily detected. Besides, the yellow covered cloths which are used to wrap up cheese, contain a poisonous substance; they are chromates with basis of lead or potassa. Such is, however, one of the means employed to preserve substances which are daily coming into the domain of consumption. This is particularly common as regards hams. With reference to these two articles, milk especially, I do not know that there is in the country any means of investigation employed to detect adulteration, so as to severely punish these great frauds committed to the detriment of the health of our children especially. From time to time a correspondence accompanied with painful statistical facts awakens the attention on this question, but little by little every one goes back to the beaten path which is sunk deeper and deeper, to be filled up with the corpses of the little ones we love so dearly, of whom we had such great care and whom a slow and murdering poison has snatched away from our tenderness. The verdict is always the same—dentition, children's cholera, anemy, the rickets, when it would be so easy to write down, poisoning or starvation. Why should not the chemist of the Government, without previous notice, take here and there, from time to time, samples of milk sold, and analyze the same, so as to find out their purity by means of densimeters, lacto-butyrometers and chemical re-agents? The cancellation of the license, heavy fines, imprisonment for grave offences, the uncertainty of the moment when such tests are to be made, would be the means of diminishing the evil in a great measure, and of aiding private initiative, which, by itself, can do nothing, and is not competent to make such analysis. It is a serious danger which I have not at all overrated, and which calls upon our immediate attention. I hope the hon. Minister of the Revenue of the Interior will give it all his attention, and will find means to remedy the evil. Now, I will say a few words about alcohol, comprising under this generic name all fermented liquors. This is a matter which has been dealt with very lengthily in this House, but from a standpoint different from that which I take. I do not propose to make a speech on temperance, nor do I intend to advocate prohibition. Besides, those who have spoken on that question have made such exhaustive speeches that I would stand in fear of not throwing any more light on the subject. Confining myself to a more limited field, I simply wish to prevent my friends from using spirits. I know, Mr. Speaker, that doctors are strongly blamed for the immoderate use of alcohol in their treatment of diseases. Without wishing to exonerate us, I say that we are the only judges—it may be that there is on my part a little sympathy for my colleagues of the profession, but at any rate while employing it as a remedy, I hold that attention should at least be called to it on grounds of public health. In fact it is easy enough to judge of the real damage caused by alcohol on the constitution, which damage is more or less active according to the temperament. But, Mr. Speaker, how is it that our ancestors, who took alcohol the same as we do, have been able to withstand this usage which, though not immoderate, still was such that at certain times in the year, spirits were imbibed in considerable quantities. All the difference between that time and to-day is that in times of yore people drank their glasses brimful of alcohol, and now we drink our glasses brimful of poison. There is all the difference, and what I should wish would be to see the old usage revived, if not to drink alcohol by the glassful, at least so that we should not absorb poison by the glassful. Speaking of alcohol, we stand face to face with a substance very universally used, and whose constant and repeated use always produces baleful effects, the consequences of which are the more striking as the adulterations are more noxious, more dangerous to health, and less ascertained than in ordinary alimenation, especially when the nervous centres have lost that equilibrium, which is necessary to the exercise and perception of the senses, and to the working and intelligent exercise of the judgment. It is a precious element in many cases, especially in cases of sickness; although there are abuses on that score. But to what extent is not this counterbalanced by its injurious effects, by the disasters of all kinds, and by the numerous cases of death that it causes everywhere, in all classes of society. For the benefit of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who has proposed the temperance Resolutions the other day, I will quote the remarks of the celebrated Leibig:

"He who drinks them draws a bill, so to speak, on his health. This bill must always be renewed, because he cannot, for want of means, take it up. He consumes his capital instead of his interests, and the result is bankruptcy of his body."

This sums up all that I might say on the subject of the effects of alcohol, but as it is an evil which can not be eradicated, we must endeavour to diminish its bad effects, by following on his own ground the falsifier who, by the addition of substances which are often venemous, always scalding, and corrosive poison in many cases, can make more alcohol by adding water to it. Out of many of the samples examined in Canada by Professor Croft, of Toronto, it is found that 7 have given from 31 to 36 per cent. of alcohol, and from 0·2 to 1·7 of solid matter, comprising tannin, sulphuric acid, grape sugar; 10 samples have given from 25 to 49 per cent. of alcohol and 0·4 to 3 per cent. of solid matter, comprising sulphuric acid, tannin, salt, sugar, and all the remainder was water. Eight samples of gin have given from 23 to 42 per cent. of alcohol, and from 1 to 7 per cent. of solid matter; the remainder was water. Four samples of wine gave from 14 to 18 per cent. of alcohol and from 7·5 to 12 per cent. of solid matter, comprising tannin, iron, grape sugar and acids; the remainder was water. These quotations are sufficient to show the enormous adulterations that are made in alcoholic liquors. Brandy and gin are manufactured outright in grocers' cellars and at some hotels, the basis being inferior alcohol, with addition of fragrant matters to modify its effects. These are essential oils, such as in kirsh. It is these oils which are particularly poisonous. Wines especially are apt to be sophisticated in that way. There is the dilution, or the mixing together of wines of different grades. It is obvious that such a mixture, however great the skill of those who make it, never make good wine, except when it is a mixture of pure wines, but they are frauds when they are imitations of natural wine, such as Bordeaux and Burgundies. The second process is vinegar or the addition of a certain quantity of alcohol to wine, not in the tank, but long after it has been drawn. Then there is the debasing of wine in order to give it a vivid color. This practice is denounced and I even think that in France all natural wine containing over four gram-

mes of sulphate of potassium per litre is considered as debased, and on this account is set aside as unfit for alimentation. The sophistications of wine are too numerous to be considered here. Some of them, such as the addition of water, are inoffensive. Others, on the contrary, are hurtful and deserve general attention. I shall mention especially the addition of alum, and salts of copper and of lead, which are discovered by chemical process. To colour it, to conceal the addition of water, and to give it the appearance of wine from another Province, many organic substances are employed, such as logwood, fruits and red leaves, which are not dangerous nor unhealthy. It is not so with fuscine, a substance lately employed, and which seems to exert a deleterious influence on the economy of the human body. Now, as regards beer, there are good grounds for complaints and good reasons for inspection. When exposed to air, beer may undergo fermentation, and in such cases it ought to be rejected; the quantity of extract may be superior to the quantity of alcohol, while in good beer they are about evenly divided. Beer is falsified with nux vomica salicine, *coculus indicus*, boxwood, gentian, picric acid, and all kinds of substances, besides two of the most poisonous, strichine and *coculus indicus* especially. Here again the law may give an effective protection which is greatly required. These remarks may indicate the great alterations made in spirits. It was observed the other day that so many thousands of bushels of grain were absorbed in the manufacture of spirits without any direct benefit for alimentation, I venture to say that in a great many cases there is not enough consumed in the manufacture of spirits. In fact, spirits are made with acids, poisons, water, and the trick is played: it is alcohol. That is what is done in a great many cases, which tends to diminish the consumption of grain employed in the manufacture of spirits, to the detriment of the consumer. Now, let us say a few words about tea. Here is another product largely consumed, and whose consumption reaches a fabulous figure, especially among certain people, and which holds out grave dangers, as no doubt hon. gentlemen have long been aware of the fact. In the first place, there is the out-and-out falsification with different kinds of leaves which have never been near the tea tree, but which, by some process or other, are shaped in the required form, and are then drawn through a bath of Prussian blue. Then there is the trade of old tea leaves, which, after having been used in large hotels, are sold again to certain specialists, who dry them, and by means of furnaces roll them up in the primitive form, its native shape. Then they are drawn through a bath of sulphate of copper to give them the colour, and the trick is played. More than that; owing to its fresh colour, this tea is put on the market as Hyson of the first quality, and every one drinks with delight this subtile poison. In that respect, black tea is more free from fraud, and more natural. The same thing occurs as regards ground coffee, which contains so many mixtures of all sorts, which may all be detected with the microscope. In a great many cases ground coffee is nothing but succory mixed with saw dust; it is a great deal better to buy it in the kernel, and to grind it for domestic use. Now, Mr. Speaker, next to tea and coffee are certain substances which, though not being nutritious aliment, have, however, similar functions to perform in the economy by the local excitation they produce. They are pepper, nutmegs, aromatic condiments generally, fat condiments, such as lard, oil, and the *maigre* food condiments. These substances are more easily sophisticated than many others; unless special care is taken, they give rise to a serious danger to health, for it is particularly here that falsifications take place to a larger extent. It is a chase after new inventions, after heterogeneous mixtures of all kinds. It is mostly in that line that our Inspectors will have a fine part to play by carrying out the law in all its stringency. It is among them that we find butter manufactured entirely with oleomargarine oils and poisonous colouring matters. I shall now say a word about a question which is none the less important, especially for the sick or convalescent. It is that which refers to the purity of medicines, patent medicines and drugs of all kinds offered for sale by every one, from the barber and grocer to the druggist. It is mostly with reference to these that the popular artlessness and credulousness are taken advantage of by means of advertisements, pamphlets and puffs of all kinds. To begin with pharmaceutic remedies: To how many adulterations of all kinds and sorts are they not subject, especially with regard to preparations which are the most valuable, both as regards the effect which they are expected to produce and the price at which they are sold? Their cost price is the main cause of the adulteration. When an inoffensive substance is used as a substitute the evil is not so great, but, unfortunately, this is not always the case. Another thing which must be taken into account is the delay which is so prejudicial in certain cases of disease whose progress is rapid, when the physician waits with anxiety the result of a medicine whose known physiological effect ought to put a stop to alarming symptoms, and when, however, none of the expected effects are manifested, in consequence of adulteration, of frauds, of substitutions, and the Lord knows what else. The valuable time which is thus lost is sometimes irretrievable. Here, again, the law can not be too strict, and I am glad to see that the penalties imposed will be in proportion to the offences. What shall I say of the patent medicines of all colours, of all shapes, always presented to the public as the universal panacea, with thousands of certificates coming from all parts of the world, and recommending themselves especially by their high price? This is another secret. We have vials coloured red, green, yellow, lilac, and even blue. We have pills containing anything you can wish for, except what might be useful to you, or even useful in any way whatever—things that nobody would buy if they knew what they were. Still, every one buys them. And why? Because a circular says that it cures all sores, ailments and diseases and, very naturally, the pain from which a person may be suffering is always mentioned in the circular. At last, when the poor, sick person is fairly worn out, after having been imposed upon by these quacks, then we are called upon to give our professional services, but very often it is too late. For my part, I have seen a great many of these dupes in my extensive practice, and whose fault is it? The fault is with the law which protects these charlatans and does not protect the public at all. If all these patent medicines, for instance, were submitted to a serious analysis, do you think they would stand for a minute before the amount of ridicule which would be heaped upon them, when their composition and their mixtures would come to be determined, and when the buyer could compare the Inspector's certificate, which would be pasted on the bottle, with the certificates in which the bottle is wrapped? Besides, how many millions would be saved from our credulity? How many painful accidents and deaths would be averted? These remarks are not a puff in favour of doctors. This protection—he has it by law; more than anyone else, he is interested in taking and accepting from all parts, all medicines, preparations made according to prescriptions, patent medicines from anybody and from anywhere, provided it is proved to him that they have an intrinsic value. And if his mission is to lay out a line of conduct for his patient, and to administer to him the medicines which are, according to the long experience acquired by his predecessors, the only real and truly useful remedies, he should also have authority to give the alarm of danger, and to ask for protection in favour of the public, when there is danger, abuse or fraud. As for me, I wish to know all about the remedy which is brought to me, and the individual who offers it for sale. And, besides, why should we not compel the inventor to give the composition of his

panacea to the Government chemist who, by an analysis, would find out the real nature of the medicine, would compare the result of his own examination with the formula furnished to him, and might then give his certificate, with a duty represented by a stamp on each vial, which would be a source of revenue to the Government and would be a protection for us, as the chemist would have authority to examine new samples at any time or place, and to find out whether the preparations which are sold are identical to that which had been originally submitted to him, that he might give his first certificate; and in case of falsification, he should carry out the law in all its stringency. It is, perhaps, somewhat late now to insert this clause, but like all human things, this Bill is liable to be modified, and I hope that we will supply this want next year Before concluding these remarks, which are already too long, I must congratulate the Minister on his work, which is already very large and very complete, and I hope and trust that this measure will meet the hearty approval of all the hon. members of this House, and that from year to year we will improve it by supplying the wants and filling the voids which it may contain, the whole in the interest of public honesty, in the interest of the protection to health, in the interest of the life of our children. It is high time that the solicitude of the Government and of the legislators should be extended for a moment on this immense wound which requires a radical treatment, and that by putting all together our shoulder to the wheel we may one day deserve the name of benefactors, protectors, and even saviours of our countrymen. I cannot conclude, however, without saying a word of a certain newspaper, which is to be started in Montreal, and which is to be called *Le Journal d'Hygiène*. The Hygienic Society of the Province of Quebec publishes a programme or circular from which I cannot resist the desire of reading you an extract, although my speech has been very long, which extract is of great importance with reference to the question I have just dealt with. As the hon. leader of the Opposition has enquired lately about the mode of application of the $20,000 subsidy which we have voted towards the establishment of a Board of Vital and Mortuary Statistics, I think I may say that with respect to that there is yet much to be done; this Board will be established to gather not only mortuary statistics, but also vital statistics and to start a hygienic newspaper. It is in dealing with this question that the Hygienic Society has published the following circular-programme: —

"FALSIFICATION OF ARTICLES OF FOOD.

"Modern industry, that Briarean, with the hundred hands, has deeply modified the conditions of our existence; not only have the articles of the first necessity, but articles of commodity, even luxuries, have been multiplied while prices have been constantly decreased and comfort has come down little by little till it has reached the home of the labourer and the peasant. But along side of this radical transformation which economical production, scientifically carried on, has produced, a growing evil has been developed. The manufacturer who sold cheaply wished to sell cheaper still while realizing the same profit. This was not possible unless false labels were put on inferior articles. Deception as to quality was practised. Hygiene has nothing to do with this state of things, which is essentially human; the evil is not there. The evil lies in the following facts. The manufacturer has not only put on the market inferior or falsified products, but very often, in a multitude of circumstances, these falsifications have been obtained directly or indirectly by the aid of unwholesome and even poisonous matters.

"We do not propose to cry shame on the manufacturer; it is not always his fault; he has to struggle unceasingly against competition; he has to imitate his opponents in the business; he must adopt their processes and try to beat them in the contest for low prices, for the buyer goes in for cheap articles. The manufacturer and trader, in quite a number of cases, will poison you openly and with good faith, so that they will submit without difficulty to a control which would be the general rule.

"THOSE WHO SUFFER

"Are mostly the labouring man, the small trader, the employee, the small land owner, the peasant; in a word the people are the victims of this state of things. It is they who consume, instead of tea, plum-tree leaves colored with Prussian blue; it is they who drink, instead of coffee, succory, which has itself been made out of saw dust. It is they who think they are drinking chocolate while absorbing British gum. Poor deluded people, who imagine they eat sardines put up in olive oil, while crunching small herrings preserved in cotton seed oil They pepper with queer sorts of dust the meat they cook in vessels which have been *tinned* with lead. They buy preserves made out of sea-weed and fucus jelly, sweetened with glucose and flavoured with nitro-benzine. Their vinegar only owes its strength and preservation to the sulphuric acid which it contains, and this sulphuric acid invariably contains arsenical acid. The white bread which they think they are getting cheap, has been made out of damaged flour, to which alum has given back tone and body.

"We might indefinitely multiply the instances, but such is not our purpose. We only wish to call attention to the sad features of the state of things to which we refer. It is precisely the working men, those who are absorbed all day long in their labours, who suffer mostly. They buy from day to day and have neither the time nor the necessary means of verifying the value of the articles of food.

"ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS.

"With this question of the falsification of alimentary substances, that of alcoholic liquors is closely connected. If there is a thing worthy of remark it is the development of alcoholism; its rapid and baleful effects are not at all to be compared to what existed formerly. In olden times intemperance only had recourse to liquors which were very natural and which were obtained by very simple processes. To give one single instance, in times of yore rum was distilled from the molasses of sugar cane, while now it is fabricated outright with badly rectified alcohols which consequently contain certain substances which have very sad effects on the economy. These alcohols are coloured, flavoured, and the taste of rum is given to them by means of (we beg the reader's pardon for using these barbarous expressions) formiate of ethûle. The same thing may be said of all alcoholic liquors, without exception; they are all artificially obtained, because they cost less. The most common are naturally the most poisonous, and we should not be astonished when we see the most sturdy men fast sinking under the influence of drink, when they engulf not alcohol but poisonous liquids. We might say very queer things about sherry, ports, white and red wines, common champagne, ales and beers.

"POISONS IN INDUSTRY.

"But articles of food and drink are only a branch in the immense field of industrial falsification and poison trade. We may even add that the most condemnable of things are not found in that branch, for the human stomach, however badly used, at last rebels when the thing is carried too far: unless he becomes dyspeptic, the consumer of alum bread at last begins to think that it is not as good as that of his neighbour, and the consumer of sardines put up in cotton seed oil, finding them indigestible, does not eat any more of them.

"There is no criterion for a man who poisons himself slowly, in a room whose walls are covered with tinted paper badly pasted, or simply painted in distemper without varnish. The venomous colouring dust loosens itself little by little, accumulates on the carpet and every morning the broom raises it conscientiously. The smoker absorbs lead with the yellow wick with which he lights his pipe or cigar. The yellow cloth which covers Chicago and Cincinnatti hams largely furnishes the same substance, chromate of lead. The tinning of copper plates and dishes does not protect us in any way whatever, for the tin used in trade is falsified with lead which weighs more and costs less. Our socks, undershirts and drawers, so brilliantly colored, cause us to absorb, whenever we perspire in the least, the colours with anniline base, all venomous, and so true is this that acute cases of poisonings are reported as being due to this cause. Even the very bands of leather which are inside of our new hats, the silk and satin lining of our caps are steeped in these colouring matters derived from anniline, with which they are cheaply and handsomely dyed. We must not omit perfumery, which, under the guise of scents, tinctorial lotions, cosmetics and various pomades, hold out to us a choice of chemical products which are most always dangerous.

"ABSORPTION OF POISONS.

"Try and find out the cause of your headaches, sudden dizziness, obstinate neuralgias, rheumatic pains, slowly developed palsies, which came in little by little; find out the cause of aedemas, dropsies, wens, distentions, ganglionaries, eruptions of the skin, ringworms; ask yourselves from whence come these sudden saturine cholics. We will be greatly astonished if you think of your headdress, shoes, or underclothing, of your tinned plates and dishes, or of the walls of your room. Of course, we do not pretend to ascribe to these causes all the ailments that human flesh is heir to, but it is likely that they play an important part in their genesis.

"COMPLEX TASK OF THE SOCIETY.

"This struggle which our society proposes to undertake against the invasion of poison is evidently only one task among many others. We shall briefly enumerate the principal questions with which the Hygienic Society of the Province of Quebec intends to deal in their meetings, on which we desire to call the attention of the public and of the legislators and to which we intend to give the greatest publicity."

I beg your pardon for having detained the House so long on this question, which is somewhat dry, but which is of material importance, especially at this moment, when the hon. Minister of the Interior is introducing a measure which, although not entirely new, offers, by reason of its object, an altogether new interest, because it tends to con-

solidate and to increase all former provisions on this subject.

On the motion being put,

Mr. BLAKE. Surely the hon. gentleman will not ask that a Bill of this importance be read the second time without giving us some explanations.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am quite satisfied that this House will require no further explanations after the eloquent speech on this measure which has just been delivered by my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Lesage).

Mr. BLAKE. He is not the Minister.

Mr. COSTIGAN. But the hon. gentleman has discussed the question so exhaustively that there is no necessity for my entering into its merits.

Mr. BLAKE. He spoke in French; repeat what he said in English.

Mr. DESJARDINS. You do not require that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would hardly undertake to do that; I may make a few remarks, however, on the Bill. There is no one in this House who will deny the importance of a measure of this kind, and I am sure any measure in the direction of preventing the adulteration of food and drugs will receive the support of every hon. member. This question was raised in the other House last Session, and the importance was there recognized of further legislation without delay, and it is because I believe the country expects further legislation on this subject that I introduce this measure. The subject is one that has attracted very great attention in all countries. In the United States, scientific men have given much time to its study and very liberal sums of public money have been devoted to this subject in the several States of the Union. In New York, a large amount of money was expended to carry out a law something similar to what is proposed in this Bill, and some years ago the New York Board of Health offered a certain premium for the best Bill on the subject. Two were submitted, one prepared by an English gentleman and the other by Mr. Winter, who is well known as an analyst; and in this measure we have introduced some of the clauses taken from the New York law which we considered applicable to this country, the first section states that this Act may be cited as "The Adulteration of Food Act, 1884;" and then proceeds to give the interpretation as follows:—

"In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires:
"The expression 'Food' includes every article used for food or drink by man;
"The expression 'Drug' includes all medicines for internal or external use;
"The expression 'Officer' means any officer of Inland Revenue, or any person authorized under this Act to procure samples of articles of food or drugs and to submit them for analysis.
"An article is deemed to be 'adulterated' within the meaning of this Act,—
"In the case of Drugs:
"If when sold, or offered, or exposed for sale under or by a name recognized in the British or United States Pharmacopœia, it differs from the standard of strength, quality, or purity laid down therein;
"If when sold, or offered, or exposed for sale under or by a name not recognized in the British or United States Pharmacopœia, but which is found in some other Pharmacopœia or other standard work or *materia medica*, it differs materially from the standard of strength, quality or purity laid down in such work;
"If its strength or purity falls below the professed standard under which it is sold or offered or exposed for sale;
"In the case of food—
"If any substance has been mixed with it, so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength;
"If any inferior or cheaper substance has been substituted wholly or in part for the article;
"If any valuable constituent of the article has been wholly or in part abstracted;
"If it is an imitation of, or is sold under the name of, another article;
"If it consist wholly or in part of a diseased or decomposed, or putrid or rotten animal or vegetable substance, whether manufactured or not, or in the case of milk or butter, if it is the produce of a diseased animal, or of an animal fed upon unwholesome food;

"If it contains any added poisonous ingredient, or any ingredient which may render such an article injurious to the health of a person consuming it——"

Mr. BLAKE. This sounds very like the Bill itself.

Mr. COSTIGAN. These are the principle features of the Bill and involve all the changes. The other sections are those necessary for carrying it out. I read those to give a general idea of the Bill, and I do not think it is necessary to take up longer the time of the House with further explanations.

Mr. BLAKE. I really hoped it was an explanation we were going to get, and did not expect the hon. gentleman would confine himself to exercising his very remarkable elocutionary powers in reading the Bill to us.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman can complain that I have often taken up the time of the House with my elocutionary powers. There is nothing very remarkable about my elocutionary powers, but I cannot say the same thing of the hon. gentleman, for I believe he possesses elocutionary powers that I can have no pretention to possess.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall this Bill be read the second time?

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is only partly read.

Mr. MILLS. This Bill is beyond our power. It looks very like a Police Bill, and should properly come under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. It is an interference with their rights.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think my hon. friend from Bothwell is very unreasonable. He ought to know that it is the business of this House to interfere with the Local Legislatures, and we must have a certain portion of such interference every day. There is nothing new about that, and I am surprised the hon. gentleman should take objection to it.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope if the hon. gentleman intends to have the Bill discussed in Committee to-morrow, an interval of one day will be allowed to take place between the consideration in Committee and the third reading. We have had no information on the subject from the hon. Minister; it will be an entirely new discussion, and we should have time to consider any explanations he may make before proceeding to the third reading.

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

After Recess.

AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, the Esquimalt Graving Dock, and certain Railway Lands of the Province of British Columbia, granted to the Dominion.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to ask the Committee to allow me to amend the Bill by adding the following Resolution:—

"Until the boundary line between British Columbia and the North-West Territories is finally settled and located, and such settlement and location is published in the *Canada Gazette*, the Courts of law and equity of the said Province shall have civil and criminal jurisdiction in and over all the territories described and laid down in the map of the said Province issued and published by the hon. Joseph Trutch in the year 18 , as being within such Province, and all offences committed in any part of the said territory may be stated, in any warrant, indictment, or other legal instrument or proceedings, to have been committed in British Columbia."

I may state that the object of this is to meet a difficulty which has presented itself in regard to the legal boundary of British Columbia on the eastern side, a portion of the boundary, the only part that is at all in question; and, a doubt having arisen as to what is really the legal boundary of British Columbia, and minerals having been discovered, and a good deal of influx of population being anticipated in this portion that is, perhaps, in question, until it is finally decided, it will be found extremely inconvenient to have a section of country there in which questions might arise as to the legality of proceedings taken in relation to any offence committed in that section of the territory. The question is now being investigated with a view to its final settlement, but, until that settlement takes place, it is suggested that it is desirable to have this provision made.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman should not have been able to introduce this clause into the Bill originally. I have no information as to what the proposed conventional boundary for the purposes of the administration of justice may be. The hon. gentleman refers to a map, but he gives us no information as to what boundary is assigned to British Columbia by that map. I should like to have some general information as to where the difficulty exists.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The map defines the boundary. It was issued by Mr. Trutch, I think when he was Commissioner of Crown Lands of British Columbia. I do not remember the year at this moment, but it was some considerable time ago. In his map he had marked the boundary, taking the height of land, which I believe is recognized very generally as the boundary. Starting from the boundary line between the United States and Canada at the height of land of the Rocky Mountains, it follows that height of land until, as my hon. friend is aware, it is intersected by a particular meridian which is described in the Imperial Act. The definition in the Imperial Act is not clear as to whether it is on the height of land or not, but Mr. Trutch's map marks it on the height of land, on the watershed of the Rocky Mountains, from the 49th parallel, where it commences, until it intersects this meridian. After that, of course, there is no difficulty and no doubt. That meridian intersects the height of land somewhere, I should think, in the neighbourhood of Tête Jaune Cache, but it is clearly marked on the map, and this will make a perfect conventional boundary until the question is finally settled. The question has been raised by the Government of British Columbia as to what the true boundary is, and, upon reference to the Imperial Act, there is a good deal of obscurity. The question is being investigated, and, if legislation is required, it will have, of course, to be brought here as well as in the Legislature of British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. If I recollect aright an earlier piece of legislation provided something with reference to the main chain of the Rocky Mountains and later legislation fixed the height of land at the Rocky Mountains. I think it will be found there is some practical difficulty in saying where the height of land is. I believe there are certain portions of that territory in which there are series of detached mountains, and in one series you can go from mountain to mountain with ranges on each side so that you cannot tell where the height of land is. One can easily see on Fletcher's map that it is difficult to find what is the height of land, because, I believe, that is the real difficulty in the case. Of course, there is some one point which is the height of land, but it is not, as I understand, a visible and easily ascertained object, nor, as I have said, with these detached hills in which there are different ranges, roughly speaking parallel to one another, is it easy to be known which is the main chain of the Rocky Mountains that is to be held to be the boundary, some maps give the easternmost chain of the Rocky Mountains, and others the western. Then I doubt whether the hon. gentleman can, by the force and strength of this legislation alone, grant to the courts of any Province jurisdiction beyond the bounds of that Province. They are Provincial Courts, to all intents and purposes, and if it happens that the territory which the hon. gentleman's clause covers is in reality beyond the powers of the Province, it is a very strong proposition, I think, to say that the Parliament of Canada can confer upon Provincial Courts jurisdiction outside the Province. You are turning them into Dominion Courts and that is the only way you achieve your object. I do not intend to oppose the passage of the clause which, no doubt, the hon, gentleman, under the circumstances, will not ask to be read the third time to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to let the third reading stand over till to-morrow. With reference to the maps, that of Captain Palliser is percisely the same. The line of mountain was taken by Mr. Trutch from Captain Palliser's map.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is a different scale, is it not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. HOMER. I did not know this Bill was coming up. I understood it was not ready.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is distributed and has been marked printed in English.

Mr. HOMER. I called for it two days ago and it was not printed. I see it is not marked yet as printed in French.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The third reading is not proposed to be taken to-day, so the hon. gentleman will have ample opportunity, with the Bill in his hands, of moving any amendments he pleases.

Mr. BLAKE. Every member of this House has a right to understand that no Bill shall be taken until it is marked on the orders as proper to be taken. We dispense with that frequently, and I have not raised any objection this evening, but it is important we should remember that hon. members have a right to believe that until "E. F." is marked against a Bill it cannot be taken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt the hon. gentleman is quite right, and it is only by courtesy that we can proceed with a Bill under these circumstances. I may say that the reason for proceeding with this Bill at so early a period, arose from the fact that the season is opened, and as the time allowed for the construction of this work is limited, it is desirable that parties should understand whether the Bill is to pass or not.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. HOMER. I ask to have the amendments read.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The only amendment provides that until the eastern boundary of British Columbia is finally determined and settled, for the purpose of criminal jurisdiction, we should adopt the boundary as laid down on Mr. Trutch's map, following the height of land until it strikes the meridian or intersects that.

SUPPLY—NORTH-WEST DISCONTENT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CAMERON (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, it is known to many members of the House—or at all events to those who take an interest in public affairs—that discontent prevails to a large extent in the Province of Manitoba and in the North-West Territories, and that a good deal of uneasiness exists in the public mind as to what may be the upshot of this discontent. I fully expected before this period of the Session that the Government would have taken some

steps to consider of the discontent that prevails in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and that the Government would initiate such legislation as might be necessary for the purpose of allaying that discontent. I find that the attention of the Government has been directed to this important question in the other branch of the Legislature during the present Session, and from the reply that was made by the Minister of the Interior to the statement of an hon. Senator, I had reason to believe, and did believe, that the Government would during this Session ask the sanction of Parliament to such a scheme as they might consider necessary for the purpose of removing that discontent. Sir, on more than one occasion during this Session of Parliament I drew the attention of the Government to several causes of discontent in the North-West Territories myself, and from observations which were made by the hon. First Minister I think I had some reason to believe that some steps would be taken by the Government to remove any just cause of complaint by the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. I waited until now, after the hon. First Minister had declared more than once that Parliament would prorogue before Easter—and I trust it will—in the hopes that the Government would submit some scheme to Parliament that would have the effect of removing any just cause of discontent in either Manitoba or the North-West Territories. But so far my hopes have been disappointed. Nothing has been done; the Government have not indicated so far as I am aware that they propose dealing with the question of discontent in either Manitoba or the North-West; and now when delays in my judgment are dangerous, I venture once more to direct the attention of the Government to this very important question. It is known to members of the House that for a number of years, notably for the last two years, the Province of Manitoba has been persistently protesting against the policy of the Government in respect of the public affairs of Manitoba and the North-West Territory. They complained at one time, and that very recently, of the unconstitutional and unreasonable interference with their local legislation. They complained of the vast monopolies that were created in both Manitoba and the North-West Territories. But relying to some extent, I suppose, on the statement of the Minister of Railways, that now the Government were in a position to reconsider their policy with respect to interference by them, with local legislation, those questions have in the Province of Manitoba, at all events to some extent, passed out of consideration. There are, however, other questions equally important, other questions of great importance, that have presented themselves, and the people in Manitoba through their Government and in other ways, have pressed on the attention of the Government here the fair consideration of what they call their just demands. The demands to which I have referred, made by Manitoba and the North-West Council, are of a not unimportant character. They involve very grave considerations. Hon. members acquainted with the country will admit that they affect the growth and prosperity of the whole of our western possessions. Their admission will to a large extent inspire hope and confidence in the minds of the settlers who have gone to make homes in the North-West, and the refusal of those demands—reasonable demands at any rate—will, in my judgment, imperil the very existence of the Province and of the Territory; and I claim also that the refusal will at least check the growth and prosperity of the Territory, and to some extent, I believe, will weaken the ties which bind Manitoba and the Territories to the Dominion of Canada. I do not say that all the demands made by the Province or by the Territories are fair and reasonable demands. I do not pretend to say that the claims made are all fair and reasonable; but I say, that every claim advanced by the Province of Manitoba, and every ground of complaint against the policy of the Dominion Government made by the North-West Territories, deserve at the very least, at the hands of the Government, a fair consideration. If those claims are fair and reasonable they should be met promptly, they should be discussed promptly, they should be considered promptly, and if fair and honest claims, they should be considered by the Government promptly. We know that up to last year the claims made by Manitoba—and I speak now especially of the claims of that Province—were of the following character: First, they claimed that the Dominion Government should transfer to the Local Government the public and school lands in the Province. Second, they claimed a re-arrangement of the financial basis on which Manitoba was erected into one of the Provinces of the Dominion. Any person who has taken the trouble to enquire into the matter, and who has read the correspondence which has passed between the Manitoba and Dominion Governments, and the State papers sent by the Manitoba Government to the Government here, will know that the claims of Manitoba are advanced in very clear, distinct and forcible language—that is as regard the control of public lands and the financial re-arrangement. As to the control of the public lands, the Dominion Government two years ago refused to accede to what the people of Manitoba thought their true rights, that is, the control of the public and school lands of the Province; and I find on the 22nd March, 1882, the following communication passed between the two Governments. The Government at Ottawa writing to the Government of Manitoba said:

"With respect to the second item, public lands, I have to inform you that His Excellency in Council is not prepared to allow any change in respect to Dominion lands lying in Manitoba, the analogy which the delegates see between the public lands in other Provinces and those of Manitoba, does not seem to His Excellency in Council to be well drawn, inasmuch as the other Provinces owned their lands before Confederation, and brought them into the Union with them as their own property, whereas the whole of Manitoba was acquired by the Dominion, by purchase from the Hudson's Bay Co., and thus became the property of the Dominion, and stands really, as it seems to His Excellency in Council, as lands in the territories of the United States, which are not given to the New States as these new States are created, but remain the property of the United States."

That was the answer made to the first proposition—the acquisition of the public and school lands. I do not propose discussing the merits of Manitoba's demand. I propose submitting to the House, and calling the attention of the Government to the fact that the demands have been made over and over again, and that the Government should but has not considered them in a generous and liberal spirit. As regards the claim for the lands, the Dominion Government have refused the request of the Province of Manitoba. As regards the re-arrangement of the financial basis, the Government did, to some extent, grudgingly and sparingly, yield to the claims made by Manitoba. What have we now? The same demands made? No; but we have extended demands. We have the Province of Manitoba sending here its Premier, who spent a month in interviewing, or attempting to interview, the Government, in order to have further demands conceded; and in the very able and admirable State paper which the Premier of Manitoba sent to the Dominion Government, the following demands are made:—

"EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES.

"I.—That the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba be extended northward so as to include Por Churchill, on Hudson Bay, and westward to the one hundred and second meridian.

"PUBLIC LANDS.

"II.—The Province of Manitoba will agree to refund all expenses incurred by Canada in surveys of lands within the Province that remain vested in the Crown, in consideration of said surveyed lands and other lands yet unsurveyed being handed over to the Province, and the revenues arising from the sale or lease thereof accruing to the Province for provincial purposes; and further,—

"The Province will agree to refund to the Government of Canada its proportion of the three hundred thousand pounds sterling (£300,000) paid by Canada to the Hudson Bay Company for the Territory.

"The undersigned would suggest the appointment of a Commission of three, for the settlement of all titles of land arising under the Manitoba Act, or any other of the Acts of the Parliament of Canada, within the Province, two to be appointed by the Government of Canada, and one by the Government of Manitoba.

"The Province will also bind itself to carry out any agreement entered into between Canada and any colonization, railway company, or other association, for the settlement of the lands of the Province, a commencement of which has been made by such company or association.

"SUBSIDY.

"III.—That the Province shall receive credit at the rate at which the other Provinces were relieved of debt on entering the Union, and that the same shall be allowed on the present population of Manitoba, and be adjusted decennially, according to its population.

"The undersigned took occasion to discuss elaborately with the Committee the above propositions, urging a settlement on the basis proposed, as one that would be very acceptable and satisfactory to the people of the Province. The Hon. Mr. Sutherland also submitted his views on the different questions, supporting the statements made by the undersigned, and urging a concurrence therein. After hearing the arguments advanced, the Committee said that they would submit the matter to their colleagues and communicate to the undersigned the decision arrived at by them.

"J. NORQUAY."

These appear to be the demands made by the Province of Manitoba upon the Dominion Government. Now, Sir, no attention appears to be given to these demands. Mr. Norquay was here representing the Government of the Province of Manitoba; he remained here pressing his claims on this Government, seeking interviews with them and endeavouring, as he says, to get the views of the Government, but all of his endeavours failed. His demands were not entertained, and according to a statement made by Mr. Norqvay, they were not even considered. It is known to almost everybody that Mr. Norquay left the Capital discontented, dissatisfied and disgusted with the treatment he was alleged to have received from the Government. He did not conceal his dissatisfaction and disgust. On his way home from Ottawa to Manitoba, he was interviewed at St. Paul by one of the reporters of the St. Paul's *Pioneer Press*, and as that interview throws light on the way Mr. Norquay's demands were received here by the Government, I will read it. The action of the Privy Council is first referred to:

"THE PRIVY COUNCIL'S ACTION.

"There was some discussion as to the financial question, and note was taken by them, of the other matters referred to, and the Committee promised to submit the same to their colleagues and communicate to me their decision."

"Did you arrive at any definite understanding in these matters before leaving Ottawa?"

"No, I did not, although I asked the Chairman, Mr. Macpherson, both by official communication and personally, to furnish me with an answer, that I might report it to the Legislature of Manitoba soon after my return."

"Had you any intimation before leaving Ottawa, as to the probability of a favourable consideration of those suggestions, or otherwise?"

"I had no intimation, although I received a message when in Toronto, on my way home, asking me to return to Ottawa. Before consenting to do so, I requested an assurance that Manitoba matters should be taken up immediately; and, not receiving a reply to assure me that such would be the case, and having already spent over a month in Ottawa as a representative and leader of the Manitoba Government, ready and anxious at any time to discuss these matters, I did not feel that either the interests of the Province or the dignity of its Government would be served by my returning to renew negotiations without the slightest assurance of any early solution."

"This, then, is all the report you will have to make to the Legislature on your return?"

"That is all, unless a reply is received from the Dominion Government before the meeting of the Local House."

"About what time will the Local Legislature be convened?"

"About the middle of March."

"In case no conclusion is arrived at before your Legislature meets, what course will your Government pursue in order to press these claims of the Province upon the Dominion?"

"THE PREMIER'S INTENTIONS.

"Of course I am speaking without consultation with my colleagues, but the probability is that the Government will not withdraw its demand for what it believes to be justice to the people of Manitoba, and should no satisfactory arrangement be arrived at, the Legislature will probably be asked to support the Government by resolutions appealing to the Imperial Parliament, for aid in securing the rights of Manitoba at the hands of the Dominion Government."

"What are the prospects of the Hudson Bay Railway scheme?"

"There is a Parliamentary Committee taking evidence now at Ottawa, and the evidence so far elicited, goes far to justify the belief which the people of Winnipeg hold, as to the practicability of Hudson's Bay navigation, for commercial purposes."

"Will the proposed railway receive any aid from the Dominion Government?"

"No; if we get a satisfactory settlement with the Dominion Government, as the basis I have stated to you, we will aid the railway by a grant of land and by a guarantee for construction."

"What is the state of feeling in Manitoba upon the subject of the claims you have been pressing upon the Dominion Government?"

"The people are a unit in support of the representations made to the Dominion by my Government, and are very determined upon having them carried out. While there is no danger of this very strong feeling making a violent outbreak, the people are prepared and determined to use every constitutional means to secure justice to the Province."

Here we find that Mr. Norquay, the Premier of the Province, made a statement of his claims, in which he set forth the demands of the Province and the grievances they complain of. In this interview he states to a reporter of this St. Paul newspaper, that he could get no solution of any kind to the demands he made against the Dominion Government. Sir, the Local Parliament met shortly after he went home. It met on the 13th of March, and in the Address from the Throne the following paragraph occurs:—

"The claims which this Province has always preferred as a right, have again been urged upon the Privy Council. My Government have taken the view that the time has arrived when such provisions should be made for the Government of this Province as will obviate the necessity of future delegations to the Capital. With this object in view, the Privy Council have been urged to concede to the Province the control of the public and school lands for local revenue and the support of education respectively, and also a re-adjustment of the credit allowed Manitoba on her entering Confederation, the same to be based on the population as ascertained decennially.

"In pursuance of the policy already sanctioned by the House, representations have been made by my Government urging upon the Privy Council the expedieney of extending the boundaries of this Province as far north as the sixtieth parallel, and westward to the one hundried and second meridian. The importance of this extension, in view of the contemplated construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, cannot be over-estimated.

"I regret to inform you that as yet no answer to the memorial submitted by my Government has been received. You will be asked to give your careful consideration to such means as will be suggested by them to secure the objects asked for in the said memorial."

Here is what the people of Manitoba complain of, and the complaint is so strong that the Premier of that Province finds it necessary to make reference to it in the Speech from the Throne. He draws attention to the fact that although these claims were presented to the Dominion Government months and months ago, up to the time the Speech from Throne was delievered no reply was received by the Government or the Premier to the claims he had made. But that was not all; a few days after the Local House met the Premier of Manitoba tabled certain resolutions, and proposed moving in the direction indicated in the Speech from the Throne. The resolutions, after reciting the demands made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion Government, and the refusal of the Dominion Government so far to concede, or even to consider them, goes on:

"And whereas no answer satisfactory to the Legislature of the Province has been received in reply to the demands as above mentioned, and in the opinion of this House the rights of the people of the Province to obtain redress in all matters of a local nature which are extended to the people of the other Provinces of Canada, are denied to the people of Manitoba, and the resources derivable from the sale of land in Manitoba are appropriated by the Dominion, which, in other Provinces of the Union are administered by their several Legislatures, and the revenues arising therefrom inure to the several Provinces respectively;

And whereas this Legislature views with alarm the alienation from the Crown of the public domain without provision being made for the future necessities of Government in this Province, which will, in the near future, be obliged to resort to direct taxation to support its institutions, and prosecute improvements necessaay to the building up thereof, which state of affairs in the other Provinces was obviated largely by the revenues arising from the Crown lands, and by liberal provisions made for them on entering the union:

Be it therefore resolved, that an humble address be passed by this House praying His Excellency the Governor General to cause such enquiry to be made into the relations of this Province with the Dominion, and such action to be taken in reference thereto, as will place this Province in as favourable a position, as regards her future necessities, as

are the four Provinces confederated under the British North America Act;

And be it further resolved that a memorandum of the case be prepared and transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with an humble request that the Manitoba Act may be so amended as to place this Province of Manitoba on the same status in the Dominion as the older Provinces of the Union"

Here are the proceedings of the Government of the Province of Manitoba. Here is the Speech from the Throne, the State papers to which I have referred, and the notice of certain resolutions which the Premier proposed submitting to the Local Parliament. But the Premier goes a step further. He not only complains of the fact that no satisfactory answer has been made to his application respecting the transfer of the public and school lands to the Province of Manitoba, that no arrangement has been made respecting an additional money grant which they claimed as of right, but he further insists that the financial and fiscal policy of the Government is ruinous to the best interests of Manitoba. A few days ago he tabled notice of certain other resolutions, and I draw the attention of the Government and the House to an extract taken from the Emerson *International* upon this subject. It says:

"The speech to a Provincial Legislature is supposed to indicate legislation only on such matters as are within the jurisdiction of that Legislature, and everybody knows that the Tariff is the creation of the Dominion Parliament and entirely outside the jurisdiction of our Local Solons. But Hon. Mr. Norquay meant that expression of sympathy with the farmers on the Tariff grievance, and he took the first opportunity to prove it by giving notice at the first sitting of the Local Legislature, after the formal opening, that he would, on the following Wednesday, introduce a resolution setting forth that the duty on agricultural implements, lumber, and canned goods was believed to be an undue and unnecessary burden on the people of this country, and asking the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into the matter, with a view of obtaining evidence that would sustain a memorial to the Dominion Government, asking them to remove the burdens complained of."

These, Sir, are the proceedings which were taken by the Premier of Manitoba, the political friend and ally of hon. gentlemen opposite, with the view of inducing his Government to redress the grievances complained of by that Province. Sir, the Premier of Manitoba, I am sorry to say, utters by no means a hopeful tone as to the future of that great Province. He speaks of the crisis as grave and serious. He made these demands upon the Government of the Dominion, and they have not so far been redressed. He appealed to the Privy Council of Canada, and according to his statement, the ears of the Privy Council were closed to his appeal; and now he proposes to appeal to the Imperial Parliament. I say all this indicates a most unsatisfactory condition of affairs in our new Province in the great North-West. The Premier of Manitoba goes a step further, and warns the Government here of the danger of the critical condition of public affairs in that Province. At a public meeting, Premier Norquay said:

"At present we are on the verge of a crisis from which we must emerge in a better or worse condition. Not, however, until the masses were made aware of the situation, would they stand up and maintain their rights The time had arrived when Manitoba must be placed on a level with other Provinces of the Dominion. Not one new arrival had been in the Province three months before he, who before was loud in its denunciations, was equally loud in demanding its rights. The eyes of the farmers had been opened, and they were alarmed at the prospect. These matters would shortly engross the attention, not only of the Provincial, but of the Dominion Parliament."

From all these circumstances, Sir, it is perfectly evident that the political sky in the Province of Manitoba is dark and lowering. No one can tell the moment when we may go just a step too far in our injustice to Manitoba to retrace our steps with safety. The Government should remember that justice deferred always enhances the price of it. Let us deal fairly and honestly with Manitoba, and let us fairly and honestly consider its claims. I say, and I say it with regret, that the present situation there is fraught with difficulty and danger; and is a fit subject for Parliamentary enquiry. When we acquired that vast territory, it was supposed that it would be a magnificent field for a large immigration; and we know that enormous sums have been expended year after year in the effort to turn the tide of immigration from the United States to the free homesteads in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Sir, unless we can gratify the reasonable demands of the settlers in that country, we cannot hope for that prosperity for it, which is the earnest desire of every true Canadian. The existence of a spirit of dissatisfaction and distrust in the minds of the settlers may produce very serious consequences to the peace and prosperity of this country. Now, Sir, I find that the large body of the farmers of the Province of Manitoba are at one with the Government of that Province on this question. In the month of December last, a meeting of delegates from the farmers, representing every section of the Province, was held in the city of Winnipeg. From the names of those delegates, one may see that they were representative men, many of them hailing from the Province of Ontario. At that meeting they set forth their bill of rights, containing the demands and claims that they insisted upon being conceded to them by the Dominion Government. That bill of rights I am going to trouble the House by reading:

"And whereas, in convention they proceeded to form the association now known as the 'Manitoba and North-West Farmers' Union';

"And whereas, they thereafter formulated a 'Declaration of Rights' in behalf of the citizens and Province of Manitoba, in which declaration they stated the grievances of the people as follows:

"Whereas, in view of the present depression in agriculture and commercial industries in the Province of Manitoba, the farmers of the Province have assembled for the purpose of expressing their views upon the causes of the said depression and the means of removing the same;

"And whereas, the present and the future prosperity of this Province depends both commercially and otherwise upon the successful prosecution of agriculture;

"And whereas, numerous and embarrassing restrictions are placed upon the efforts made by the settlers to extend their operations and improve their condition;

"And whereas, such restrictions are unjust and unnecessary, and have been continued in defiance of the just rights of Manitoba;

"And whereas, some of the said restrictions consist of the oppressive duty upon agricultural implements, the monopoly of the the carrying trade now enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the improper and vexatious methods employed in the administration of the public lands of Manitoba;

"And whereas, the inhabitants of Manitoba are British subjects, and have made their homes here, upon the representation that they would be allowed all the privileges which, as such subjects they would elsewhere in Canada be entitled to, and it appears that by the tems of the admission of Manitoba into Confederation they should be allowed such rights and privileges;

"And whereas, they are denied such rights, and they find that the representative system of the Province is such that they are practically denied the privilege of securing the redress of their grievances through their representatives in the Provincial or Dominion Parliaments:

"And whereas this Convention approves that statement of grievances.

"And whereas the convention of the 19th December, 1883, further stated and resolved as follows:

"And whereas a large proportion of the business of the Dominion Government is wholly connected with Manitoba and the North-West, especially the important Departments of the Minister of Railways, Public Works, Immigration and Agriculture, which should be controlled by our Provincial Legislature;

"And whereas it is the right of every British subject to call the attention of the constituted authorities to the existence of abuses and wrongs;

"And whereas this Convention approves of those statements;

"And whereas, in consequence of facts recited, the convention of the 19th December, 1883, claimed for the citizens and Province of Manitoba the following rights:—

"1. The right of the Local Government to charter railways anywhere in Manitoba free from interference, and

"2. The absolute control of her public lands (including school lands) by the Legislature of the Province, and compensation for lands sold and used for Federal purposes.

"3. That the duty on agricultural implements and building materials be removed, and the Customs tariff on articles entering into daily consumption be greatly modified in the interests of the people of this Province and the Northwest.

"4. The right of representation in the Dominion Cabinet."

Now, Sir, that was the declaration of rights of the convention of farmers which met in Winnipeg on the 19th of December last. That convention selected certain delegates, who were instructed to proceed to Ottawa and press the claims of the Province of Manitoba upon the attention of

the Government of Canada, in the hope that that Government would initiate such legislation as would, to a large extent, remove the well-founded grievances they were complaining of. The delegates arrived in Ottawa; I believe they interviewed the Government; they returned to Manitoba without any satisfactory answer to the demands they made. A second convention was called, to meet in Winnipeg on the 5th of March, for the purpose of hearing the report of the delegates; and at that convention the following resolutions were passed:

"That whereas the interests of this Province immediately require that the privileges conferred by the British North America Act (the charter of Confederation) and enjoyed by the other Provinces—shall be granted to it;

"And that the Local Legislature of Manitoba shall be supreme in the subjects and area prescribed by the said Act, in the 92nd clause thereof for exclusive legislation by the Provinces of the Federal Union;

"And whereas the Government at Ottawa continues to withhold these privileges:

"And whereas all constitutional means have been adopted to secure those, both by the delegates of the Farmer's Union and by the Premier (Hon. Mr. Norquay), from the Dominion Government—and have failed;

"And whereas the said Government at Ottawa continues to treat this Province as if it was a purchased or conquered country and an appanage of the Eastern Provinces—using the assets of the Province not for the benefit of Manitoba, but for Dominion purposes, on the pretence of having purchased the title thereto from the Hudson Bay Company;

"And whereas the highest legal authorities, and the Canadian Commissioners, refused to acknowledge the claims of the Hudson Bay Company as valid or tenable, and that the amount so paid to the said company was paid as a matter of compromise and expediency, and could not secure more than the same company legally possessed;

"And whereas Manitoba was no consenting party to the said compromise, nor to the public lands being retained by the Dominion Government and used for the purposes of the Dominion;

"And whereas the best interests of this Province have greatly suffered, and continue to suffer, and the development and progress of the country are seriously retarded;

"Therefore, be it resolved: That this Convention hereby petition the Premier (Hon. Mr. Norquay) at once to declare, by resolution of the House of Assembly, that this Province shall no longer continue a member of the Federal Union, unless accorded equal privileges with the other partners of the Confederation—and a modification of those duties which press so heavily on the agricultural interests.

"And further, that an appeal be made to Her Majesty, Queen Victoria, and to Her Privy Council, to so amend the British North America Act as to allow of Manitoba withdrawing from Confederation, and graciously to allow of this country being a colony of Great Britain, with a separate Constitution, separate laws, and with a Government of its own;

"And this Convention further pledges itself to sustain the Premier in this course of action by any means in its power; and feels sure that the people of this Province will support them in securing that independence and freedom so dear to every British subject."

Now, Sir, that convention was a representative convention composed of men from every section of the Province of Manitoba; it was attended, not only by farmers, but by the Winnipeg Board of Trade, another representative body and composed very largely of supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am told that three-fourths of the members of the Winnipeg Board of Trade are the prononced friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Those resolutions—at all events, most of them—had also the hearty sympathy and support of the Local Government of Manitoba. At this convention, Mr. Ashdown, who is one of the leading men of Winnipeg, a large and wealthy merchant, a pronounced Conservative and a distinguished friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, made use of the following language:

"Mr. J. H. Ashdown congratulated the chairman on the representative character of the meeting, and congratulated the Province on the able manner in which the proceedings had been conducted throughout. Every portion of the Province, he understood, was represented, and the tenor of the speeches showed plainly that politics were not mixed up with their proceedings. It was a gathering to provide for the necessities of the Province. That being the case, the Board of Trade felt it a duty to take part. Mr. Ashdown proceeded to notice why the Board of Trade felt it incumbent on them to join this movement. They did so because, equally with the members of the Union, they desired an extension of the Provincial bounds, as proposed by the Government. They desired to get control of the public lands of Manitoba. They desired to be placed on an equal footing with the other Provinces of the Confederation. There should be a re-arrangement of the provincial subsidy such as would set matters right in this respect. And there should be such a re-arrangement of the Tariff as would relieve Manitoba of some of her present burdens—such as the duty on agricultural implements and canned goods. In the case of these oppressive duties, Mr. Ashdown pointed out it was the consumer and not the merchant who was the real losser. He pointed out that the settlers in Manitoba gave into the Dominion Exchequer at least three times as much as the next best revenue producing Province of the Dominion, outside of British Columbia. On account of her ports of Quebec and Montreal, the Province of Quebec was the next largest revenue producing Province. He went on to show how every settler in Manitoba contributed at least three times as much as any settler in Quebec, and very nearly five times as much as any settler in the beloved Province of Ontario. With regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, he looked on that as a great national work—a national necessity. We happened to be situated in the heart of the continent, and, to some extent, got the benefit of the construction of that road. But we were hardly in the calculation at all when the construction was first undertaken. The object was to bind the two ends of the Dominion together, and it was not, as the Eastern people seem to think, a work undertaken specially for our benefit. Having expressed pleasure at the constitutional course taken by the Union, he hoped that course would be successful. Should it not be so, it was open to them to go to the foot of the Throne, and there we would get our rights."

Another gentleman, also a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, Captain Carruthers, made use of the following language:—

"Captain Carruthers said he was glad to see so large and thoroughly representative a gathering of the men who had been well styled the back-bone of the country. Their interests as farmers were indissolubly bound up with every branch of trade and commerce in the Province, and therefore anything bearing adversely on the interests of the farming community affected the whole Province. Having noticed the non-political character of the movement, Captain Carruthers sketched the vast extent and resources of this Province and the North-West Territories, which would be materially affected by this movement. He went over in detail the objects aimed at by those who had combined to form the Union—showed that the Province had not been justly dealt with—and hoped they would concentrate their energies on the main issues. An enlargement of the provincial boundaries—a re-adjustment of the subsidy—a re-modelling of the Tariff. These things were matters of prime necessity."

I have shown you what some of the speakers, the pronounced friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, said on that occasion. The President of the Board of Trade was there, and he also made a speech. His speech was in the following language, short and to the point:—

"Mr. McKenzie, President of the Board of Trade, being called on to give statistics as to the operation of the duty complained of, came forward and said: The canned goods industry is perhaps one of the least of the manufacturing industries of the eastern Provinces, and I refer to it quite as much to show how ready the Government is to listen and to assist any demands made upon it by the eastern people—quite a contrast to its treatment of the demands of Manitoba—as to show how enormous the protection afforded on canned fruits is, and how peculiarly hard it presses on this country, owing to the fact that all fruits, green or canned, have to be brought here. The duty on canned vegetables up to a year ago was 20 per cent. *ad valorem;* on canned fruits 2 cents per pound. This was not considered enough, and the manufacturers went to the Government and had the duty arranged, so that it was calculated to make other manufacturers sick with envy. There is no allowance for quality, poor paying a higher rate than good. Here is the Tariff:

Canned apples, 3c. per lb	58	per cent.
" gooseberries, 3c. per lb	60	"
" pears, 3c. per lb	62½	"
" strawberries, 3c. per lb	84	"
" peaches, 3c. per lb	74 to 105	"

CANNED VEGETABLES.

Tomatoes, 2c. per lb	78	per cent.
Corn, 2c. per lb	80	"
Peas, 2c. per lb	87	"

and the weight of the cans to be always included; jams, 5c. per lb., equal to 60 per cent.

"It is not, let me add, the first time the fruit business has led to trouble; but whether there was a woman in the case this time I do not know."

Here, I say, are the resolutions of the Farmers' Convention, and the speeches of some of the leading gentlemen who took part in that convention. They are the views of leading men of Manitoba, who are supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite; and I may say that, to-night, in the remarks which I propose making, I do not propose to quote extracts from the speeches of any gentlemen except those who are friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do so for this reason, that if they complain, hon gentlemen opposite have good ground for believing that there is something wrong in the Administration of public affairs in the great North-West. These claims are very clearly set forth, some of which appear to me to be very reasonable; at all events, they are

of that character which ought to entitle them to receive consideration at the hands of this Government and Parliament; yet up to this hour, according to the statement of the Prime Minister of that Province—another friend of hon. gentlemen opposite—no answer, satisfactory or otherwise, has been made. I maintain that, with the full knowledge we have of the discontent which exists up there, and the impending crisis, the whole question is a fit subject for parliamentary enquiry. I have spoken to you of the Province of Manitoba and the farmers of that Province, but we must recollect that there is another representative body in the North-West, a body of equal, perhaps of greater importance—a body that rules over an area of 400,000 square miles, with a population estimated at from 100,000 to 150,000 people, a body which has sovereign power within the limits given to it by the Constitution under which it has its existence. I refer to the North-West Council. They, too, in solemn Council assembled, drew up a list of the grievances of which the North-West Territories complained. These grievances were sixteen in number—sixteen different grounds of complaint—and all these grounds of complaint have an importance and a significance well worth the consideration of those who are now at the head of the affairs in this country. I do not propose dealing with those grievances at any considerable length; I propose only referring to one or two of them; but in dealing with any of these grievances we ought to bear in mind that the importance to be attached to a protest of misgovernment, of bad policy, depends very largely on the source whence the protest comes. The first question that naturally arises is: Do the people who complain know whereof they speak? Are they conversant with the position and the circumstances of the country? Do they appreciate thoroughly the trials and the difficulties connected with pioneer settlement? And can they fully appreciate the errors of judgment or policy committed by the Administration in the great North-West? Are they free to give an honest and an unbiassed judgment on the questions on which they undertook to pronounce? If they are the friends of the Government, they surely cannot desire to embarrass the Government, and one cannot help coming to the conclusion that there must be some foundation for their complaints. We all know perfectly well that at least four-fifths of the North-West Council are the friends of the Government. Now, let us see what those friends of the Government in the North-West complain of. I know that at this late period of the Session the House will find it tedious that I should enter into this matter, but I cannot help it. I am bound to submit these facts for the consideration of the Government, in the expectation and the hope that the Government are, even at this late period, prepared to consider some, at all events, of what I believe to be the reasonable claims of the people of the North-West. The minute of Council transmitted by the Council of the North-West Territories to the Government here, is in the following words:—

"*To His Excellency the Governor-General in Council:*

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

"Your memorialists, the Lieutenant-Governor and the Council of the the North-West Territories, show as follows:—

"1st. That the reservations held by the Government at Regina and Moose Jaw and the reserve known as the 'Mile Belt' reserve are detrimental to growth and prosperity, large blocks of land being held by the Government, and settlers being debarred from locating upon them, paralize the expansive force of this young country, and by bounding the railway by a tract comparatively uninhabited, gives the traveller a false idea of the North-West, and an inadequate and sometimes misleading impression of the character of the soil. Your memorialists are aware, too, that many *bonâ fide* settlers have located upon lands included in these reserves, innocent of any order to the contrary, and have in many cases been driven from their claims, and in others have been prevented from obtaining those advantages which the inducements held out by the Government led them to expect. Your memorialists, therefore, pray that immediate action be taken to remove these barriers to the development of the country.

"2nd. Your memorialists also pray that immediate measures be adopted to determine titles to land that have been over three years in cultivation; that patents issue at once to those entitled to them; that pre-emptions and squatters claims settled on prior to the 14th October, 1879, be allowed at a price in accordance with the Order in Council at the time of settlement; that settlers who have entered upon lands prior to survey and previous to the 14th of October, 1879, at which time there did not exist any distinction between odd and even numbered sections, and after survey, are found to be located on odd numbered sections, should be allowed their homesteads and pre-emptions on such sections at a price in accordance with the Order in Council existing at the time of settlement.

"That settlers on school lands, who settled thereon prior to survey, and ignorant of the fact, be afforded security in their holding. That the Government will use its good offices to obtain security for those who have in good faith settled on Hudson Bay sections prior to survey and after 1873, and in ignorance that they were such sections. Your memorialists further pray that those half-breeds in the Territories who have not participated in the arrangement to extinguish the half-breed claims in Manitoba, should enjoy the same rights as accorded half-breeds in that Province.

"3rd. Your Memorialists also pray for some extended surveys in the country of the North Saskatchewan; that the special settlement survey on the South Saskatchewan, in the Parish of St. Antoine, made by Mr. Adams, Dominion Land Surveyor, be approved, and that the Land Agent of Prince Albert be instructed to receive entries for such lands; that the lands in the Parishes of Grandin, St. Laurent and St. Louis, and fronting on the South Saskatchewan, be surveyed into ten-chain lots, it being occupied by settlers in this manner.

"4th. That the system of granting of leases of lands in western grazing districts be discontinued, as injurious, and for the reason that a very large portion of the land so leased is fit and required for actual settlement.

"5th. That homesteads cancelled for any cause should be again open for entry and not held for sale, is, we believe, best calculated to settle the country.

"6th. That the safety of documents, valuable alike to the Government and the people, demand that vaults should be erected in lands and registry offices in the Territories.

"7th. That at least two additional Stipendiary Magistrates should be appointed for the Territories.

"8th. That power be given to the North West Council to incorporate companies having territorial objects and to enforce ordinances by imprisonment.

"9th. That sub-section 2 of section 91 of "The North-West Territories Act of 1880" be amended so as to vest all trails and highways in the Councils of the North-West Territories.

"10th. That the duties on agricultural implements and lumber should be reduced, it having heretofore been the policy of Your Excellency's Government to foster the industries of the country.

"We feel that the heavy duties imposed on lumber and implements used in agricultural pursuits, together with the heavy rates of freights which must be paid, is calculated to so increase the cost of building and of farming that the effect must be injurious to settlement.

"11th. That largely increased sums should be voted for expenditure on the Saskatchewan River, to improve the navigation of that stream, it being the only means of outlet for a very large section of the North-West, and the Canadian Pacific Railway in the south being at such a great distance, making it, as a means of cheap outlet, almost impracticable.

"12th. That mining laws and regulations should be assimilated to those of British Columbia and Montana Territory.

"13th. That the right of pre-emption should not be abolished.

"Your memorialists also pray, in view of the very large increase of the population in the Territories, and the consequent increased demand for various improvements, that a sum per capita, based on the assumed population of one hundred thousand now in the North-West Territories, be given for expenditure by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, as best calculated to suit the requirements of the people, than at present followed.

"15th. That the system of granting immense tracts of the choicest lands in the Territories to colonization companies is inimical to the best interests of the country. Your memorialists therefore pray that no more such grants be made; that the companies now holding the same be compelled to fulfil the conditions imposed upon them, in letter and in spirit, and that the agents of the companies be not allowed to act as the Agents of the Government in any respect; that granting lands already thickly settled, as in the case of the Edmunton and Saskatchewan Land Company, is contrary to the intention of the Land Act; that the company profits to an undue extent by the energy and forethought of the pioneers of the country, who are prevented from reaping the advantage of their own labour, in that the odd-numbered sections are locked up for speculative purposes which would otherwise be open for settlement or held for sale by the Government on reasonable terms: Your memorialists therefore pray that Your Excellency's Government will enquire into the matter and redress the above grievances.

"16th. Your memorialists believe that the success of the North-West Territories is of such importance to the whole Dominion that the time has arrived when representation for the Territories should be had in Parliament. At the present time the people of the North-West Territories are without representation of any kind, and have to depend solely on petitions and memorials to make their wants known"

Now, these, shortly, are the grievances complained of by the people of the North-West Territories. Some of these grievances, since that document was drawn up, have been

remedied. The Government have seen fit to thrown open for actual settlement the vast and fertile tracts of land south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government in that respect acted wisely and well. The great mistake committed was that it ought never to have been withdrawn from actual settlement, but should always have been left open for homesteading and pre-emption. As I said before, I do not propose to discuss the merits of these different complaints, but I propose to draw the attention of the House and the attention of the Government to these complaints. I propose fortifying the position of the North-West Council where I can fortify it, by the utterances of the supporters of hon. gentlemen, and by the utterances of the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen will find that one of the grounds of complaint is the locking up of the Mile Belt. I say it was a terrible mistake to have left a reserve of two miles in width through that country, from Brandon to the summit of the Rocky Mountains. It was a mistake that ought never to have been made. I say that those who went there, the early pioneers of the country, were entitled to every advantage that would result from a favourable location. I have not objected—I never did object—to the Government availing themselves of the location of town sites, and securing all the financial benefits that can be secured from the location of those sites. I think the Government were perfectly justified in so doing, in respect of town sites, and securing the proceeds of the sale of town lots; but when a reserve of 2 miles in width, extending through the whole of that territory, is made, I say it was an unwise and an injudicious reservation, and the quicker it was opened up the better. I know that many settlers went there—*bona fide* settlers went there—before they were aware of this reservation, and it is said—I believe it is capable of proof, I am sorry to say—that some of these settlers who went there, ignorant of those regulations and of this reserve, either lost their lands, lost the improvements they had made upon them, or were compelled to pay a very high price, in order to secure the lands they settled upon in good faith, and made improvements upon in good faith. I say it is an unsatisfactory condition of affairs, that the whole administration of the law in the North-West for the last two years has been of the most unsatisfactory character. I copied a letter from a paper published in the Old Country, a communication written from Canada and addressed to a Scottish newspaper, drawing the attention of the people of the Mother Country to the mode in which they were treated there. The letter is important in this sense, that it is apparently the expression of the opinions of a disinterested party, a settler from Scotland, who proposed making his home in the North-West, and does not appear to have been treated there with that consideration he ought to have been treated. It is addressed to the *Alloa Advertiser*, written to a friend, apparently:

"SIR,—I briefly drop you a few lines to warn your readers or their friends against being taken over-much with the Manitoba fever. This country has been much over-estimated and bepraised, and when we consider the manner in which emigrants are treated on the way, and left to find out how much they have been deceived when struggling amidst the mud of the North-West, they had better bethink themselves in time and stay at home.

"The climate and seasons of Manitoba are enough to contend against in farming there, and if to this we add the stones, bogs and endless swamps—the beautiful lakelets of some of our penny-a-liner writers—it will be found a country not quite a farmer's paradise. Then again, to crown all, the contemptible treatment of settlers by the Government. I was one of a party of five who went west as far as the Fort Ellice Trail, over the Pipestone Creek, and though we saw nothing to induce one to be in love with the country, took up a section of land as squatters, so as to have an undisputed claim, when the land office should open, to enter it. On going to the front again, however, for the rest of our goods—over a hundred miles distant—we learned for the first time, that in our absence among the mud, snow, brush and swamps of this mighty country, far from civilization or any chance of getting news, official or otherwise, an order had been issued from Ottawa to give squatters no mercy if found within a mile or a mile and a-half of any existing or projected railway."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Now, Sir, that is a letter sent from the Dominion of Canada to a Scottish newspaper. Of course, it would have the tendency, published in a Scottish newspaper, seriously to affect the very class of people that we wish to secure in the country.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Name. What name?

Mr. CAMERON. I do not agree with all the statements made by the correspondent. I think some of them are overdrawn, but I think some of them, on the other hand, especially with reference to the policy that has been pursued last year, are absolutely correct. Now, Sir, such a letter as that——

Mr. FERGUSON. Give us the name of the writer.

Mr. CAMERON. Is calculated to do very serious damage to the country. I will read you still further what is said by a Rev. Mr. Hay.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask the hon. gentleman to give the name of the writer of that letter in the Scottish newspaper.

Mr. CAMERON. The Rev. Mr. Hay is a Presbyterian clergyman, who has been in the North-West, and I will also read you a statement made by the Rev. Mr. Wright, I believe a Methodist Minister. I do not know either of them, but they give their impressions of the effect of the policy of making this reserve two miles from the boundaries of Manitoba to the summit of the Rocky Mountains. The Rev. Mr. Hay says:

"Even abundance amid solitude is unendurable. Mr. Hay reports, in the district of which we are speaking, about ten settlers, that is ten families, to the township, as the average number. Very often it is much less than this, and in not a few instances settlers are separated many miles from their nearest neighbours. The intervening land, though it would be quickly and gladly taken up if only the Government had not forbidden it, is lying waste and vacant, either held by the Government or by speculators who have, in a very few instances, purchased it at the auctions where it has been offered for sale. No improvement can be looked for under such circumstances."

Then Mr. Wright says:

"Next morning at ten o'clock we left for the west. We passed Brandon, Broadview and Regina, intending to visit them, if possible, on our return, and early next morning arrived at Moose Jaw. The country through which we passed is, for the most part fertile, and nearly all more or less fit for agricultural purposes. The Mile Belt reserve and other restrictions on settlement tend to make the line of travel somewhat dreary, and one fails to get a true idea of the progress the country is making. Only here and there you see a settler's cabin in the distance, with a patch of grain in its vicinity, or a few acres of newly-turned sod. I conversed freely with men of all political stripes, but not one had a word to say in favour of the land regulations of the Government. They believe the land policy is seriously retarding the settlement of the country, and with singular unanimity they condemn it as unrighteous and unpatriotic. With regard to Manitoba especially, the sentiment is fast ripening into conviction that the Province must be allowed to manage its own lands in the same way as Ontario and Quebec. And why should they not? Having become a Province, why should provincial rights be denied them? They believe they have ability and honesty enough to manage their own affairs, and that having attained their manhood, they should no longer be treated as children."

Now, Sir, this all goes to show the very injurious consequences of the policy pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to this reservation. I recollect the First Minister stated in the House here that not a single man ever lost his squatter's rights by reason of his having settled upon one of these reserves. Here is a person, by the name of Mr. Livingston, who writes this letter in the Winnipeg *Sun*:

"'I see in your issue of to-day that Sir John Macdonald, in the debate on the Address, denies that any *bona fide* settler has ever been dispossessed. This I am in a position to contradict, for after residing on and cultivating my homestead for nearly nine years, and having improvements to the amount of $20,000, my land was sold by the Government, and I have been dispossessed.' Hundreds of others can tell the same story."

I do not doubt the truth of that statement. Mr. Livingston states, over his own name, that after settling upon a farm

and cultivating and improving it, he was dispossessed and the land was taken from him. Well, Sir, these statements may not be true, but I believe, to a large extent, they are true, and if so, they are fit subjects for parliamentary enquiry. Sir, up to this day, although the Mile Belt is open up to the fourth meridian, the reserve at Moocs Jaw is still kept, so that settlers cannot get either homestead or preemption there. I drew the attention of the First Minister to the fact, that a large number from my own county went up there before the line was located. They had no idea the Government proposed to make Moose Jaw the town site. They went there in good faith, and some of them have been there two years and a half. They have made valuable improvements, but up to this hour they can not get any satisfaction from the Government, as to whether their claims will be recognized or not. When I went up there myself and heard them proposing to leave the country, I begged them to remain—men with more that 50 acres broken upon a quarter section, with valuable buildings and farm implements. They proposed leaving the country because they could not tell whether their claims would be recognized or not. I advised them to remain there, and I trust the Government will see their way to give satisfaction to these people before the spring opens, because hon. gentlemen must know that unless the claims of these people are recognized they will leave the country. The spring is now coming on, and the farmer requires to do his work, and the result will be that these people will become dissatisfied and disgusted, and leave the country. Now, Sir, to show the effect in Moose Jaw, I will read the proceedings that took place at a public meeting held there, largely attended by settlers:

"A largely attended meeting of the settlers located in Townships 16 and 17, in Ranges 26 and 27, west, was held at Mr. McLennan's, at Moose Jaw Creek, on Saturday, the 12th inst., to hear explanations from one Mr. Steers, who professed to have authority, as a Government Agent, to examine into the claims of settlers in this neighbourhood.

"Mr. Steers' statements did not prove satisfactory to the meeting, when a second meeting was immediately held, John McKay being appointed Chairman, and Mr. Parke, Secretary.

"The strongest expressions of indignation were manifested by all the speakers, at this unwarrantable interference with their rights as homesteaders, and resolutions were unanimously passed, condemning the policy of the Government in its dealings with the settlers, and warning all jumpers that they will be dealt with summarily, as the assembled judgment of the squatters may determine."

Another meeting was held of Conservatives, a meeting of friends of the Government, and at that meeting the following resolutions were passed:—

"A meeting of the Conservatives of Moose Jaw was held on Tuesday evening, the 11th ult., at which resolutions were passed condemning the action of the Dominion Government regarding the land policy. It was also resolved that the Government be memorialized by the Conservatives of that place, asking the Government to grant an immediate solution of land problem."

Now, it was thought by the settlers who complain that representations would have more influence with the Government if made at a meeting of Conservative settlers of Moose Jaw, for the purpose of protesting against the land policy of the Government. Now, Sir, I will read an extract from the Winnipeg *Times* as to the land policy of the Government. I think, when hon. gentlemen hear that, they will be satisged there is something wrong with the administration of public affairs in the North-West. The Winnipeg *Times* is the organ of the Government, and is edited by a political friend of the Government, who went up from Ottawa for the purpose of editing that paper. On the 17th of May, 1883, the following article appeared in the editorial columns of the *Times*:—

"On the lands sold south of the railway belt there are scores of squatters who, at this moment, are planting their crops in blissful ignorance of this fact, that some speculator will soon own their farms and the labour spent on them. It is true the Department professed some time ago that compensation for disturbances would be given to those squatters who had made improvements, the compensation to be determined by a Government valuator, that as a matter of fact, the buyers at the sale buy not only the land but the improvements; and even within within the Mile Belt, the Government will find it a difficult matter to inspect the farms sold and appraize the improvements. South of the Belt, this will be utterly impossible. Then all, looking at its pecuniary results, is a failure. To reserve a vast quantity of land in the market at a time when money is exceedingly tight and the richest speculators poor, was madness. It is reasonably safe to say that Commissioner Walsh did not advise the step. It was no doubt taken in pursuance of that incomprehensible policy which the Department has adopted at the suggestion of ignorant or interested friends. But the failure of the sale, in a pecuniary sense, is a small matter compared with the evils it is bringing to the country. A squatter who has gone in upon land, now being sold, and ploughed and sown it, will think himself justified in holding it against all-comers, and his neighbours will think so too.

"Mr. Metcalf, of Kingston, has an easy task in selling the land, pocketing the commission, but the Department will find, when it comes to evict the squatter, that human nature in the North-West is much the same as in Ireland. If we cannot prevail against the Government and the speculator, the squatter can, at least, leave the country with a curse."

That is the evidence of the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the policy of the Government is not changed on this subject, the squatter can do—what? He can at least leave the country and leave it with a curse. They complain that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is oppressive, is incomprehensible; that it is based on ignorance of the country's requirements, that it is bringing evil on the country, and that the squatters are liable to pursue the same course as they pursued in Ireland, and at least leave the country with a curse. With these facts, if they are facts, and they come from the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, staring us in the face, we cannot close our eyes to the position taken by the North-West Council, that there are difficulties and dangers, and breakers ahead. It will not do for us, in view of all these facts, to say you have no ground of complaint—to adopt the line followed by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and tell these men they are children and must be nursed; that they are infants and want to be spoon-fed. We must deal with the people of the North-West fairly and honestly, and must not close our eyes to the facts staring us in the face, or turn a deaf ear to the warnings of the North-West Council and the entreaties of the people whom we have induced to settle there. The whole position is fraught with difficulty and danger. That is not the only thing they complain of. The North-West Council complain of the Tariff, in the tenth paragraph of this Bill of Rights. They, voicing the opinion of the settlers of the North-West, pronounce this Tariff an unreasonable one, especially the duties on agricultural implements, lumber and canned fruits. The people have advanced in calm, moderate and deliberate terms, their complaint and grievances. They deserve every consideration at the hands of the Government. Here in the North-West we have—what? The advanced guard of an army of settlers whom we expect to take possession of the country, men who have gone there and struggled against the initial difficulties of settlement in a new country. We intensify those difficulties by unreasonable and oppressible taxation on the prime necessaries of life, and the necessaries of settlement in a new country. I say, in the first place, it was unfair to impose that Tariff, and having done that unfair act, we should at least consider what the people have to say when they ask us to retrace our steps. Is it not better for us to pause and consider our position and see whether we cannot do something to alleviate the condition of the people of the North-West? If our object be to settle that vast territory, as I suppose it is, we should take care that our policy has not the effect of creating dissatisfaction among the people whom we send there. We know that one settler leaving the country under a sense of injury sustained and wrong committed, does more harm to the country in England, Scotland and Ireland and on the continent, than twenty immigration agents can counteract. I will read from the organ of the Government in Assiniboia, a letter written by a Mr. Sykes. I never saw that gentleman I do not know whether his complaints are just or unjust; but the organ of the Government at Regina, which has a

large circulation in that country, published this letter, and it has been circulated all over Canada. The letter is dated from Stockport, England, and no doubt it was published there and reached the very class of immigrants whom the Minister of Agriculture desires to settle in the North-West, namely, the tenant farmers. Mr. Sykes wrote as follows, to the Regina *Leader*:—

"*To the Editor of the Regina Leader:*

"SIR,—I am discouraged on account of the high duties which the Dominion Government are charging on agricultural machinery, and I really cannot see any possibility of the country prospering. I calculate that what with the protection duties and the charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a capitalist is at a disadvantage of 50 per cent. as compared with Iowa, Minnesota and eastern Dakota. Again, labour is much higher in the Canadian North-West, and produce is much lower. The Canadian North-West is an agricultural country and labours at many disadvantages, as compared with the United States. It would have been a wise policy to have admitted all agricultural machinery and stock duty free. If any class of persons in Canada require protection it is the farmer in the new North-West, as he has to compete with heavy railroad carriage, and he gets very little return from his land for a couple of years. If the present Tariff is to be maintained, a bonus of 50 per cent. should be granted by the Government on each $1,000 expended in the North-West. This bonus would not even suffice to place the farmer on an equality with his brother farmer on the south side of the international line.

"I am a loyal subject of Her Majesty and a staunch Conservative, but I cannot support the policy of the Dominion Government, and should be a Liberal in Canada.

"R. SYKES.

"Stockport, England, Sept. 8."

The *Leader* goes on to say:

"Mr. Sykes is a large English capitalist and the owner of 20,000 acres of lands (purchased from the C. P. R.) in the vicinity of Troy. He has imported one of John Fowler & Sons' steam ploughs, at an enormous expense, on which he was charged 35 per cent. *ad valorem* duty by the Dominion Government, and enormous excess freights (over enormous schedule rates) by the Canadian Pacific Railway. He has had a large gang of men at work on his lands since April, thereby necessitating large monthly expenditure, the greater portion of such expenditure being for supplies, which consisted largely (of course) of canned goods and coal (for running the plough engines). Imagine the idiocy of asking a man in this country to pay 50 cents per ton duty on coal.

"Mr. Sykes' letter speaks for itself and any intelligent man can judge whether the asinine policy of the present Government is calculated to recommend the Canadian North-West as a field for investment to English (or any other) capitalists."

I do not know whether these statements are true; I do not give them to the House as my statements, but as the statements of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and of their organs. Do hon. gentlemen wonder that, with such letters scattered by their own friends and organs broadcast, not only over Canada, but over England, that the immigration into the country was of the scantiest character last year? The organ of the Government in Winnipeg wrote on the same subject. It is equally pronounced and strong; and can hon. gentlemen wonder, when their own friends, their leading friends, their own organs, their leading organs, take high and strong ground against the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, that these rumours and reports circulated broadcast over the world, seriously impede the tide of immigration rolling in, that ought to roll in to our North-West country. I now quote from the Winnipeg *Times*, another pronounced organ of the Government, edited by a strong friend of the Government, and equally pronounced on the question of the impolicy, or want of policy, pursued by the Government during the last two years, especially in dealing with the North-West. The *Times* says, in an article dated 27th April, 1883:

"The North-West settler, be it repeated once more, pays four times a fair share of the Federal taxes. The tariff increases the price of every necessary of life. His pork is taxed to benefit the eastern farmers and packers; his canned meats are taxed to benefit the same persons; his lumber is taxed that the eastern lumbermen may control the market; his coal is taxed to build up Nova Scotia, at least such is the theory; and his agricultural implements are taxed to encourage Ontario industries. But what does the Tariff do for him? He raises and lives by raising wheat, barley and oats. There is a duty of 15 cents a bushel on wheat and barley and of 10 cents on oats, but seeing that these products fetch in St. Paul's much more than in Winnipeg, that protection is worthless. In short, the Tariff, so far as the North-West settlers is concerned, is non-reciprocal spoliation. Manitoba and the North-West are not, as the east maintains, unreasonable. If they were, they would not continue to stagger under these burdens and inequalities, waiting and hoping, in the face of scorn and contumely, not for favour but for fair play."

There you see what the organ of the Government, voicing the opinion of Manitoba and the North-West, said. That organ told hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Finance Minister, that the Tariff increases the price of every necessary of life; that the settler's pork is taxed; that his canned meats are taxed; that his lumber is taxed; that his coal is taxed to build up Nova Scotia; that his agricultural implements are taxed; that in fact the Tariff, so far as the North-West is concerned, is a non-reciprocal spoliation. Are these statements correct? If they are, and the Government organ says they are, and the people of the North-West say they are, then in the interests of the North-West, they should be remedied at once. If they are not correct, the Government should call their organs to account. They are not only the statements of the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the statements of leading men supporting the hon. gentlemen in the North-West. The *Times* publishes another article on the same subject, pointing out perhaps still more distinctly the impolity, the bad polity, of hon. gentlemen opposite. It says, on the 19th May, 1883:

"The fundamental blunder which underlies the policy of the political parties at Ottawa, is that the North-West settler is a pampered individual, and that he ought to submit to little inconveniences like heavy taxation, notable land regulations and disregard of his rights as a squatter. The fact that large sums have been spent on the railroad here is held up to us as proof of the beneficent treatment we are receiving at the hands of the older Provinces. That we pay three times as much *per capita* into the Dominion Treasury, as the eastern tax payer, that the National Policy increases the price of everything we buy without adding a mill to the price of wheat, oats, or barley, that even with a free homestead, the settler's life is for some years a hard and unprofitable one. These and such like considerations are quietly ignored. To make matters worse, the people of Ottawa forget that not many miles from here, a foreign flag offers the settler nearly all the advantages he can obtain here, with others, good railway facilities, peculiar to every settled region. He gets nothing here which he could not get elsewhere, and it should be the policy of the Government to treat him not as though he were beholden to it for special favours, but in terms of equality and in a spirit of fairplay. A few more blunders, a little more stamping on his corns, may provoke him, until he becomes 'unreasonable' in earnest."

Here the organ of the Government, the Winnipeg *Times*, complains of heavy taxation; of unstable land regulations; of a disregard of the squatters' rights. It complains that the National Policy increases the price of everything they buy; that the National Policy does not add a mill to the price of wheat, oats and barley, and that a few more blunders, and a little more stamping on his corns, will drive him to leave the country, as the *Times* says, with a curse. Now, is that the truth? If it is the truth, then it is a fit subject for Parliamentary enquiry. The demand made by the North-West Council in their Bill of Rights is representation in this Parliament. I discussed this question a few days ago, and I will not discuss it on this occasion. I believe the people of the North-West are entitled to representation in this Parliament, and I am amazed that the Government have not seen the necessity of introducing a Bill to give them that representation. I say it is a fair and just thing, and that they should get it and that at once. Now, Sir, all these facts must convince you beyond peradventure that there is a feeling of discontent, a feeling of dissatisfaction, a feeling of unrest, in both Manitoba and the North-West Territories. And further, that, so far as we know, at all events, the first step has not been taken by this Government to redress these wrongs and remove these grievances. Sir, the statements made both in Manitoba by the Farmers Convention, and by the North-West Council, are eminently temperate, moderate and reasonable; they are made in a moderate tone and manner, and being so, they should be met in a fair and reasonable spirit, and where they are fair and reasonable, they should be conceded. Sir, we ought not to forget that England lost one empire by the disregard of just such claims as these. Let us take

care lest by ignoring these claims and trifling with these demands we do not jeopardize the existence of our new empire in the great North-West. I move in amendment, that all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following inserted:—

This House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of the condition, complaints and demands of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, with a view to devise means for remedying any well-founded grievances and complying with any reasonable demands.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think if the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, had been sincerely desirous of promoting the interests of the people who are now inhabiting Manitoba and the North-West Territories, he would have adopted a different course from that which he has adopted to-night. I do not think, Sir, that he would have proposed that this House should resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, when he knew his motion must be treated as a want of confidence motion by the Government. If the hon. gentleman had been so desirous of giving fair and full consideration to the important questions to which he has alluded, I think, Sir, he would, at an earlier period of the Session, have given notice of the motion which he has submitted for the consideration of the House; he would have taken an opportunity of making that motion when it would have been in the power of the Government to entertain the proposal he has made. But, Sir, I think there is another reason which has induced the hon. gentleman to adopt the course which he has adopted, of submitting this motion as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and of moving it at a time, when he knew there was no option on the part of the Government, but to meet his motion by a direct negative. After listening to the hon. gentleman, I am not at all surprised that he should have taken the cour e he has taken. Why, Sir, what will the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territory think when they find that their great champion in this House, the hon. gentleman who has placed his motion in a position to compel the Administration and its friends to vote it down by a direct negative, has occupied the attention of the House for the length of time the hon. gentleman has occupied it, without venturing to endorse one single ground of complaint made by the parties who have complained. The hon. gentleman says, and says rightly, that it would be criminal to adopt any course which would be calculated to excite discontent in that country, and yet I ask what has the hon. gentleman been doing himself for the last hour. I ask if he has not adopted to the utmost extent of his power, all the means he possesses of inciting that very discontent which he deplores; and yet I am proud to know that in his review of the action and policy of this Government he has not ventured to put his finger on one single charge or ground of complaint, one single demand for redress, that he says himself that he is prepared endorse. The only points to which he committed himself in the slightest degree, or uttered a single word which would enable the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories to hold him to the opinions he advanced, were as to the reservations of the lands in southern Manitoba and in the Mile Belt; and he, himself, admitted that the Government had acted wisely and well in having removed these restrictions. So, the only point on which the hon. gentleman has ventured to join in the complaints which have been made, and endorse those complaints, the only point on which he has not guarded himself, and taken care to guard himself effectually, against being held or committed to sanction or approve of these complaints, he himself admits the Government have already swept away all cause of complaint. And yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman would stand and pose here as the champion and advocate of the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Why, Sir, I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman took the course he did. I do not wonder, when he came to refer to the demands of the people of that country in the terms that he did, that he was compelled to adopt the extraordinary course of refusing, directly and in the most pointed manner, half a dozen times over, to be himself held committed to approving of or sanctioning these complaints. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knew that if he endorsed these complaints, instead of attacking the present Administration he would have been attacking the previous Administration, of which he was a supporter. The hon, gentleman knows that all the grounds of complaint he referred to, could be held to be infinitely stronger as applied to his own friends, when they were charged with the duty of administering the public affairs of this country, than they could as against the present Administration. The hon. gentleman knows that the policy of this Government has been a policy of steady, unvarying advocacy and support of everything that it was believed would develop and promote the interests of the people of the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman knows, Sir, as every member of this House knows, that it would be impossible for the most paternal Government to conserve and preserve and promote the interests of the people of any country to a greater extent, to make them the subject of greater care and consideration, than this Government have made the interests of the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that no sooner had the North-West Territories been brought within the confines of Canada, no sooner had we been charged with the administration of that large and valuable territory than we came down to Parliament—to do what? Why, Sir, to propose a measure which it was believed would do more to promote the prosperity and development of that country than all the measures that could be conceived for that purpose—that was the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows how we were met. He knows that instead of receiving the aid and co-operation and support of himself and his friends on that side of the House—he knows that from the first hour the measure was propounded down, I may say, to the present hour, all our efforts were systematically antagonized. All our efforts in initiating that great work, upon which the future of that vast country was entirely and completely dependent, were met and opposed at every stage and step by these hon. gentlemen. The hon. gentleman knows right well that the Government of this country staked its position and lost it in the effort to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, Sir, what more? We went out of power; and when we came back, what was the position of affairs in Manitoba and the North-West? From the day these hon. gentlemen were charged with the administration of public affairs—from the first hour they came into power down to the hour they left it, what was the progress made by Manitoba and the North-West? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that on the day they went out of power, by their own testimony, out of the mouth of their own Finance Minister on the floor of this Parliament, they delared that the lands in North-West were not worth 25 cents an acre.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nonsense.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and the hon. gentleman himself has admitted it on the floor of Parliament during the present Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Distinctly, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say the hon. gentleman has been again and again charged by myself on the floor of the House with having refused to secure the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch under Mr. Foster's contract, by granting him 20,000 acres of land per mile, as they were pledged by the contract to give him, and giving 25 cents an acre instead. The hon. gentleman declared that the contract could have been completed if they had given 25 cents an

acre in cash for the land, instead of the land. But, Sir, they refused, and the hon. gentleman has declared on the floor of Parliament, during the present Session, the reason why they refused. He said that the whole condition of things had changed. The hon. gentleman knows that the leader of the late Administration, who sits beside him, also declared, subsequently to their going out of power, that it would have been impossible to build the Canadian Pacific Railway with the lands of the North-West, when we asked for 100,000,000 acres for that purpose, because, he said, you will have to pay to carry the people into the country, and give them the lands after you get them there, in order to induce them to stay in the country. Now, Sir, that was the condition of the people of Manitoba and the people of the North-West. The people of the North-West! There were no people of the North-West. The country was an unpeopled desert from end to end, and the hon. gentleman knows it. And yet, Sir, with all that has been achieved—achieved, I say, by the most magnanimous, the most generous efforts that a Government or a Parliament ever put forward in any country—in the face of all that, the hon. gentleman ventures, in this year of Grace, to bring forward a resolution of censure upon this Government for not dealing justly and equitably and fairly with the people of Manitoba and the North-West. Why, Sir, let me draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the position of the railway under the Government of his own friends. It is true, a section was put under contract between Thunder Bay and a point some 112 miles west, and another portion running east from Winnipeg had been put under contract; but, Sir, the day they went out of power, they had not decided that they would put in the intervening link at all, by which alone the line they had constructed could be made useful.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is stating what he must remember to be incorrect. He knows that the very day he came into power he found tenders lying in his office for the construction of that line for the whole distance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. To the only tenders the hon. gentleman had asked for, he had not received the response of a single man, and we had therefore to take them up.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why, Sir, the very sections which were built, sections A and B, were built by us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to remind him that so far from that being the case, although the surveys were in progress, he himself stated, when he brought down the proposal for the construction of that portion of the line, that although tenders had been asked, he had not decided——

Mr. MACKENZIE. Were the tenders not in the office?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, Sir, and the hon. gentleman will find that that is the case. He will also find, and I will show him the statement in the *Hansard*, that subsequent to the change of Government, he himself stated that the Government had not decided to construct that portion of the line.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Did the hon. gentleman ask for tenders for that section?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only tell the hon. gentleman——

Mr. MACKENZIE. Answer my question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then, I say no one has ever heard of it, but the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I will undertake to show my hon. friend his own statement in the *Hansard*, subsequent to the change of Government, that although tenders had been asked for, for the purpose of obtaining information and ascertaining on what terms the road could be constructed, the Government had not decided upon accepting the tenders or upon the immediate construction of that portion of the line. But what did we do? Why, the very first moment this Government came into power, we took immediate steps to secure the prompt construction of that without which all that had been done would have been entirely useless. The hon. gentleman is aware that when we came into power in 1878, there was not a mile of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or of the branch to Winnipeg, under operation, and that this Government took the most prompt and effective measures to establish railway communication at the earliest possible moment. But what more? Why, the hon. gentleman had decided that if he did construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, there was not a mile of it, not a mile of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, that should run within 20 miles of Winnipeg; the hon. gentleman knows that he had located that road to run away across to the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, and that he would leave the whole of that great, magnificent district of country lying south of Lake Manitoba thoroughly unprovided for, without any railway communication whatever.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What was the result? The result was that when the change of Government took place, there was not only no North-West population, but there was comparatively no Manitoba population. The hon. gentleman knows that Winnipeg was in a state of complete despondency and depression; he knows that had the line not been changed by this Government, there would have been no such development of that great, magnificent and fertile region lying south of Lake Manitoba, and from that to the boundary, as that which has taken place under the policy of the Government and the administration of the affairs of that country by this Government. From the first hour that this Government came into power, the interests of the people of Winnipeg, the interests of the Province of Manitoba, the interests of the great North-West, have been cared for—cared for with an energy and a zeal such as no Government in the old world could have shown in a greater degree for the promotion of any section of territory in the world; and the hon. gentleman knows it. He knows the magnificent results that followed; he knows that, not step by step merely, but by one giant bound, Winnipeg, from its dormant condition, from its condition of despondency, in which there was no life, no vitality, no progress, no prosperity, sprang, as if by magic, into a condition of affairs that would compare favourably with anything that has ever been witnessed, even on the Continent of America, in the way of development; and he knows that from the hour this Government came into power down to the present day, the progress of Manitoba and the North-West, will compare favourably with the progress that has been witnessed even in the great country to the south of us, in regard to its development. My hon. friend next refers to the Portage. What was the conditions of Portage la Prairie? Portage la Prairie was 100 miles away from the line where the hon. gentleman intended to construct his road, and what was the result? The result was, when we found the importance of touching the river at that point, and when we ran the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to it, Portage la Prairie sprang out of his condition of despondency in the same way, and from a comparatively insignificant village became a prosperous town, as if by magic. So along the whole settlement of the country. Why, I was amused when I heard the hon. gentleman talking about a great public meeting at Moose Jaw. How did that happen? Why I was at Moose Jaw two years ago, and there was not a house to

be seen within the whole range of vision from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the horizon. Who created the great public meeting? How did it happen? How is it that in that great wild and unpeopled portion of the desert, lying 400 or 500 miles away to the west of Winnipeg, unvisited by any but the wild animal or the Indian from one years end to the other—how is it that that, as if by magic, is transformed into a place in which a great public meeting can be held? Why, it is the policy of this Government, who, in the face of all the opposition that hon. gentlemen opposite could give them, carried through triumphantly and successfully that contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; it is their policy that has pushed the iron horse so rapidly across that country, and has carried civilization and development, and the creation of villages and of towns, from one end of this North-West to the other. Yet the hon. gentleman ventures, in the face of these facts, which are a matter of history, which have been attracting the admiration of the world—yes, I say, that the course this Government has taken in connection with the rapid construction of this great transcontinental line of railway, has fixed the eyes of the civilized world on that country, and that men looking for the means of exchanging from the older and more densely populated countries of Europe to a home where they might succeed in attaining, not only the comforts of life, which they are unable to obtain in these older and more densely populated places, but where they may also rapidly achieve fortunes that may be handed down to their children after them—these men have been centering their eyes on this great North-West, which, by magic, as it were, under the influence of the policy of this Government, has been developed before the eyes of the civilized world. Yet we are to-day to be upbraided—by whom? By gentlemen whose policy would have left that country an unpeopled desert, if it had been carried out, and who know that, so far from being in a position to challenge the action of this Administration, there is no one thing in which they stand at such a terrible disadvantage as in the contrast between their dealings with Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and the action that this Government and the great party that sustain us have taken in relation to this country. I have stated the result. The lands that the ex-leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie) said must be given away, and the people carried there and put on them; the lands that he said must be given the people as a free gift, in order to induce them to stay on them; the lands that the ex-Finance Minister declared and admitted, by the action of his Government, were not worth 25 cents an acre, have been — millions of acres that have been sold have commanded, under the operation of this rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a net result of something like $1.36 per acre. Hundreds of thousands of people have free homes provided for them on the most productive lands and on the most advantageous terms that they can find in any portion of the world. And millions of dollars of capital have been brought in by men, who, under their policy, never would have seen the country, but under our policy have not only brought their industry and their intelligence, but their millions of capital into that country, to develop it and to make Canada a great and growing, a prosperous and happy country. What is the only charge the hon. gentleman has to make against us? Why, he has only one charge, and only one ground of complaint, and he came very near stating it two or three times; he just came to the verge of the statement, and drew back. He is not prepared to endorse one of the complaints. He is not prepared to endorse a single complaint that has not already been remedied, and he admitted that the Government were entitled to the fullest consideration for having remedied and swept away these defects, but his complaint is that we did not give an answer. Mark; he did not say they were entitled to have the answer "Yes," and the objection that the hon. gentleman has, and it is just where the shoe pinches, is because they did not get the answer "No"; it is because the Government on points on which he himself refused to commit himself to an affirmative answer, did not give the only answer the hon. gentleman conceived they could have, and thus carry out and develop and accomplish that to which hon. gentlemen opposite and the press supporting them have devoted so much of their time—the unholy, the unworthy, object of stirring up discontent, fraught with danger, as the hon. gentleman says it was, to the integrity of the country. Fraught with danger! Danger has not been averted, Sir. At this moment, capital that was prepared to come in, capital that at this moment would have been flowing into that country for its development, capital that alone is required to sweep away every trace of grievance, is being stopped and arrested by the too successful efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to stir up and foment and develop discontent in that country. Why, it is beyond the bounds of common sense, it is beyond the bounds of reason, that any body of men could be brought together to pass so fatal a resolution in regard to themselves as that immigration into their country ought to be stopped. Is there a gentleman on the other side of the House that does not know that the greatest misfortune that could happen to the Province of Manitoba or the North-West Territories would be to stop the flow of immigration into the country, to stop the flow of industry and the flow of capital into the country; and, when I speak of capital, I speak of it as altogether inferior to that greater and more valuable and essential capital, the industry which is calculated to create wealth, and by the easiest process, out of the fertile territory of that magnificent country. Yet, with the fact before us that no man, no intelligent man in this country will say that a greater misfortune could fall upon the country than to stop immigration into it, these men were mad enough to do this, goaded on, induced by the pernicious advice and instruction of people who, when it comes to the test, refuse to back their complaints; people who, when face to face in this Parliament, in the discussion of this question, are not prepared to back their complaints, but are ready to adopt any and every means that will foment and stir up that dissatisfaction, and inspire the action on the part of those people that they know will be more fatal to the development of the country than any other course that could be pursued. So perfectly obvious was the madness, the criminal folly of such a course, that the words were hardly out of their mouths, they had hardly tabled the resolution, when the whole community rose to the danger they had to meet, and were anxious to efface it and sweep it out of existence. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Norquay, the Prime Minister, has made demands. He took care not to endorse any of his demands. He says he is a very able man, and so he is. He is so able a man that, in the Legislature of the country, when that Legislature was meeting under all the excitement of this public gathering which had been called together for the purpose of controlling and influencing it, he was able and statesman-like enough to vote down the attempt to stir up this discontent by the sound and practical solution of asking for a Commission to enquire into the condition of the country and recommend such measures as might be necessary in the promotion of its interests. It would be well for hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be well for the country, if the press supporting them would take a suggestion from the leader of the Manitoba Government in that regard, who, while pressing as he is bound to press, all these questions that he considers necessary on the consideration of this country, stopped at that point where the pressure and the policy which is proposed to be pursued would be, he knows, entirely fatal to the progress and prosperity of the country where he administers public affairs. But the hon. gentleman would intimate

that nothing had been done. I have spoken of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me refer to what we have done in the promotion of immigration into that country — the very life and soul of progress and prosperity in the North-West. And what are hon. gentlemen opposite doing? Why, the very gentlemen, the very party that are confronting us, the very party that are declaring that we are not doing enough for the North-West, spoke by the hour the other night to strike down the Estimates of the Government and endeavour to stop the means of promoting immigration into that country. So it would appear that, not only is discontent to be fomented on the one side, but the means of promoting and extending that discontent is to be carried on at the same time. Then it appears that we have never paid attention to the claims. Why, the Government before us dealt with this question of the claims of Manitoba. I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman did not venture to endorse these demands on the part of the North-West, because, if he had, he would have been inflicting the most severe censure which it was in his power to inflict upon the Government which he had supported for five long years in this House. He knew that that Government had had all these questions before them. He knew they had this question of enlarging the boundaries of Manitoba before them; he knew they had the question of the public lands before them, and yet they entered upon their term of office and they closed their five years' term of office without giving them the control of an acre of land or having enlarged the small, restricted boundaries of the Province of Manitoba. But what have we done? The Government which is arraigned here to-night with this vote of non-confidence, which is assailed because we have not answered these proposals from Manitoba, instead of having refused, instead of having turned a deaf ear to their claims, have given these 150,000 people, or a much smaller number than that, boundaries which extended their Province over a larger area than the great Province of Ontario; and yet we are to be charged with being negligent of our duties, because we do not at once yield to these demands. No; the hon. gentleman did not venture to ask us to yield to the demands. All he wanted—and I followed him very closely on this point, from beginning to end—was, not that we should yield to the demands, but that we should give such a negative as to stimulate that discontent, which, while it may promote—and I believe it will fail in that object—while it may promote the poor, paltry, insignificant interests of party, tramples the best interests of the country under their feet, in order that they may ride into power over the ruins of their country. I say the hon. gentlemen know, and that is the difficulty with hon. gentlemen opposite, that the intelligent people of this country, from end to end, recognize the fact of the enormous contrast between the policy of the late, and the policy of the present Government. They know right well that the intelligent people of this country regard the five years during which the hon. gentlemen opposite controlled the public affairs, and ruled Manitoba and the North-West, as five years lost to Canada. They know that from the very hour a change of Administration took place, this country not only rose from a condition of depression, but it has attained a height of power and influence and wealth in the brief period between 1878 and the present hour, that will challenge a comparison with the proudest era of prosperity ever witnessed in any country in the world. But, Sir, finding that progress, finding that hundreds of thousands of people were pouring into this country with their capital, finding the enormous development that was given to the North-West, finding the prosperity that was evidenced on every hand, these hon. gentlemen turned their attention to the only means by which that progress and prosperity could be arrested, and hat is by stirring up and inflaming the public mind and, instead of sending abroad such truthful information as the facts will warrant in regard to the position of affairs in the North-West, they send through every channel they can devise, false information, false statements, that are calculated to discredit the country, to arrest that flood of emigration that was building up that country with such wonderful rapidity. The hon. gentleman read a few letters from persons who are discontented. I do not mean to say that you can pour tens of thousands of people out of the old world into a country like Manitoba and the North-West Territories without having some discontent. It is not only the industrious, the frugal and the prudent who go there, but in all such cases where attention is attracted to a new country, thousands of people come to the conclusion that without any qualifications for settling in a new country like that, they have only to transfer their home from a European or British city to the North-West in order to become millionaires, and no wonder some of these people are discontented. The idle and dissolute go there along with the industrious and prudent, and naturally these are discontented. But the dissatisfaction is on the part of those who thought they had only to go to Manitoba to be provided with happy and comfortable homes without any effort on their part. An unfavourable crop, a little frost, a little difficulty, will excite dissatisfaction at such a time, and cause it to become widespread. Nothing is so easy as to excite dissatisfaction on the part of persons who have no opportunity of being accurately informed with respect to public affairs. That facility for exciting discontent has been taken hold of, and many of the industrious, many of the most valuable citizens of Manitoba and the North-West Territories have been drawn into the fatal position of lending their countenance, to a certain extent, to these cries of discontent that have been so industriously spread over the country. But there has been a very sudden awakening. The intelligent people of the country, the moment they have come to look at their own acts, have recoiled from the position they had taken, and the Legislature of Manitoba, by a vote of twenty-two to seven, have shown that they understand too well the interests of Manitoba and the North-West to be led into the position of lending themselves to these delusive cries, which are calculated to destroy and ruin the country. But, Sir, what more? Did we not lend an attentive ear to the claims of Manitoba when Mr. Norquay came down here and presented them? Yes; the moment it was shown to be necessary in the interests of that country that they should have their subsidy revised, and their position reconsidered, it was reconsidered, and measures were proposed that were satisfactory and were accepted as such by the leader of the Provincial Government—not as a final and permanent settlement that is to last forever—we did not expect that; but, we thought it would answer the purpose, in the meantime, and we gave such a response to their application as showed that we were now, as we always have been, fully alive to the importance of dealing in such a way as to promote the best interests of that country to the utmost extent. The hon. gentleman says we have turned a deaf ear, that we have refused to consider the claims of Mr. Norquay. Does the hon. gentleman not know that it is a matter of public notoriety that, so far from that being the case, the Government have considered with the utmost care and attention, the demands that have been made? It must not be forgotten that the question of the school lands stands in a peculiar position. These school lands were deliberately consecrated by this Parliament to the important and almost sacred object of providing for the education of the people of that country; and so far as the Government have been able to consider it, they have regarded it as a sacred trust they cannot lightly part with. It must be husbanded and must be guarded in such a way as to provide, for all time to come,

the inestimable boon of free education to the people who shall settle in that country. With regard to the public lands, that is an open question. The hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, did not take the position they do now; they did not decide, as one would suppose from listening to the hon. mover of these Resolutions, that these public lands must all be handed over to the Province. They held on to every acre; they resisted every attempt and every demand on the part of the Government of Manitoba to have an acre of those lands.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was no demand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, Sir, it was a wise and statesmanlike policy, and I think my hon. friend will find that he is mistaken. I may say, that so far, we have considered that an open question. It is known that in the United States, when they create State out of a Territory, the Federal Government does not hand over the public lands, and if any man in the Province of Manitoba who is dissatisfied with the policy of this Government in retaining the public lands, crosses the boundary, he will find himself in a country in which the avowed policy is not to hand over the lands. An hon. friend reminds me that we gave them $45,000 per annum in lieu of the public lands, and yet we are denounced here for not giving any answer on that question. I have already stated that so far as the boundaries of the country are concerned, the hon. gentleman took care not to demand that the boundaries should be made greater than the great Province from which he comes, and from which a great portion of hon. gentlemen opposite come—that Manitoba should be made very much larger than the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman took good care not to commit himself to that proposition, because I am inclined to think it would not meet with a great deal of favour from many hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You stole the property of Ontario and gave it to them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will not now attempt to settle the boundary between the two Provinces; but the hon. gentleman has just reminded me that we have been so generous to them that we have not only extended their boundary to the west, giving them a great slice of the most valuable portion of the North-West Territory, but we have actually committed larceny—and not a petty larceny either—in stealing a large section of the Province of Ontario to hand it over to them; and I am quite sure that hon. gentlemen will not endorse the Resolution that has been proposed, and which will lead to the inference that he is disposed to hand over a much larger territory to the Province of Manitoba. Then, Sir, with reference to the other point that was claimed as of importance—that is, of ascertaining the amount of population oftener than once in ten years, and readjusting the subsidy *per capita* under the Terms of Union, the Government have already stated that they are prepared to consider favourably that question, and to provide for a frequent estimate of the population of Manitoba, with a view to the re-adjustment of the subsidy that is paid in proportion to the population. I need not refer to the fact, which I mentioned in another place, and which is also well known, that having provided for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government are prepared and intend to bring down to the House a proposition to make a munificent grant of public lands in the North-West Territory and in the Province of Manitoba for the purpose of promoting and securing the construction of a railway to Hudson Bay, and also intend to ask this Parliament to provide means for promptly ascertaining the condition of Hudson Bay itself, by sending a vessel into that region, for the purpose of having a thorough and accurate survey made. There is hardly a question or demand of the slightest importance to which the hon. gentleman referred, that the Government have not already anticipated, that the Government have not already given most careful attention to, and respecting which they are prepared to go as far as possible in the interests of the people to meet any just claims that may be brought forward from that portion of the Dominion. I do not think it is necessary for me to occupy the time of the House very long while I discuss the other grievance—the duty on agricultural implements. A great deal has been made of that, but it is fortunate that the subject has been ventilated so thoroughly, because it has led to the establishment of the fact beyond controversy that, instead of the cost of agricultural implements having been increased a single cent by the additional duty imposed, agricultural implements are cheaper now than they were before the duty was levied, cheaper than they would have been if the duty had not been imposed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then put on more duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sometimes that accomplishes the object, as the hon. gentleman knows. Sometimes the imposition of such a duty as to make it an entirely prohibitory one has had the effect of producing such rivalry and competition in the manufacture of the article, as to cause it to be furnished at lower cost. I will not go into the question of duties on canned goods; the whole complaint dwindled down into a question of canned fruits. So far as the duty on pork is concerned, of which the hon. gentleman complained, I could hardly suppose that a country which can raise more potatoes to the acre, and more corn to the acre, than any country to be found in the world, should complain of having pork shut out by duties. I should suppose that nothing was more in the interests of the people of the North-West than to maintain fair and legitimate prices for the products of the farm, and the fertile area is so enormous as to render it a matter of profound indifference whether the products of the farm have prohibitory duties placed on them or not, as the country is in a position to raise them to the very best possible advantage. I need not, therefore, follow the hon gentleman, especially as he guarded himself against giving his adherence to any single one of the demands made by the people of Manitoba and the North-West that remained unsatisfied, and the hon. gentleman, in the speech which he seemed to make by the clock, appeared to speak with the determination of saying as little as possible. I ask the people of Manitoba and the North-West to peruse the speech of the hon. gentleman, and they will find this striking and important fact: that their champion in this House, the hon. gentleman who puts himself forward to bring into public notoriety the grievances of which they complain, refused to give his support to a single demand they had made, with the exception of those demands which he said had been already disposed of. I call the attention of the intelligent people of that country to the further fact, that while the hon. gentleman guarded himself against committing himself to a single proposition they had propounded, he took the opportunity of making this motion at a time when it could only be viewed as a vote of want of confidence and had to be voted down—a course of action which must necessarily, if he desired to have Parliament enquire into the subject, completely defeat and prevent this being done. I cannot resume my seat without drawing the attention of the House for a single moment to an astounding statement made by the hon. gentleman in his unparallelled speech, because a more inconsequential speech I never listened to. The hon. gentleman seemed mainly anxious to guard himself from being supposed to commit himself to the support of any of the proposals that he was bringing under the consideration of the House; and I draw the attention of the House to the fact

that the hon. gentleman closed his remarkable speech with a statement that was most remarkable: that the English lost America by refusing to consider just such claims as those made by the North-West. Where did the hon. gentleman find the analogy between the claims put forward by the old British colonists of the present United States of America and these claims? I am afraid the hon. gentleman found no analogy; but it was lying on his mind that, while he himself refused to give support and countenance to any of the demands which he claims are unredressed to-day, that hon. gentleman wanted to suggest to those parties that all they have to do is to menace this country with danger and disaster, to create the impression that the North-West is not that great fertile country which it has been supposed to be, and that great country which is to supply homes for the homeless in every part of the world, but he wants to let the loyal and law-abiding citizens of other countries know not only that the people there are down-trodden and oppressed, but also that if they go there they are removing to a country which is going to be shattered by discontent and by disunion, and where there is no prosperity to be found, but where they are exchanging adversity which surrounds them for a still worse condition. I say that a greater disaster to Canada could not occur than the course taken by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, than the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, in fomenting that discontent which is calculated to prevent the hundreds of thousands of people who to-day are looking to the great fertile territories of the North-West, as that country which, above all others, presents the most inviting and the most advantageous prospect of providing, not only happy homes, but the opportunity of obtaining that competence which men desire to provide for those coming after them as well as for themselves. What the hon. gentleman read here—I will not say for what purpose—will be used by the enemies of Canada and by the land companies endeavouring to draw people to other countries - these statements will be quoted as antagonistic to Canada, statements which the hon. gentleman knows can be met with testimony a thousand times greater and a thousand fold stronger, of hundreds and thousands who have gone into Manitoba and the North-West Territory and who, to day, testify that it would be impossible for any industrious, enterprising, energetic man to find in the wide world a country which would offer him greater prosperity than the North-West. Professor Tanner, a disinterested authority, the Government Professor of Agriculture at South Kensington, London, knowing the attention given to this subject of Manitoba and the North-West, and finding the conflicting statements made as to the character of the country as a field for immigration, left his home and came to this country. He went to the North-West and travelled over 5,000 miles, and having travelled from house to house, having taken every opportunity of interviewing the people, and learning from them what their own feelings were as to the success that attended the exchange of the one country for the other, he returned with the declaration that it would be impossible for any person to have met with more complete and triumphant answers to these libels on the country, which are scattered broadcast and sent to the various papers in England and elsewhere, in order to decry and depress the country. I give that high and disinterested testimony as an answer to these individual complaints, for they are nothing else. The hon. gentleman read from a Scotch newspaper—from some person of whom we know nothing. Did he not see that Lady Cathcart's Factor, a man of education, intelligence and information, visited the country thoroughly, that he was sent out by Lady Cathcart, who contributed £100 per family, and sent out a number of families from Scotland to that North-West country, and that that gentleman, on his return, having visited the country and visited the people at their own homes, gave the most unqualified testimony, not only to the magnificent character of the country itself, its great fertility and the enormous advantages of settling in it, but to the happy contentment which he found pervading the minds of all the people who were able to exchange Scotland for that country. Knowing this, as the hon. gentleman must have known it, knowing that testimony abounds on every side, of the highest and most disinterested character, as to the success which has attended the immigrants who have gone into that country, he yet stands here by the hour and retails these miserable statements, from perhaps some disappointed speculators who were perhaps unable to realize sudden fortunes, for the purpose of inciting discontent and doing that which he knows, and which every man knows, is calculated to strike the most fatal blow that can be struck at the development of that great country which is so rapidly making Canada a country of which every Canadian may be proud.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is satisfactory to find that the hon. gentleman has recovered something of his old, pristine vigour, and I may add, more than his old recklessness of assertion. Perhaps, now that he has found his voice, he may go one step further and support his arguments by his vote. If he does it will be the first time since the House has met that we will have seen the vote on record of the hon. gentleman who is not the member for Cumberland.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I call the hon. gentleman to order for his statement that I am not the member for Cumberland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a Bill to make him so.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not in order to make any such statement. The hon. gentleman has a seat here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, Sir, I will alter the phrase, and I will say, the hon. gentleman who now sits for Cumberland, and to secure whose seat a Bill is before this House. Sir, the hon. gentleman asks why my hon. friend did not move earlier. Why, Sir, how could he move earlier? How could he move until those negotiations which were going on had closed, until we knew whether or not the hon. gentleman was going to grant the demands of Mr. Norquay and his friends? What time have we had? Why, Sir, almost from the moment this House met, from the moment the hon. gentleman opposite made his Budget Speech, we were occupied in testing the accuracy of his former statement, by granting a further gift, for it amounted to that, of $30,000,000 to the Company of which the hon. gentleman boasts so much, and which he told us was never going to cost the country a dollar after the enormous grant originally given. The hon. gentleman talks, as his friends have talked on every occasion, when their misdeeds have been brought to light by hon. gentlemen on this side, of our want of patriotism and of our exciting discontent. Why, Sir, cannot they vary that old refrain, even for a single moment? It is the same old answer which has been made to every complaint made from this side of the House. When we point out the abominable extravagance of this Government, when we show, as I showed not long ago, that while entering on our career as a nation, we did so under conditions which gave us enormous advantages over the people of the United States, we have been, or the Government have been, so false to their trust, that Canada to-day is labouring under an expenditure nearly double per head of that in the United States; and when these facts, which should be known to every ratepayer in the country, are brought out, what is the answer? Can they prove the statement incorrect? No, Sir; but they say it is unpatriotic to state the fact. Sir, the unpatriotic conduct is in bringing about such a state of things, and not in calling the attention of the people to

those who brought about that state of things. When we call attention to the enormous loss of people which is going on from the great Province of Ontario, when we know that 60,000 or 80,000 people a year are lost to that Province by the misgovernment of these gentlemen, they tell us it is unpatriotic, but it is not unpatriotic to cause this exodus of our people. When we condemned the gross and flagrant corruption which they have displayed in dealing with so many things in this North-West country, it is unpatriotic, because it reflects on the honour of these hon. gentlemen; but it is not unpatriotic to take tens of thousands of acres of land and sell them for one-quarter of their value to Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces. It is very unpatriotic for my hon. friend to point out these facts, but it is not unpatriotic for these gentlemen to misgovern the North-West, as my hon. friend has shown they have misgoverned it. Sir, the hon. gentleman says we will not endorse the complaints of the people of the North-West. What have we been doing night after night but calling attention to the consequence of the Tariff which these hon. gentlemen imposed, under which we all suffer, but under which the people of the North-West suffer most and worst of all. Have we not called attention again and again to the dishonest exercise of the veto power made by these hon. gentlemen. Have we not called attention again and again to the reservations which have taken place all over the North-West, and yet this same hon. gentleman claims credit for his sacrifices for the benefit of the people of the North-West. He tells us that he and his colleagues staked office and lost it to build a railway to the North-West. Why, Sir, they staked office, and they lost it in the attempt to debauch the electorate of Canada. That is how and why they left office, and I say there is no viler page in the history of the country than that which records the mode and manner in which they left office in 1873. And these are the men who talk to us about our conduct in exciting discontent, about our designing to come into the Government of this country over the ruins of the country. Sir, if these hon. gentlemen unhappily retain office much longer, I am afraid there will not even be the ruins. They talk about stopping immigration into Manitoba, and they are the men under whose policy Ontario alone has lost 234,000 of the best of her people within the last four years. I say that 234,000 people, nearly one-fourth of a million of the people of Ontario, have been to all intents and purposes driven out of it by the misconduct and misgovernment of these hon. gentlemen. And they talk about having a vote struck down in the Estimates to bring in immigration. Why, Sir, the vote which was taken the other night expressly declared that we were perfectly willing to bring in all persons except mechanics and artizans, and if the Minister knows anything about what is going on in Canada, he knows too well that under this policy, which was to remove all distress, there are thousands of people to-day in the different cities of Canada who are unable to obtain employment. Sir, he talks of danger; he talks of the unholy objects of these people. Well, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. gentleman what he would have us do. When we find that the country is being misgoverned, does the hon. gentleman suppose that we are going to supplicate interviews with him and his colleagues, and confide to them, with whispered humbleness, our views as to the dangers which await this country? Here, on the floor of this House, is the place where we have to tell the hon. gentlemen what we think of their policy; and it is in the discharge of a public duty that my hon. friend has spoken to-night, as he ought to speak, calmly and temperately, asking the consideration of this Government to what the people of Manitoba demand—not desiring to prejudice the controversy, but asking simply that their demands should be considered and adjudicated on by the Government. Now, Sir, it is quite idle to ignore these complaints. It is quite idle for the hon. gentleman to blind himself to this discontent which he knows to exist, of which so many evidences and proofs have been accumulated by my hon. friend, which are known to exist by everybody who pays the slightest attention to the affairs of the North-West—I say it is quite idle for the hon. gentleman to suppose that there is any use in shutting our eyes to the plain and patent fact that the great proportion of the settlers of Manitoba and the North-West are at this moment very seriously dissatisfied with the policy of that hon. gentleman and his colleagues. Sir, the hon. gentleman said one thing that is true. He said that these complaints would go far. I am very sorry to say that they will—that mischief will be done by them. But I say that is the very strongest proof of the substantial justice of these complaints. Who are the men who have been making them? Why, Sir, they are the very men whose interests are most of all bound up—far more than the hon. gentleman's—in everything that can possibly promote the prosperity of that country; and if you find these men, who know that so well, indulging in these complaints to their own detriment, you may be sure that the oppression has been grievous indeed which has induced them to speak as they have done. I regret, Sir, myself, that they should have gone so far as to declare that Manitoba desired no immigrants. For once I agree with the hon. gentleman that that is to be regretted. But we know on better authority than his that there is an oppression which drives men mad; and very much that kind of oppression has been perpetrated by himself and his colleagues on the great mass of the settlers of Manitoba. Now, Sir, let us examine the position for a few minutes, and ask ourselves a few plain questions. What makes Manitoba and the North-West of such great value to the people of old Canada? What makes it worth our while to expend enormous sums of money in that country? The hon. gentleman knows that if to the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to the sum we are obliged to pay for it, you add the sum already expended in that country in one way or other, you will find that about a hundred millions of our money will in all probability be spent in that enterprise. He knows, too, that in the expenditure in other directions, such as on Indians, Mounted Police, and the immigration service, which is chiefly for that country, enormous annual charges amounting to no less than $2,000,000 a year are incurred. Now I ask of what value is that great expenditure to us? Why, Sir, the value lies wholly here—that Manitoba and the North-West, if wisely and well administered, would provide homes for all that enormous mass of people who for many years back have been daily and hourly quitting Canada and finding homes elsewhere. My chiefest charge, Sir, against these hon. gentlemen is this—that their policy has been such that the people of Canada who ought to have found homes in their own country have been driven into the United States to find homes there. Sir, so far from thinking that the hon. gentlemen are entitled to any credit for what they have done for Manitoba, I say that, they have grossly neglected their opportunities. I say that with common prudence, common energy and common care, four or five times the number of people now in that country might have been brought there; and, what is more, they would have been our own fellow-citizens, who, as I said, have been driven to seek homes in the United States. More, Sir; once you have established a drift away of our people, it is to be remembered that that drift lasts. Every man who goes from Canada to the United States is apt to bring many others in his train. That we have seen, that we know; and every scrap of evidence laid before us—from the Census of the United States, as well as from the statistics of our own Provinces, points in the same direction; it all shows that the impolicy of the Government

has driven enormous numbers of our people from our own territory to seek homes in a foreign country. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman asks why the people of Manitoba should be dissatisfied. Well, Sir, I say this—that the people of Manitoba are dissatisfied, and justly dissatisfied, because, in the first place, the common rights of freemen have been taken from them and trampled upon. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that no such gross or unfair interference as that perpetrated by the present Government, by the exercise of their veto power, has been put in force against any Province in this Dominion, save the Province of Manitoba alone. Moreover, that was a distinct breach of promise. The Canadian Pacific Railway contract was passed through this House on the distinct pledge, made by the hon. gentleman and by his leader, that Manitoba could not and should not, and that Ontario could not and should not, be interfered with; and you have only to look at the speeches delivered during that debate to see that many gentlemen who supported and defended the monopoly then enacted, did so on the ground that it would still be in the power of the Province of Manitoba to construct its own lines of railway wherever it pleased, within its own limits. Sir, the hon. gentleman laughs at the increased duty levied on agricultural implements: and he has the supreme audacity to tell intelligent men in this House that agricultural implements are none the dearer for a duty of 35 per cent. Well, Sir, to such arguments no answer is possible, I admit. The men who believe them, or pretend to believe them, are below or beyond all argument by any intelligent being. Sir, I will take the case of southern Manitoba. Settlement began there in 1878, and no thanks to the hon. gentleman. It began the moment the line of the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway had approached that country. Thousands of the very best settlers in the world were borne in there. They made but one request from this Government—they asked leave at their own cost to build their own line of railway there, and the hon. gentleman knows that they were refused. The Government that refused that simple right to these men took upon themselves the bounden duty of causing them to be supplied, at the earliest moment, with railway facilities. What have that Government done? Five or six years have elapsed since that time, and the hon. gentleman knows that up to this moment, those people, to whom he refused that simple right, are deprived of all railway facilities whatever. He knows that the Government have not taken any steps to give them those facilities. They have promised to do this and to do that; but all they did was to foster an intrigue, by which the Canada Pacific Railway Company got possession of a rival line; and these people are left to-day, and will perhaps be left for years longer, without the slightest railway facility, in spite of all the Government had promised them. What do we find? We find that the very moment that they attempted to approach this territory over the Canadian Pacific Railway line itself, just so soon as a few hundred of families had got in, the Government, by the quintessence of stupid folly withdrew those lands from settlement; and during the eighteen months in which those families were going through those lands to Dakota, those lands were locked up by a telegram from Ottawa. For all those men who have been lost to Canada—and their number is to be estimated by thousands, if not by tens of thousands—the present Government, by its deliberate misconduct, is directly responsible. The hon. gentleman took upon himself to draw a comparison between the policy of my hon. friend from East York and his own. I say that my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), in one year, did far more good work than the hon. gentleman has done in his whole five years of office. What did the hon. gentleman do in the two years before that road came into the possession of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He laid down about a paltry hundred miles of road, so badly engineered and laid out that the first thing the Canadian Pacific Railway engineers did was to tear up the rails and throw all his work to the wind. When he talks of the condition of the city of Winnipeg and of its being deprived of roads, I tell him this, that the moment the road was constructed from Port Arthur to the Red River, had the city then been allowed to use its own resources in the construction of roads to the south-west and to the west, as was provided in the plan laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell, the city of Winnipeg would have made a solid, substantial and far greater growth, great as its growth has been, than it has made; its progress would now been more solid and substantial. If the hon. gentleman knew as much about the city of Winnipeg to-day as he says he did two or three years ago, he would know that its position is now far worse than it would have been if the people of Manitoba had been allowed to construct the road out of their own resources, after the 400 miles between Winnipeg and Lake Superior had been bridged over by the road constructed by the Government. My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) did make a connection with a road to the American frontier, and, until a very few months ago, that road was the only mode of access to Manitoba, and he knows well that no exertion that man could make was spared by my hon. friend from East York, in endeavouring to open up Manitoba. Of course, until railway communication was had with the United States, it was utterly impossible to bring in immigrants in any number; and when the hon. gentleman has recourse to that most unworthy subterfuge of asserting that I declared the lands in Manitoba were not worth 25 cents an acre, he knows that what I said was that the land there had no value until railway communication was given to that country, and that therefore I could not recommend my colleagues to take back the land Mr. Foster was to receive, at any price. I simply stated the fact that you could not put any value on the land until the railway was built; and it was for the purpose of giving value to these lands that my hon. friend from East York spent the millions he did, contrary to the advice of hon. gentlemen opposite, in the attempt to open, at the earliest possible date, communication between the Red River and Prince Arthur's Landing, and thus give value to those lands. It is no doubt true that the Canadian Pacific Railway have displayed vigour in pushing on the construction of that road, and no wonder that they should, considering the amount of subsidy they have received recently; but a very few years, perhaps few months, will show the country that no men were more thoroughly justified than the present Opposition in denouncing the monstrous imbecility which has marked the whole action of the present Government in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If any hon. gentleman wants a proof of that, he will find it, no doubt, in the Resolutions which will be presently brought down, and which were promised the followers of the Government as an inducement to support the last measure which the Government put before this House for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am not going, particularly as the hon. First Minister is not in the House, to take up the time of the House in discussing the administration of the lands in Manitoba, but will simply say that there is no instance on record in which the patrimony of the people has been so squandered, has been administered with so little regard to the interests of the people and so much for the purpose of making political capital and of rewarding political partizans, as during the last few years, by the late and present Minister of the Interior. I say that, so far from the hon. gentleman being justified in declaiming, as he has declaimed, about all that his Government have done for the benefit of Manitoba, and in censuring the people of Manitoba, or those of them who have dared to assert their rights as freemen, in remonstrating against the acts of the Government, Manitoba, on the whole, has been very patient under unjust and unmerited injury; and although I admit it is very undesirable, indeed, that the people of Manitoba should

be pushed too far, and although I should regret as much and perhaps a great deal more than the hon. gentleman and his friends, to see the prospects of this country blighted by any injury done to Manitoba or by any severance between Manitoba and ourselves, still I warn the hon. gentleman that he and his colleagues are trying the temper of that people too much. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that our position, as a confederate system, has always two serious physical obstacles to contend with. On the east, between ourselves and our brethren of the Maritime Provinces, there extends a great tract of scantily peopled country, traversed only by the single line of the Intercolonial; and, as he well knows, on the west these is a similar expanse, which it would be very difficult to people and colonize at an early date. Under these circumstances, we ought, in common prudence, if for no higher motive, to be very careful indeed how we give just cause for dissatisfaction to the people of Manitoba. I do not think that our policy, either our Tariff or our land policy, or our railway policy, has been such as to give fair play to the people of Manitoba, or is calculated to make them at all pleased or contented with the condition of affairs under the administration of the present Government. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have been pursuing, in my mind, a policy of alienation for some time. They have shown, both one and the other of them, very little regard for the interests of Manitoba. They have not hesitated to impose special taxes, specially obnoxious to an agricultural people. The Minister of Railways has not hesitated to proclaim on the floor of this House that, if the interests of Canada and Manitoba clash, Manitoba must go to the wall. That was a very foolish statement, a very unstatesman-like statement, a statement which I think he must have regretted, a statement which I think he ought to retract at the earliest possible moment. The interest of Canada is to assist Manitoba. The interests of Canada and Manitoba cannot be dissevered. The hon. gentleman should know that we have staked so much on developing the North-West that we cannot afford to allow the people of Manitoba to become discontented with our rule; and the hon. gentleman might perhaps remember this, that if there is such a general content, if there is such a feeling of well-being in Manitoba, it is a most extraordinary thing that, the moment you go into Dakota and the States adjoining, you find hundreds and thousands of Canadians, who had been in Manitoba, who liked Manitoba, who thought it a better country than Dakota, but, who, by reason of bad Government and bad regulations, were obliged, contrary to their own inclinations, to forsake their own flag and seek an asylum elsewhere. Perhaps is was as well in one respect that they did so, because, knowing what I do of the temper of my follow-countrymen, it might have been dangerous for the hon. gentleman and his Government if these men had staid there. Knowing the conduct of those hon. gentlemen, one is almost driven to suspect that they are afraid that the North-West will grow too fast; that they are afraid that the people of the North-West will rise up and become something like another Ontario too soon to suit their purpose, and that they are conspiring together to check its growth. They could not do it better than by the policy they have been recently adopting, and, if that is their object, then the hon. gentleman is justified in congratulating himself on having achieved a brilliant success. But, if that is not his object, if he does desire, as I would fain hope he does, to develop Manitoba and the North-West and fill it with a prosperous population, then never were any men so infatuated in endeavouring to carry out such an end as the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Mr. WATSON. As seconder of this amendment, I shall occupy the attention of the House for a very short time. We have heard some very good speeches on this question, and I think the members of the House have been enlightened on a good many points of interest. I was a little surprised to hear some statements from the Minister of Railways. We, in Manitoba, appreciate the railway, but we should appreciate it a great deal better without monopoly. As I do not intend to occupy the attention of this House long, I will come to a few points I have marked down here. The hon. gentleman has lauded the Premier of the Province of Manitoba as being a great statesman, able to cope with all the elements that have taken place there, and he referred to the farmers, the people who were formulating those grievances to the Government, as a class of disappointed speculators. Now, I might call his attention to the fact that this hon. Premier he speaks of is probably one of the disappointed speculators. Speaking as Premier of the Province, in his manifesto to the Government, he stated:

"These facts ere now have been laid before the Government at Ottawa, but either through inappreciation of them, or a disbelief in their existence, only such relief has been given as would tide over the difficulty for the time being, and no adequate provision made for the exigencies of Government that have arisen under the state of affairs just cited. The provision allowed by our requirements being now so inadequate, the contemplation of our position when a great influx of population multiply the expense of Government, is a far from pleasant prospect, but a fact that must be faced. Indeed, a large addition to the population of the Province would be nothing short of an evil in disguise; rapid settlement of the territory would prove anything but a blessing; to meet increasing requirements under present circumstances would be an impossibility, our revenue being out of all proportion to our necessary expenditure."

Now, I hope, as the hon. the Minister of Railways has spoken of the deputation appointed by the Local Legislature to investigate these matters, that the grievances complained of by the Local Legislature will be attended to. I might state, also, that I was a little surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state, as he has stated before in this House, about the town of Portage la Prairie, that I live in, what would it be without a railway. We in the Portage never felt we had the Minister of Railways to thank for the Railway running there.

Mr. BOWELL. Whom did you thank?

Mr. WATSON. A deputation of that town was appointed to wait on the Minister when he visited Winnipeg, for the purpose of having him state that the railway would run through Portage la Prairie. He stated to the deputation—and one of them was the hon. gentleman who represented Marquette at that time—that it was impossible for the railway to run in there, but that it would go six or seven miles north of that. But he changed his mind after, at the dictation of two of the gentlemen who formed the Syndicate and wanted to get the contract. It was at some point outside of Winnipeg on the Canadian Pacific Railway. He was dictated to by these gentlemen, for the purpose, probably, of getting the support of the member for Marquette to that contract, that the road had to run into Portage la Prairie. He obeyed them at that time, has obeyed them since, and will obey them again. I shall not detain the House longer. I endorse heartly this Resolution, and endorse the statements that have been made by the hon. mover.

Mr. MILLS. I just wish to make an observation before the question is put, and shall not detain the House for five minutes. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Railways say that this motion was moved at a time when it must be considered a motion of want of confidence in the Government. I deny that this is a motion of want of confidence in the Administration. The hon. gentleman must know the constitutional practice;—in England it is a well recognized rule, that the redress of grievances must precede Supply, and it is never considered a vote of want of confidence to ask for the redress of a national grievance upon going into Committee of Supply. In fact, the whole theory of parliamentary government, the growth of the power of the House of Commons, originated in the principle that supplies are withheld until the grievances of the nation are redressed,

The hon. gentlemen themselves have recognized this principle here. Let me take the case of M. Letellier. The hon. gentleman who leads the House at this time, the Prime Minister, moved, upon going into Supply, a motion condemning the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec. When hon. gentlemen came into power, there was a question of the disputed boundary of Ontario that was about to be raised in the House. It was a matter of arrangement between the two sides of the House that this motion should be moved from this side of the House upon going into Committee of Supply; but a friend of the hon. gentleman anticipated the action of this side of the House, and moved a resolution in reference to the boundaries of Ontario, on going into Committee of Supply. Did the Government vote against it; did they say "this is a motion moved at a time when we have no opportunity of accepting it or of expressing a proper opinion of it?" Not at all. They voted for the motion, which was moved upon going into Committee of Supply; and there is nothing improper in the course taken by my hon. friend. We know that practically there was no other opportunity, no other way of bringing this matter, under the circumstances, before the House, except by doing what the mover of this motion has done. It is a grievance of a large section of the people of this country, a serious grievance, and the proper and constitutional period for bringing that grievance before Parliament is when the Government of the day are asking for a subsidy—when they are asking for Supply. I did not think it was right to allow this question to be put until I had called the attention of the House to the statement that the hon. Minister had made, in replying to my hon. friend who made this motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but it is a parliamentary rule that no motion in amendment can be made to the amendment made on the motion to go into Committee of Supply. The object of that rule is to secure a vote upon the specific grievance that is brought up; otherwise it would be easy for a parliamentarian to avoid an expression of opinion on any subject whatever. This is the only occasion upon which an amendment can be moved which would secure an expression of opinion upon a distinct question. But the hon. gentleman opposite who leads the House to-night, is too intolerant of any expression of opinion at all, and he seeks by sheer abuse to put down every person who ventures in the least degree to differ from him. I rose simply, not only to say that much before going into Committee of Supply, but also to ask the Minister to bring down—and he will do it, I presume, without any notice—a copy of his advertisement calling for tenders, in the fall of 1878, for the section from English River to Keewatin, 185 miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I said was that the hon. gentleman had asked for tenders, but had subsequently stated that it was for the purpose of accurately informing himself as to what the expense would be, and that he did not decide to let either the portion that he had advertised for in British Columbia or that between lake Superior and the Red River, until he had learned from the result of the tenders what the expense would be. I said that the hon. gentleman had stated that tenders were all in waiting to be alloted when the change of Government took place. I have refreshed my memory by looking at the *Debates*, and I find I was strictly accurate in the statement I made. Specifications were prepared after I became Minister of Railways, on which these tenders were received, and not on the specifications of the hon. gentleman. I will bring down the advertisements ordered by myself, based on those the hon. gentleman had given for the work. I will also remind the hon. gentleman that he not only stated that he had not made up his mind, before a change of Government, to let that work at all, but I will show the hon. gentleman that what he said was that he had advertised for tenders for the whole work, with a view to ascertain upon what terms he could let the entire line, from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean, and that not a single tender was sent in.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; there was one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was an informal one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was formal, but not admissable. But, I asked the hon. gentleman specifically, did he say that these contracts were based upon tenders that he asked for, and he told me they were. Well, I was astounded at his statements, and I went out to get authorities. The hon. gentleman may not have meant to say it, but he did say it. The hon. gentleman proceeded to say, in the most extraordinary manner, that nothing had been done during my five years of office, and I was proceeding to show, by the question I put, that every part of that road that he alluded to was put under contract upon tenders that I had invited. I invited tenders for the entire work across the continent, based upon the well-known intention not to work the line ourselves, but to include in the contract so given the amount of work we had done as cash; and also anticipating the possibility of not getting a tender for the entire line, I asked tenders for the part of the work in British Columbia, the initial parts of the work, and that 181 miles between Keewatin and English River. I intended to proceed in the same way with the construction of the initial part. I always intended that, and I could not have said I had no intention of proceeding with that. Now, the hon. gentleman ventured to say that when he came into office not one mile of the road was constructed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I said in operation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then they were in operation. The road was built and completed, and all the payments made from the boundary to Selkirk.

An hon. MEMBER. It was not ballasted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was a large portion of it ballasted, and also trains were running and arrangements made for working the road, and I was accused by a colleague of the hon. gentleman of doing something very wrong in building that road at all—I was denounced by Mr. Macpherson for building the line at all. Now, Sir, besides that we had under contract from Selkirk eastward to Keewatin, 108 or 110 miles, and westward from Port William, 118 miles of it remained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. One hundred and twelve.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, I am very near it, at any rate. That distance is mostly completed, as the papers will show. Now the hon. gentleman said that my five years of office was a blank, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway was concerned. But I say that more work was done every year than during the two years of incumbency of the hon. gentleman, when he ventured to lay down an air line and ultimately settled down a colonization road; after spending two years groping in the dark, he made up his mind to build a road that could not be called a trans-continental railway, but merely a colonization road. To use his own words, the hon. gentleman did nothing for two years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to remind him that he himself said that he had not decided to build any road on the prairie of any kind, not even a colonization road.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I had not decided in what way it should be built; but we decided it should be built on the prairie, and we brought down a Bill, as a mere speculative matter, for discussion. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman seems to think it was a crime in me not to build the road towards Winnipeg. I accepted the reports of the engineers, and adopted the line through Lake Manitoba, as being the shortest and best route to the Pacific, as being the route

that traversed the best country, and as being the route, in every respect, the most suitable for a trans-continental railway. Upon that line there was no grade in excess of 50 feet to the mile, and very little of that, and there was less curvature than in any other line that had been surveyed, and all the advantages were wholly in its favour. I also gave up the Bute Inlet route, and determined to go by the Fraser. The hon. gentleman, in the very start of his Administration, had that order repealed, and he was obliged to go back, afterwards, to the course I had originally adopted. The hon. gentleman, Sir, is not only ungenerous, but most unjust in his attempt to belittle the efforts that were made by his predecessors. The Government of the hon. gentleman opposite had contracted with British Columbia to have the surveys completed, and the work of construction commenced in two years, and this bargain had been in existence two years and a-half when we accepted office, and not a single mile was surveyed or located across the entire continent, after two years and a-half of labour. The entire work was begun afresh by us, and when we left office we had the country opened up. Settlers were going into the country, the prairies were occupied, and everything was put in order for the resumption of work. The hon. gentleman will find that I simply determined to consult Parliament about the various plans. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I am unable, on account of a defect in my voice, to give that attention to the hon. gentleman that I would like to give, and to his scandalous misstatements respecting my own Administration. I can only hope that some day we will meet at Philippi, where I shall endeavour to give him what he deserves.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that no person in this House regrets more than I do, the condition of his health, which does not allow him to deal with questions with all his pristine vigour. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that no person would be more gratified than myself to find the hon. gentleman able in the future, as in the past, to deal with the most formidable antagonist able to confront him; but he must permit me to say that his memory has failed him on this occasion, as well as on the other.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It did not fail me on the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman stated that those tenders were in the office when the change of Government took place, and were ready to be awarded. I said that was not the case; and that the hon. gentleman had himself stated subsequently that he had asked for the tenders without having made up his mind when to proceed with the construction of the work. The hon. gentleman will permit me to remind him that he asked for tenders for 125 miles of the section in British Columbia, from Kamloops to Yale.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I stated that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to call his attention to what took place, that he asked also for tenders covering the entire line from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean, including the work that was done. As I said, not only were the tenders not in, but although advertisements had been inserted that the contracts would be let, the letting was twice postponed, no offers being sent in—and such were not sent in until after the change of Government had taken place, because the surveys were not sufficiently advanced to enable specifications to be prepared. As the hon. gentleman is aware, no tenders can be sent in unless specifications are prepared, and these were prepared in the Department under my own direction. The hon. gentleman is, therefore, mistaken on that point. The hon. gentleman is also mistaken in supposing that he had constructed and put in operation the line from Winnipeg to the boundary. This work was completed by the Department under my instructions, after a change of Government had taken place, and it was not until the change of Government that any of the line was in operation. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not better able to deal with the question in controversy. I did not intend to be unjust and ungenerous, but the hon gentleman must not forget that I was not the assailant; that I was defending this Government against a gross and unjustifiable attack from the other side of the House, as to the manner in which this Government had fulfilled its duty to Manitoba and the North-West; and in dealing with that matter I did, although reluctantly, contrast the action of the present and past Administrations.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman was most unfortunate in his choice and style of language. One would have thought that, instead of this motion being one respecting grievances in the North-West, some motion had been proposed in regard to the management of the railway system. If the latter had been the case, the hon. gentleman's remarks would have been in place. Nothing, however, would justify the gross extravagance of the hon. gentleman's language in depreciating what his predecessors had done, and glorifying himself for his past actions, when he well knew that he had accomplished nothing—that his Government spent two years without doing anything.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman who calls out "hear, hear," tell me what they did during those two years?

Mr. HESSON. We had to get a new plan altogether.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That hon. gentleman had better get a new plan too. No one in the House needs it more. I could not even, disabled as I am for the moment——

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. member is performing his usual office of *claqueur* to the Ministry, and I must submit to be interrupted, as other members are.

Mr. HESSON. He interrupted the Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No doubt the Minister and myself can settle our difficulties. I will say this of the Minister of Railways, that he never objected to any interruption of that sort in debate; I would be the last man to object to it, for I rather like interruption, and no man with a good cause will ever object to interruption. I wish to point out the gross extravagance of the claim made by the Minister, when the fact was that during the eight years from the time the road was commenced until we left office, all that was accomplished was accomplished by us, and nothing by hon. gentlemen opposite, though two and a-half years in the first place and nearly two years in the second were spent, and the only thing done was to lay down an ill-constructed road which had to be taken up.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Huron) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	Mills,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Forbes,	Platt,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne)
Blake,	Holton,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Trow,
Catudal,	Mackenzie,	Vail,
Charlton,	McCraney,	Watson,
Cockburn,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Davies,	McIsaac,	Wheler,
De St. Georges,	McMullen,	Wilson.—57.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dodd,	McCallum,
Amyot,	Dundas,	McDougald,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McGreevy,
Baker (Victoria),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McNeill,
Bell,	Ferguson (Welland),	Masson,
Belleau,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gagné,	O'Brien,
Benson,	Gault,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Ouimet,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Paint,
Billy,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Bolduc,	Guilbault,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hackett,	Ross,
Brecken,	Hall,	Scott,
Bryson,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hesson,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Smyth,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Stairs,
Carling,	Houde,	Tassé,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	Langevin,	White (Hastings),
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	Macdonald (Kings),	Wigle,
Daoust,	McDonald (CapeBreton),	Williams,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desjardins,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Woodworth.—116.
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

MILITIA.

60. Contingencies and general service, not otherwise provided for, including grants to Artillery and Rifle Associations, and bands of efficient corps. $38,000 00

Mr. CARON. This is the usual vote for Government grant to Provincial Rifle Associations and other matters.

Mr. LISTER. I notice that the vote includes a grant to bands. I would like to know how much money is paid, and how the grant is given.

Mr. CARON. It is about $70 to each band, and we estimate for 100 bands.

Mr. LISTER. Does the Minister intend making any arrangement by which bandmasters shall form part of the service and have the right to rank?

Mr. CARON. It is very difficult indeed to make any such arrangement. In many instances the one man is in control of several bands in different corps, and to make the arrangement which is suggested, the expenditure would have to be much larger than at present.

Mr. LISTER. Of course the hon. gentleman knows that the difficulty in London was partly owing to the fact that a bandsman was there without uniform, and of course he had a right to be there. I think there is a general feeling in the service that the bandmaster should have rank in the service and that their pay should be increased.

Mr. CARON. We could not do it on this vote.

Mr. LISTER. No; of course not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This vote includes grants to the Battalion Rifle Associations. On what principle are they distributed?

Mr. CARON. There are eighty associations, and we estimate at the rate of $75 each. The grants are paid on the report of the Brigade-Major, or the Deputy Adjutant-General, where there is one in the district, as to the efficiency of the Rifle Association.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And it is handed over to the president and devoted to the purchase of ammunition.

Mr. CARON. To the purchase of ammunition. It is distributed by the president in the shape of prizes to the competitors and in keeping up the organization.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I suggested before, I think it would be a great boon to these associations if they could get their rifle ammunition at a moderate price. The tax on these young men to enable them to practice and make themselves good shots, is a considerable sum, to say nothing of the time, and I think it would be money well spent if the hon. gentleman could make a reduction in the price of the ammunition issued, of course, under proper restrictions, to these associations, as I think it is very desirable to encourage them.

Mr. CARON. These small amounts are really what keep up the associations, but I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that this is a matter affecting the whole Militia force of Canada, and that the Department cannot do too much in helping these associations in every possible way. As I stated the other night, we are trying to reduce the price of the ammunition to the lowest possible point, and I hope when our factory is complete that it will be possible for us to reduce it far below the present figure, merely of course, for these associations for rifle practice.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think it would be well if the Department would issue an order defining the status of the bandmasters. In the Imperial service the regulations have been altered and the bandmaster is now an enlisted man in some shape. I think there is too much laxity in the conduct of our bands, and that no grant should be given unless the bandmasters are enlisted men. It often happens that the money goes to keep up the bands for drill and then we hear nothing more of them. With regard to the grants to Rifle Associations I think a great deal of the money now goes to officers who should be above taking part in the competition, or at least above taking the money. I know it is a constant thing for non-commissioned officers, such as sergeants, paymaster and quarter-masters, to enter into competition with the men. The fairest competition I had was in the annual camp, where every man was allowed to compete, but no officer. There was no expense, and the whole proceeds went into the funds of the band. I would, therefore, urge upon the Minister that where there is a grant given to bands, it should only be given to bands in regiments, and that non-commissioned officers should not be allowed to compete for prizes for which that grant is given.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the Minister of Militia to intimate that he desired to supply the ammunition made at the factory at cost price to the service. Might I ask the hon. Minister where the small-arm ammunition is at present obtained?

Mr. CARON. At our cartridge factory in Quebec.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there any reports from the factory?

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman refers to my Annual Report, he will find there a very exhaustive report about the cartridge factory. At first, some of our riflemen considered that the cartridges manufactured in Canada were not up to the standard of the English manufactured cartridges. Of course, I need not tell the hon. gentleman that it was my anxious desire, as we had established this cartridge factory in Quebec, to make it as perfect as possible. Not being in a position myself to express any opinion upon it, as a practical marksman would, or one who made a special study of the subject, I appointed a Commission, composed of officers

who are known marksmen, and who have taken the greatest possible interest in the Dominion Rifle Association, and other rifle associations. These gentlemen spent three or four days in Quebec, inspecting the cartridge factory, examining the different component parts of the cartridges, seeing how they were put together, testing the powder, and trying the cartridges by having some of the men belonging to "A" Battery for one or two days to fire them off, for the purpose of testing them thoroughly. The report of that Board is as follows:—

"The Board are of unanimous opinion—

"1st. That the process of manufacture of the Dominion cartridges is perfectly satisfactory, the greatest care being taken in overlooking and testing the component parts of each cartridge, by which the slightest defect or blemish must be discovered; that the powder used is the R.F.G., Waltham Abbey, such as is used at Woolwich in the manufacture of Snider ball cartridges.

"2nd. That the tests from the Whitworth fixed rests, of the Dominion ammunition, were quite satisfactory, the result, as shown on the annexed diagrams, being that the variation was much within the limit of the Woolwich test.

"3rd. The Dominion ammunition gave a better result than the English No. 9 of the years 1877 and 1882, from a fixed rest at 500 yards —as shown on the accompanying diagrams.

"4th. The result of the individual shooting on the Lévis range, at 200 500 and 600 yards, by a squad of sixteen men fro n "A" Battery C.A., and the 8th Royal Rifles, satisfied the Board of the uniform strength and quality of the Dominion Ammunition. Therefore, the Board have no hesitation in recommending the Dominion ammunition for issue and general use in Canada.

"The Board, in conclusion, have much pleasure in testifying to the superior qualifications of the Superintendent of the Dominion Cartridge Factory, Major Prévost, who afforded them every facility in furthering their investigation.

"Signed at Quebec, this 11th day of October, 1883.

"T. J. DUCHESNAY, Lt.-Col.,
"*D.A.G., M.D. No. 7, President Board of Survey*

"Edwin B. Beer, Lieut.-Col., Commanding 74th Battalion.
"E. G. Scott, Lieut.-Col. Commanding 8th R.R.
"Charles J. Short, Major "B" Battery, R.S.C.
"H. F. Perley, Capt. H.Q. Staff.
"G. H. Balfour, Capt. 8th R.R.
"E. A. Macnachtan, Lieut., C.G.A."

Mr. MULOCK. Might I ask the hon. Minister if that report was submitted to the Major-General commanding.

Mr. CARON. It came to me through the usual channel. It was sent by the Deputy Adjutant-General to the Adjutant-General, and referred by him to the Major-General, and sent to me.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the report here—the one that was submitted to him?

Mr. CARON. There is no other way of submitting it.

Mr. MULOCK. Does he concur in the report of the board?

Mr. CARON. I think so.

Mr. MULOCK. It is said not. Perhaps the hon. Minister can submit his remarks on the report at a later day.

Mr. CARON. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the report of the board was submitted to the Major-General commanding the forces, and that he made certain remarks upon it which did not sustain it; that in fact there was a conflict of opinion, and that the Major-General pointed out some defect in the system pursued in the cartridge factory in Quebec. However, that may not be correct. The remarks on the report will be in the Department, and the discussion may be deferred until they are produced.

Mr. CARON. There is no report from the Major-General which does not appear in my report.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not say that. What I say is, that the report from which you have quoted was, I understand, submitted to the Major-General commanding, and he made certain remarks thereon, not in the form of a report, but simply comments.

Mr. CARON. It is quite possible. In any case, I will bring down the remarks.

61. Government Grant to the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association $8,000 00

Mr. CARON. It is intended this year to supplement this vote by an amount of $2,000, to be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the Wimbledon Team. It is found the amount of $8,000 was insufficient to keep up the association. This Rifle Association is really the foundation of our system of rifle associations all over the Dominion; marksmen come from the various Provinces here for the purpose of competing. We were never in debt, but last year and the year before, through the efforts made by His Excellency the Marquis of Lorne, certain contributions were received from bankers and other sources which helped to make up the list of prizes. This year it is found that this source of revenue was not only not large but in some instances had failed, and it is very important that we should not make any change in the programme as carried out for the last few years. Without the supplementary vote, it would be necessary to give up Wimbledon or reduce so considerably the list of prizes as to destroy the association. On this account, I ask this supplementary vote of $2,000. I intend dropping the vote of $2,000 for Government aid towards sending a team of Canadian Militia artillerymen to Shoeburyness, England, or for artillery competition in Canada, as it is not intended this year to send a team to Shoeburyness.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is alleged that the team sent under the present regulations does not, by any means, represent, owing to the mode of its selection, the very best marksmen in Canada. Of course, there is something to be said on both sides; but I think it is desirable that if we incur the expense of sending a team across, our very best marksmen should go, particularly, as I understand, the men with whom they have to compete are not subject to the same restrictions as those to which I believe our men are subject. This puts our Canadian marksmen at a great disadvantage, considering we have to choose from 4,000,000, whereas in England the choice can be made from about 40,000,000.

Mr. CARON. There are many opinions on this subject. Some very high authorities hold exactly what the hon. gentleman has stated, that from the fact that some of our crack shots are sent repeatedly to England, the association has not taken the best mode of choosing competitors. No doubt, the men sent are the very best marksmen we have, but the opinion is expressed that those marksmen who have, on more than one occasion, represented Canada at Wimbledon, should not be allowed to go back on the team, but that they should be replaced by others. The great difficulty is what the hon. gentleman has pointed out, that we have only a population of 4,500,000 out of which to select competitors, who must compete with the picked men of 40,000,000. The hon. gentleman will see the difficulty with us is to secure a number of men to devote that time to rifle practice, so as to enable us to make a good selection. I think, on the whole, Canada has reason to be proud of the efforts of our marksmen in England, and this practice has had the effect of promoting a feeling favourable to rifle practice in Canada. It is productive of what I believe to be the best possible results, and I am of opinion that this $8,000, supplemented by $2,000, is really money invested in the best possible way, so far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. VAIL. I have always strongly advocated the granting of a sufficient sum to enable the association to send a team home, but I must say I am sorry to see this increase; $8,000 is as much as the Department should grant, consider-

ing the small amount granted for drilling the Militia. If we make this vote now $10,000, we will have to do the same the next and following years.

Mr. CARON. Under the late Administration, the late Government granted to the Dominion Rifle Association, on more than one occasion, $10,000; the figure of $8,000 has stood for a number of years, so that there is no danger at all of our having to increase it any more than I have just stated.

Mr. VAIL. If you increase that $2,000, it will stand for the future.

Mr. CARON. No; it will not.

Mr. VAIL. In my time, they were quite satisfied to receive their $8,000.

Mr. CARON. At that time, I was sitting on the other side of the House, and I know that several deputations called upon the then Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie, for the purpose of getting this increased, and complained most bitterly that the association was unable, from want of funds, to carry out its objects. For one year it was dropped, and the year after it was taken up again.

Mr. LISTER. The team is composed of Canadian militiamen of the active force?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the Minister whether our men are armed with the most modern rifle?

Mr. CARON. The arm which is distributed to the Militia force of Canada is the Snider. In the case of the Dominion Rifle Association, in the practice previous to the time of going to Wimbledon, the practice is carried on with the Martini-Henry. The hon. gentleman stated the other night that the arms which were in the hands of the Canadian Militia were perfectly useless. I beg to differ completely with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LISTER. Not perfectly useless.

Mr. CARON. The Snider is not the latest pattern or the most improved rifle, and the Martini-Henry is the last model which has been adopted by the British Service, but my hon. friend knows, if he has taken any interest in the matter and looked into it, that experiments are going on every day in England now, and the Martini Henry is not looked upon, among the highest authorities, as the rifle which will remain the rifle of the English service. The difficulty with us is that we have a large number of the Snider rifles. I hope that gradually—but I do not believe the time has come for that—when military authorities have determined what will be the best rifle to place in the hands of the service—we may dispose of the Snider rifles—at a loss no doubt, but not a very large loss—and replace them by an improved arm; but I do not believe that at present it would be judicious, in the face of the experiments which are being carried on in England, to change the Canadian Snider rifle completely, until we know exactly what will be adopted as the arm of the British service.

Mr. LISTER. The Snider rifle is used by the whole force now?

Mr. CARON. Yes. We have a certain supply of the Martini-Henry. The Dominion Rifle Association and most of the local associations use the Martini-Henry.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am one of those who have always advocated that the pay of the rank and file should be better than it is, and I look upon this vote for the Wimbledon Team as so much money thrown away; that it should be devoted to the benefit of the men who form the rank and file of the force, and I would like to move, though, I suppose it would be useless in this Committee, that that item be struck out, as not being of any use to the force. I would call the attention of the Minister, before I sit down, to the great waste of ammunition which takes place annually, at the camps of instruction. My own experience has been, that four-fifths of the ammunition fired away at Niagara, went into the lake instead of the target. Men who never had a rifle in their hands before were there, and their whole aim and object appeared to be, to get rid of as much ammunition in as short a space of time as possible. I hope the Minister will consider this matter, as I believe he has the interests of the force at heart, though I would like to see it manifested in a little more favourable way towards the men.

Mr. CARON. Carried.

Mr. THOMPSON. What will you do?

Mr. CARON. I will.

62. Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges..... $16,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What disposition does the hon. gentleman propose to make of that $10,000?

Mr. CARON. This vote is for the pay of caretakers, $2,000; rents of rifle ranges, $2,000; for general repairs, fuel, light and maintenance of drill sheds and rifle ranges, $6,000; making $10,000 altogether.

Mr. LISTER. How much was spent last year?

Mr. CARON. The whole of that vote was spent. It is just as small as it is possible to make it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is not strictly correct, as I see that last year he spent $7,968. However, the margin is not so very great.

Mr. CARON. The difference is upon the repairs. We estimate for general repairs of drill sheds and rifle ranges about $5,000. It is a very small margin. Some years the repairs may be a little below, and other years they are more considerable and require the whole amount. I was under the impression that the whole vote had been expended, but I see that there was a small amount over.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does the hon. Minister know what is the state of the armouries and the state of the drill sheds? Has he had any reports as to their condition and repair?

Mr. CARON. I have, and I must say they are not in as good a condition as I would like to see them, but it is from the fact, as my hon. friend knows well, that a good many of these drill sheds were built much larger than they should have been, and in a manner quite unfitted for the purpose for which they were intended, and I am sorry to say, in a good many cases, they are not in as good a condition as I would like to see them. But I may say that, ever since I have been in the Department, I have been endeavouring to gradually put them in such a state of repair that I believe in a few years we will have them—some are too large and must be pulled down, and others have been repaired—without increasing too considerably the vote appropriated by Parliament, in better order than at present. Of course, as my hon. friend knows, we get reports from the Brigade-Majors upon these various points, and I believe, that as a rule, as far as I am able to ascertain, without looking into every individual report, the armouries are in a pretty good state.

63. Maintenance and care of military properties transferred from the Ordnance and Imperial Government..... $12,000 00

Mr. VAIL. There is an addition of $2,000 here.

Mr. CARON. The vote, apart from the addition, is made up thus: $3,300, pay of caretakers; $1,800, rents of military properties; $400, removal of snow at Montreal and Quebec; care and maintenance of properties, including general services in connection therewith, $4,500. The additional $2,000 is required for pay of a military engineer, to

be placed in charge of fortifications and military buildings of the Dominion of Canada. Last year some very valuable military property was transferred to us by the Imperial Government, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This property, with the other property we had already received, sums up to some $14,000,000, taking the whole value, as estimated in our Department, of the military properties transferred to Canada by the Imperial Government.

Mr. WELDON. What property was transferred last year?

Mr. CARON. All the balance of the military property, except that now used in Halifax for the Imperial troops, has been transferred over to Canada.

Mr. VAIL. There has been no property transferred in Nova Scotia that would require a caretaker.

Mr. CARON. I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman stated that the value of the total properties transferred was $14,000,000. They may possibly have cost the British Government that amount, but I do not suppose he means that they are of that value to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CARON. They might not bring that amount, but that is the estimated value. It includes the Citadel in Quebec. During last summer, certain Imperial lands, held for military purposes in the Province of Nova Scotia, were transferred to the Dominion Government, and are now classified with the other Militia properties. Most of those lands are under lease to parties in the several localities. In Nova Scotia, £25,000 sterling is the estimated value of that property; and in New Brunswick, the estimated value is $240,000. These values are given approximately, as near as can be ascertained at present.

Mr. VAIL. I am well aware that a certain quantity of land belonging to the Imperial Government was transferred to the Militia Department last year, but there is no land in Nova Scotia that requires an expenditure of any portion of this $2,000 for a caretaker. The only land transferred in Nova Scotia is under lease to parties who are in occupation, and therefore it does not require looking after by an agent of the Government.

Mr. CARON. My hon. friend will consider that in taking the value of this property the Department had to exercise its own discretion, and considered that it was necessary to have a person who would look after the maintenance of the various properties—a military engineer to look after the various properties which had been transferred to us.

Mr. WELDON. Are not these lands so transferred occupied by other parties now?

Mr. CARON. Some are. I am ready to give the hon. gentleman all the information I have, but I think that the most satisfactory information I could convey to him is contained in the list of properties which I considered too long to bring down here, and which I would be happy to hand over to the hon. gentleman on Concurrence, or before.

Mr. WELDON. Who do you propose to put in charge? Will he come from the Military College?

Mr. CARON. He will have to be possessed of military knowledge, and will be under the immediate control or supervision of Col. Hewitt. The draughtsman and the third-class clerk who are to be employed in the Department, will be selected from military cadets. As to this officer, no decision has been arrived at yet. He will be merely put upon the military staff, and it may be that he will not be made a permanent officer.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand this $2,000 is entirely in consequence of the additional property taken over?

Mr. CARON. It is partially in consequence of the property taken over, which requires an additional officer in the Department to look after it, and partially from the changes which have taken place under the Bill transferring the military works and fortifications to the Department of Militia and Defence.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this officer to be a military man or a civilian? And what are his duties going to be?

Mr. CARON. I shall select the most suitable officer possible. We require a person possessing a military knowledge of a particular character. The salary will be $2,000. We have no one in view, and I will be very glad to take the hon. gentleman's recommendation, if he knows of any officer possessing the requisite abilities.

Mr. MULOCK. What I do not understand is, how a salary can be fixed when the hon. Minister has not prescribed his duties.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the plan which, of course, is not yet fully matured, is an excellent one. We require an engineering officer, who, in addition to looking after the military fortifications and other works, will take charge of the engineering corps. He might also, in addition, fill the office of Quartermaster-General, and in his leisure time prepare a plan for the general defence of the country. In this way services of the cadets of the college might be made available.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It seems to me that this item should have come under the head of Civil Government.

Mr. CARON. I will explain how that occurred. It is not intended to make this officer a permanent appointment and place him on the civil list. We have borrowed from England officers who have remained with us a number of years. It is intended to secure a military engineer who will come over and fill the position in question at a salary of $2,000. We have now in England several cadets in the Royal Engineers, who, within a very few years, will be quite available for positions of this kind. It is only right that we should endeavour to make use of our own cadets, who have been greatly distinguishing themselves in various branches of the Imperial Service.

Mr. MULOCK. The increase is for a specific purpose. Unless the appointment is made, the sum will not be required; and the appoinment may not be permanent. The proper course to pursue is to specify that the $2,000 is for the salary of an officer to perform certain duties.

Mr. CARON. This amount is to pay a military engineer, as I have already explained. We could not make the appointment until Parliament had voted the money,

Mr. MILLS. This amount is included in a vote for a wholly different purpose. The specific purpose for which the money is to be used should be stated, so that it could not be used for other purposes.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister asks the Committee in this item to vote $12,000 for the maintenance and care of military properties, &c. Why should not this amount of $2,000 for salary be so stated in the Estimates? At present it may be obtained for one purpose and possibly used for another.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not customary to mix up salaries and other items of expenditure. And as a matter of business, I think it would be well if the Minister should state the salary of the officer specifically in a separate vote.

Mr. CARON. I have no objection to do so, by adding the words "including the salary of a military engineer."

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to ask whether the military properties in Toronto have been transferred to the Dominion?

Mr. CARON. Yes; long ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. At what value?

Mr. CARON. The estimated value of those at Kingston, Niagara, and Toronto, is $875,000.

63½. Construction and repairs of military properties $47,410 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This, I suppose, is in pursuance of that Act passed the other day. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what he proposes to do with it, and especially the largest item of $35,700.

Mr. CARON. There are repairs at Kingston fortifications, $1,310; Quebec, $8,900; Champ de Mars, Montreal, $1,500; military works and buildings, repairs and improvements, $35,700. This last amount has been voted regularly for years to the Department of Public Works, for the purpose of keeping up barracks and fortifications and other military properties which we have to look after. I will give the items: No. 1, London, $712; No. 2, Toronto, $5,264.67; Kingston, $10,568.61; Ottawa, $1,642; Montreal, $2,338.36; Quebec, $6,337; St. John's, $793.11; Halifax, $7,403.17; Winnipeg, $835; Victoria, B.C., $2,135; Charlottetown, $671; Quebec fortifications and repairs, $8,999; Montreal, $1,500; Kingston fortifications, $1,310, making altogether $47,410.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know how many barracks we have, and how many the hon. Minister proposes to keep in order. I think a very large amount of the property he spoke of just now consists of large barracks. Does our agreement with the British Government require us to keep these barracks in order? If so, it must be a pretty heavy expense. It seems to me that we might arrange with the British Government that we should keep the barracks up at three or four different points.

Mr. CARON. This sum is quite sufficient to keep up all the barracks that have been transferred to us. We have the barracks in question, which, the hon. gentleman knows, are now the headquarters of "A" Battery and the School of Cavalry; the barracks on St. Helen's Island, at Montreal, where we keep our stores; the barracks at St. John's, Quebec, which are now the headquarters of a School of Infantry; the barracks at Fredericton, which are required for "A" School of Infantry; the Toronto barracks, which are used for "C" School of Infantry; and the military works at Kingston, which the hon. gentleman knows of. These are the principal works which require to be permanently looked after. The greatest portion of the works at Point Lévis have been transferred to the Department of Agriculture, and are now used for a quarantine; and the expenditure required for keeping them up is included in the estimates of my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are you going to do with the other barracks?

Mr. CARON. Some have been rented, and a good many have been sold. When any of this property is considered unnecessary for military purposes, it is transferred to the Department of the Interior, and it is then disposed of by that Department by sale or lease.

Mr. WELDON. Are the Fredericton barracks included in this vote?

Mr. CARON. No. When the infantry schools were established, we had to provide for them, and the Minister of Public Works provided for the Fredericton barracks in his estimates. In the Supplementary Estimates will appear the sum required after the first of July, to complete the Fredericton barracks and the other barracks which have been utilized for the new schools of infantry.

Mr. BEATY. I wish to ask the hon. Minister whether, in speaking of the way in which this money was to be expended, he included the cost of a new armoury or drill shed for Toronto, or whether any policy has been adopted for the sale of the old drill shed property, for the purpose of building a new one, better adapted for the drilling of the large regiments there, which the present drill shed is utterly unsuited for.

Mr. CARON. This subject has already attracted my attention. It is a very large question, and cannot be decided without reference to gentlemen who live in Toronto, and who can express an opinion as to the value of this military property. A suggestion was made to me by my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Small), which I think is a very valuable one. It was that a Commission should be appointed in Toronto, composed of the commanding officers of the various battalions, and possibly the Commandant of the School of Infantry and some other gentlemen, for the purpose of ascertaining the value of the military property which we have been utilizing for drill shed purposes; and if we can dispose of it at anything like a reasonable price, we may purchase a lot for a drill shed in a more convenient place. But my information is not sufficient at present to enable me to arrive at a definite conclusion.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire to ask what proportion of the buildings represented by this vote has been removed from the control of the Public Works Department. From a hasty estimate I have made, I see that the Public Works Department, in 1882-83, expended $73,000 on the repair of military buildings. Now, if it is proposed that all these should be taken in hand by the Department of Militia and Defence, I think we shall all be inclined to support this vote, because it is so much less. But if this vote is an addition to the $73,000, there is a very decided objection to it.

Mr. CARON. The $47,000 I am now asking was estimated last year for the same purpose for which I am now asking it. The balance was appropriated for buildings. There are some other buildings remaining under the control of the Minister of Public Works, but the $47,000 now asked for was estimated last year exactly as it is to-day, and is merely transferred from the Department of Public Works to my Department.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is rumoured that the Militia Department has some plan in view for disposing of a portion, if not all, of the Niagara camp ground. I trust such is not the case, and I wish to know if there is any truth in the rumour.

Mr. CARON. The Government has no intention whatever to dispose of any portion of this property. I would be very sorry to see it transferred for any other purpose than that for which it is now used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose to keep the Dufferin Terrace in repair out of this?

Mr. CARON. The stone wall of the terrace is part of the fortifications and will have to be kept in repair, but it is so substantially built that very little repairs will be required. The terrace itself is kept in repair by the city of Quebec.

64. Royal Military College..... $59,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the special attention of the Minister and the Government to what I conceive is an unfortunate circumstance connected with this college. When it was instituted, promises were made by the late Government, which ought to have been

binding on their successors, that a certain number of appointments in the Civil Service would be bestowed on the most deserving of these cadets. Very little has been done in that way. We obtain from the Imperial Government the gift of four commissions to be distributed amongst the cadets. In the hon. gentleman's own report, one of the officers of the school recommends that four posts be given in the Civil Service and four others in the military offices, at the disposal of the Government, to these cadets, to be distributed amongst the best of them. No doubt the hon. Minister himself would be disposed to carry that out, but very little use seems to have been made, so far, of these men, who are educated largely at the expense of the people.

Mr. CARON. I am anxious to do all I possibly can for the Royal Military College. In England the qualifications of our cadets are considered equal to those of the best cadets of military colleges there and those who have been sent over to England have distinguished themselves, whether on the field or as engineers; and in competitive examinations they have held their own against the English cadets. In my Department I have already appointed eight cadets since I have been in charge, and I think the new arrangement under the new Bill will afford me an opportunity of taking in a couple more. All those who know the value of the Royal Military College, under the command of such a distinguished officer as Col. Hewitt, will appreciate the efforts of those interested in providing cadets with positions their high training entitles them to. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries intends to appoint a Royal Military College cadet to accompany Boulton on a survey of the lakes, which he has come out from England for the purpose of undertaking.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the Militia force ought to receive a little more benefit than it does from these military cadets. The college ought to be more in harmony with the Militia Force, and there are two ways in which the Militia force could be benefited by this College. There ought to be a special class in the college for the benefit of young men who have passed in the military schools, and desire to attain a higher standing in the Mititia force; and every cadet who attains a certain standing in the college should be attached to some one regiment or other, according to his choice, and when it goes to its annual drill he should be required to accompany it.

Mr. CARON. In several of the camps I visited I have seen cadets who were taking part in the manœuvres.

Mr. MILLS. Are there any in the Mounted Police force?

Mr. CARON. Yes; Lieut. Perry is one of the chief officers in the Mounted Police, and is doing very well. He met with an accident, but is now recovering.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I was glad to hear from the Minister of Militia that the Government intend considering the case of the cadets, for there is a general impression that they have not had the justice to which they are entitled at the hands of the Government. I remember when a gentleman, then in the college, Major Ridout, resigned his position, two cadets of the school, the first appointees of the Government, were placed in the position he had vacated. Their appointment, if I recollect rightly, was made on the ground that there was no particular necessity for an officer of Major Ridout's standing; that there was no necessity for an Adjutant to the school at that time; that these two young gentlemen, who were cadets or graduates of the school, could really perform the duty, although not taking the rank, of Adjutant of the school. I have since been given to understand that a gentleman has been appointed Adjutant of the school, who is not a graduate of the school, and, that, although he had held a commission in the regular service, he had to be sent to England to get the training necessary to qualify himself for the adjutancy of the college. If that is so, it does not bear out to the full the statement of the Minister, and I should like to have some explanation in reference to it.

Mr. CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it was quite experimental. The two young cadets were appointed, not only for the purpose of doing the duty of Adjutant, but also for instructional purposes. As instructors, they have been great successes. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is no advantage to have the position of an Adjutant in the hands of one of the cadets, for the reason that the cadets of to-day are all contemporaneous, and, for an officer like the Adjutant, whose duty is to enforce discipline, it requires an officer a good deal older, and who is not selected from the cadets. We tried it for a winter. Col. Hewitt considered it indispensable that an Adjutant should be appointed, and he was appointed at a very reduced salary.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I take an entirely different ground from the Minister of Militia on that particular point. We know that that school has been established for a number of years. It certainly ought to have turned out men in that time who were capable of taking the adjutancy of the college. If it has not done so, it has not done the duty the country expected of it. If it has, the college cadets ought to have had the preference in an appointment of the kind. We know that in other departments of life, in the schools of the country, for instance, the student of to-day is the teacher of to-morrow in many cases, and it is often impossible to find parties to take these positions, unless we recognize some capacity in those who have been sometime students. And surely the college has existed long enough now to allow of sufficient proficiency on the part of some of those who have been graduates. I should like to have had some explanation as to the particular appointment made, as it is one of the objections which I have urged that, although at one time the party appointed held a commission in the regular army, he was obliged to go home to the old country to qualify for the position he assumed at the College.

Mr. CARON. That is quite right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister to say that he has now made up his mind to recommend to his colleagues, and, if his colleagues are willing to accept the recommendation, that he will give, say half-a-dozen, posts among the most deserving of the cadets? I think it ought to be made definite and understood. A great many of these young men are exceedingly discouraged at finding they have no certainty, no matter how they may distinguish themselves, of obtaining a post under Government. I do not propose at all that he should employ the whole class of graduates; but, as the British Government employs four, I think the least the Canadian Government can do is to give posts, either in the Militia or in the Civil Service, to some half-dozen of the most deserving. It ought to be given, I think, to those who have shown themselves best qualified, and who have obtained the highest proficiency in their studies.

Mr. CARON. From what I told the hon. gentleman of what I have done, I think he can rely upon my doing what I can.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the commissions in the batteries, how are they filled?

Mr. CARON. I can explain that when we come to that item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very few commissions indeed have been given. I do not complain of the Minister of Militia, but I think it is intensely discreditable to the Government of Canada that, after five or six years, only one single, solitary officer in the Mounted Police—which

ought to have, I suppose, fifteen or twenty officers—is a Military College cadet. It shows, in my opinion, that they have entirely neglected the promises made by their predecessors, and have entirely disregarded their duty in giving to the most deserving of the cadets a number of the appointments. I exonerate the Minister of Militia. I do not think he was responsible; but I think the Government of Canada, as a whole, have neglected their duty in that matter. When we come to the questions below, the hon. the Minister can explain his policy as to that; but, in the case of the Mounted Police, I think a great injustice has been done, in not appointing more than one to that position.

Mr. PAINT. We know that many of the young men who go to that college go to receive a first-class education, and do not intend, many of them, to enter the Militia service or the service of the country; and that is why more have not been engaged in the Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason is, they have not been offered posts in the Canadian service, and I speak with perfect knowledge, with knowledge of what these young men are saying, and of the feeling among them. I come constantly in contact with them, and I know that nothing discourages them more, and tends more to prevent this college from being a useful institution, than the knowledge that, unless a young man has extraordinary influence, he has no chance whatever, no matter how great his proficiency may be, of getting a post under the present Government.

Mr. PAINT. I must say that there is too much patriotism in every member of the Government for that to be true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the hon. gentleman shows that he is a very young member of this House.

65. Pay and maintenance of "A," "B," and "C" Batteries, Royal Schools of Gunnery, at Quebec, Kingston, and Victoria, B.C. ..... $ 152,700 00

Mr. CARON. The amount asked for "A" Battery is $62,850; for "B" Battery, $62,850. We have estimated "C" Battery, which is a smaller battery as far as numbers are concerned, at $47,000, but of that I have deducted this year $27,000, which I do not consider will be required. I may say that the formation of "C" Battery has been creating a good deal of trouble, in so far as regards getting the men. Of course, when the railway is completed, there will be no difficulty in getting the number of men. At present, it would have been easy for us to have got the men required in the older Provinces, but we could not send them over the American railways, armed with guns and all that, and it was considered that the expense of sending them over would be so very great that I have so far not undertaken the formation of that battery for the present. The Commandant, Lieut.-Col. Holmes, is acting not only as Commandant, but also as Deputy Adjutant-General of the district, and I am glad to say he is doing very good work in organizing the force in British Columbia, and preparing for the formation of this School of Artillery. As to the site, we are now negotiating with the Department of the right hon. the leader of the Government for a lot which now belongs to the Indian reserve, and upon which we intend building barracks, which will be very cheap and quite sufficient to meet the requirements of the force.

Mr. VAIL. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the very large amount paid for fuel, $9,000. Could not an economy be effected by the use of coal? The last year I was in charge of the Department I was intending to experiment with coal, to see if a reduction could be made in that amount.

Mr. CARON. It is a very large sum, but it is impossible to reduce it. If it were possible to burn coal, we might make a great reduction; but it so happens that large wood stoves are used, and it is not possible to replace them by an apparatus for burning coal.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to commissions in the batteries, how many vacancies were filled in "C" Battery from the Military College?

Mr. CARON. Two vacancies were filled by Royal Military College cadets, one by Mr. Benson and the otherby Mr. Riepert. The Commandant, also, is a Royal Military College man.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). How many vacancies are there in all the Schools; or have all the appointments been made?

Mr. CARON. All except in the Cavalry School. We have appointed so far only two officers to "C" Battery. Mr. Benson is now attached to "B" Battery, and Major Holmes is in charge of the district. Besides, there will be three more officers. A Major will be required, and there will be two Lieutenants and one Surgeon.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Is it the intention to send a number of men over to British Columbia from that battery.

Mr. CARON. Yes; it is necessary that we should send out trained men for the purposes of starting the school. Col. Holmes and myself have been corresponding about the matter, and we have already sent one man over. It is the intention to send four or five, possibly a dozen, trained men, who will be instructors for the new school.

Mr. BAKER. At the present moment, so far as I am aware, there is simply a Lieut.-Col. who is acting Deputy-Adjutant, and a Sergeant-Major as Drill Instructor. I am not aware that there are any others of "C" Battery at the present moment. I think there is a difficulty existing in getting men for the amount of money that will be paid, according to the eastern scale. I am sorry to say that I do not know any men who will undertake to become permanent soldiers in "C" Battery, for the same amount of remuneration that Chinamen and Indians are geting out there.

Mr. CARON. We will not take Chinamen.

Mr. BAKER. I hope not, and if it was the intention of the Department to take Indians, I think the school would prove a failure. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister the advisability of slightly increasing the amount of remuneration that will be given to those men in "C" Battery, until the trans continental railway shall have reached British Columbia, so that it will allow those who are already in the force an opportunity of deciding whether they would like to join the permanent force or not.

Mr. LISTER. There is no need of a battery out there at all. There are only 15,000 people in the whole Province.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. CARON. As a strategetical point, there is no place in Canada as important as British Columbia, or where there is more need of an artillery force.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I think it does not become any hon. member of this House to try to belittle any Province in this Dominion, by stating there are only a certain number of people in that Province. I wish to inform that hon. gentleman there is more than double the number he has mentioned in British Columbia—there is more than 30,000.

Mr. LISTER. I am glad, indeed, to hear the hon. gentleman's statement, because it corrects my impression that the white population of British Columbia does not exceed 15,000. So far as the battery is concerned, I fail to see any need of it in British Columbia. It seems to me that British Columbians want a great deal of money out of the Treasury of

this country to serve as soldiers. Perhaps it would be well to postpone this until the Pacific Railway is built, and then we can send a battery there.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. That has been the policy all through, to defer the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it appears to be the policy at the present time. I am happy to say, however, that the party the hon. gentleman supports is not in power to carry out that idea.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to say to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that it is not only necessary to have soldiers, and a battery, and schools of gunnery to protect individuals, but there is very valuable property to be defended, and you have also to take into consideration the millions that are yet to roll into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. McCRANEY. There is an item in the Public Accounts here which I would like to have explained, and it is this:

I. Taylor, agent for Mrs. Faragina, Russian Leather permeator,..... $160 00

Mr. CARON. So far, as I know, it is used for the purpose of keeping leather of harness and boots in a soft and pliable condition. It was recommended by the Commandants of the batteries; a certain quantity was obtained and is still used.

65. Cavalry and Infantry Schools—payments and equipment..... $171,000.00

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). How many of the recent appointments as officers of the Military Schools are graduates of the Military College.

Mr. CARON. Four; these do not include two I have mentioned as joining "A" Battery.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I rather think that other considerations beside those connected with the Militia service influence appointments. I asked the hon. Minister a question with regard to an appointment to one of these Schools, that of Major Henry Smith, and in reply he said:

"He was appointed Adjutant of the 40th Battalion and attached to a regular regiment at Halifax for three months prior to his appointment as Captain in the Infantry School Corps at Toronto, with pay at $3 per day and allowance for rations and lodging."

He was appointed 27th December, and consequently, was attached during three months prior to that time, to one of the regiments at Halifax, at $3 per day. During part of that time, the same gentleman was in the West Riding of Middlesex, where a very interesting political contest was going on, and the result of his appearance was that he was obliged to present himself before the magistrate in that neighbourhood, and in an affidavit he made a statement to this effect:

"My home is at Cobourg, but I attend the Military School at Toronto. I was, at the time of the election, Secretary of the West Northumberland Conservative Association.
"For what purpose were you in West Middlesex?
"To assist Mr. Johnston and Dr. Roome in the election."

That evidence was given in London, on 26th January, 1884, and referred to an incident which occurred between 10th and 14th December, showing that Major Henry Smith, who at the time was under the pay of the Department, and supposed to be attached to a regular regiment at Halifax, for the purpose of receiving military instruction, was really interesting himself actively in a political campaign. Of all the Departments of the Government from which it is essential to keep free from political motives, the military department is the most important. While this gentleman was attached to the Volunteer force he had full right to exercise the franchise, and to act as Secretary of the West Northumberland Conservative Association, but while in West Middlesex he was in the regular pay of the Government, and was practically a pupil preparing himself to take a commission in one of the schools. I regret that the position was not offered to some graduate of the Military College. Out of the eleven or twelve appointments, only four were given to graduates of the College. I certainly think the Military Schools should be kept free of any taint; otherwise, they will come to be assumed as established for only a section of the community, and the impression may get abroad that they are used as political engines, in which event they will no longer be useful.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This officer was appointed from the active Militia. If there are any men in the country who were deserving of appointments in those Schools, they are officers who have taken part in the active force. These have even stronger claims than graduates of the Military College. It is very desirable that they should go to Halifax and be attached to a regiment for a time, because many things in the conduct of the school can be better learned in the regular course of regimental duties. With respect to political considerations in the active Militia, they should not be tolerated, but that a man in the active force should lose all his political rights would be to carry the doctrine too far.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not understand the case. This gentleman, Major Smith, during the time he was reported as undergoing instructions at Halifax, was actually taking part in a political contest. Surely, the hon. member for Muskoka does not think that right.

Mr. O'BRIEN. No.

Mr. CARON. I agree with the observations of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). However anxious I may be to provide for the Royal Military College cadets, it would be wrong, on the part of a Minister of Militia, to overlook the claims of the old Militia force of Canada. They have done service whenever required, and certainly we should not throw them aside completely and give every position to the military cadets. I am anxious to do all that can be done for them, but I cannot forget that the Militia force of Canada stood by us in time of danger when required, and certainly they are entitled to share these positions with the new comers who are trained in the Military College. With regard to the hon. gentleman's charge, of the Department being political, I can only say that the Department is not political, and that this particular officer was not on duty at the time. Several gentlemen, in referring to the officers who have been sent to Halifax and to England, seem to consider that they were incompetent to hold these positions, until they received instructions in England, or from the regular regiment at Halifax. This is quite a mistake, as the hon. gentleman will see. The Major-General commanding the Forces in Canada, after the commissions were granted, decided to recommend that every officer be put in training for three months with a regular regiment, so as to brush up whatever knowledge they had, and also to get an internal knowledge of the economy of the regiment, which can only be acquired by living in the barracks, with the regiment, and being trained with it for a certain given time. I am happy to say that the Commandants who went to England brought back the best possible certificates from the officers by whom they were trained. The other officers who were sent to Halifax received their certificates from the Commandant Lord Alexander Russell, and when I had the pleasure of meeting that gentleman, he spoke in the highest possible terms of the soldier-like bearing of the young men we sent down there.

Mr. DALY. It would seem as if hon. gentlemen opposite doubted that Major Smith was at Halifax at all; but I can assure them that he was there a considerable time, and that he served on duty with great credit to himself. From my acquaintance with military circles in Halifax, I can speak with assurance of the great and intimate acquaintance which these men showed with military matters,

before they went there; they merely went to Halifax to become more thoroughly acquainted with the discipline of the regular army.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). No one doubts but that they were at Halifax. What I say is that they were accepted as appointees to one of these Military Schools, and for a three months' course in Halifax—that was the case in this particular instance, at any rate. The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Militia, now says besides that a portion of that three months was spent in leave of absence.

Mr. CARON. I do not say that at all; I say that if the officer went up to the constituency the hon. gentleman refers to, he was on leave. He had gone through the training at Halifax, and was on leave.

Mr. LISTER. Was he still under pay?

Mr. CARON. Yes; he was under pay.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am taking the hon. gentleman's own answer to a question I asked him, when he stated that this gentleman, until the time he was gazetted to the School, was under the pay of the Government, at $3 per day. I assumed that that was correct, and taking that information as a basis, I had no other course than to assume that while he was there he was under the pay of the Government. Now, that is proved further by his own statement in court at London, that he was an officer in the Military School. In reference to the other question, I am prepared to concede to the officers of the volunteer force all the justice they are entitled to in such cases. They should be shown all the consideration that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), claims for them. But there is another question. There is a Military School, which costs a good deal of money, and the question is, is it any use to the country? If it is, it is only natural that positions, such as that referred to, should be given to the graduates of the School, because if they are doing any good there, they are supposed to be more proficient in the details of military life than those who are only attached to the volunteer service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is very unfortunate that that officer should have mixed himself up with the elections. However, my hon. friend will have an opportunity on Concurrence, I dare say, of expressing his view on that subject emphatically. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if I understood him correctly in saying that there were nine officers attached to the Cavalry and Infantry Schools?

Mr. CARON. Twelve.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And of these, four, I think he said, were cadets, two of whom had commissions in the Imperial army already.

Mr. CARON. There are only two cadets in the schools.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which two?

Mr. CARON. Mr. Frier and Mr. Siers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Two of these were gentlemen holding commissions in the Imperial army. I do not object to their being employed, but it is no good to the other cadets. What length of standing have the other ten, or what was the minimum?

Mr. CARON. The only one who was out of the service at the time is Herring He was made a Lieutenant when he went to Halifax. Major William Gordon was from the 14th Battalion. Major William Henry Vidal belonged to to the 12th Battalion. Major Henry Smith was Adjutant of the 40th Battalion. Lieutenant Charles J. Coursol was in the 65th Battalion. Lieutenant David Douglass Young was attached to the force in Quebec; he is the son of a Quebec lumber merchant; and lived for a time in England, where he joined a militia battalion. Mr Herring came from the Eastern Townships. Mr. Wadmore is a gentleman who came out from England where he had been for several years Adjutant in a volunteer battalion. When he came to Canada he joined the School in Halifax, and although there only a short time, he passed a very brilliant examination, and is looked upon as a very valuable addition to our force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But he had never held a commission in the Canadian Militia at all?

Mr. CARON. I think not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGAT. It may sound somewhat ungracious; but, having reference to the fact that so many of our own cadets had not received the offer of any appointment of this sort, and also to the fact that there are a great many deserving officers, as the hon. member for Muskoka pointed out, in the force, whose services ought to be recognized, it is very much to be regretted that these were all passed over in favour of Mr. Wadmore, unless there were very great reasons, which do not appear, for giving him the preference.

66. Government aid towards sending a team of Canadian Militia artillerymen to Shoeburyness, England, or for artillery competition in Canada $2,000 00

Mr. CARON. I am going to drop this vote; but before doing so, I would like to read a short paragraph taken from an English newspaper, about the team that represented Canada at Shoeburyness last year. It is headed "Canadians honoured by their closest competitors," and is as follows:—

"Sir Thomas Brassey, K.C.B., M.P., at the distribution of prizes to the Third Kent Artillery (Royal Arsenal Brigade), on February 12th, said, in addressing the brigade, that he had been informed by Colonel Hozier that on the occasion of the late competitions at Shoeburyness, the corps, for almost the first time in its history, did not get the first place, which it usually held; but they had been beaten by a party of volunteers from Canada, and if the men of the Third Kent were to yield the palm to any competitors, no rivals should be more welcome than their gallant friends from Canada. 'The presence of volunteers from Canada,' he said, 'proves that the good example set by the home volunteers is being followed by the great colonial dependencies, and they know that the Force is even more important with them than with us. Depend upon it the emergency might be greater in Canada, and therefore we should rejoice that the Canadians, with our fellow-countrymen in Australia, have formed greater bodies of volunteers.'"

I may state that after the team returned to Canada, I received several letters speaking in the highest possible terms of their behaviour while in England and of the high position they took among their comrades there.

67. Improved Rifled Ordnance $15,000 00

Mr. CARON. This is for the purpose of getting muzzle loading guns for our batteries. The guns now in the hands of some of our batteries have become perfectly useless. I hope every year, for four or five years hence, that a considerable vote will be allowed by Parliament for the purpose of providing guns that are necessary for properly arming our batteries. There is no use of our keeping them up unless we give them proper guns.

Mr. DAVIES. What kind of guns are they?

Mr. CARON. Nine-pounder muzzle-loading field guns, with carriages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman made some experiments two or three years ago, if I remember rightly, in constructing ordnance in Montreal. What became of the guns there constructed?

Mr. CARON. The experiment, to a great extent, failed, I am sorry to say. It was tried when my hon. predecessor, Mr. Masson, was at the head of the Department. As far as solving the problem of transforming the guns is concerned, it has been a complete success. One has been finished, and

it has been tested by Major-General Strange and other officers, and has proved to be a very excellent gun. There were ten guns ordered. The contract was given to Gilbert & Son, Montreal. They got into difficulties, however, I believe, and they abandoned the contract. The Department transferred the matter to the Department of Justice, and the case is now before the courts. Judgment is only delayed by the absence of Major-General Strange, the witness required to prove our case. But I hope he will be here shortly, when the case will go on and be decided.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and at (2:20 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SCRIVER moved that the First Report of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament be concurred in. He said: It will be remembered that I made a motion for the adoption of this report some days ago, and at the request of the First Minister and several hon. members of the House the matter was left over for further consideration. I beg to state now, what I stated on that occasion, that the important matter of the report is a recommendation that certain legal works in the Library be transferred to the Library of the Supreme Court, and put under the Department of Justice. The recommendation does not, however, propose that any works which are needed for use or consultation by members of this House shall be so removed, and it proposes that this work of transferrence shall be done under the supervision of yourself, Sir, the Speaker of the Senate, and several members of the legal profession who are members of this House, and therefore it will be done with great care, and in a way not to prejudice the rights and convenience of the members of this House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am informed that it is the practice of some legal gentlemen to carry away numbers of books, and I would like to know if that is the case.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not to my knowledge. If it is done it is contrary to the rules.

Mr. CARON. It will be remembered that the report came before us a few days ago and it was held over for a further consideration of the question of what books should be transferred from the Library of Parliament to the Supreme Court Library. Now it seems to me that it would be fraught with the greatest inconvenience to members of Parliament if the books were transferred from our Library to the Library of the Supreme Court. The inconvenience to which the Supreme Court may be put to at present would be felt by members of Parliament, which would be deprived of books which are continually consulted during the sitting of Parliament, upon questions affecting legislation and matters upon which discussions take place in the House. Now, I do not see how any book affecting jurisprudence, or civil law, or the common law, or the statute law of Great Britain, or books of American law, could be dispensed with in a Library like our own. I think it is very important that the Library of the Supreme Court should be made as complete and as perfect as possible, but I do not see that we could consent to that Library being improved at the expense of our own. The time of hon. members here during the sitting of Parliament is so limited, so taken up by Parliamentary work that it would become almost impossible for hon. members to be running from the Parliament building to the Supreme Court to consult such books. There is another inconvenience which must strike every hon. member; at four o'clock or five, the Supreme Court Library, as I understand, will be closed, and this would prevent any hon. member from consulting these books. If the other inconvenience which I consider to be an insuperable difficulty to the transfer that is now spoken of, the inconvenience of running down to the Library for these books could not be overlooked. I think the Library has suffered from books not being there when they were sent for, and asked for many times. Several of the American and English reports have been transferred to the Supreme Court Library, and I am told, at great inconvenience to members of this House. I think so far as the standard works are concerned, if it is necessary that the Supreme Court should have them their might be duplicate copies, but certainly we should not deprive hon. members of this House of the advantage of consulting such works.

Mr. BLAKE. I entirely concur with the hon. gentleman in the view that the Parliamentary Library ought to contain all books which are ordinarily required for the discharge of our Parliamentary duties; and I agree with him also that if it is a question of the convenience of the Judges of the Supreme Court and the professional gentlemen attending the Supreme Court, and the convenience of the members of Parliament in the discharge of their Parliamentary duties, it is obviously our duty to attend to our own convenience in this regard. I was myself extremely doubtful of the expediency of the action of the Library Committee some two or three years ago in removing the reports from the Library at all. I had not the good fortune to be present at that meeting of the Committee or I should have opposed that proposition, because it seemed to me to be one very doubtful in its propriety. At present we are thus circumstanced: the reports are in the Supreme Court, and the text books are in the Library. Now the hon. gentleman knows, as every member of the legal profession knows, as every hon. member who is not a lawyer, upon a moment's consideration, must perceive that this disjunction of the reports and text books destroys the utility of either branch of the Library. We cannot use the text books—no person who is worthy the name of a lawyer, uses the text books, the ordinary class of text books, except as a vehicle to convey his enquiries into the report, in which he finds set out at length that which is oftentimes with extreme brevity, and sometimes with the inaccuracy which belongs to extreme condensation, presented in the text books. No thorough lawyer takes his learning from the text books. There are of course approved text books which form standard works of law, from which you may sometimes properly quote, but as a rule it is entirely unsafe to deal with a text book unless fortified by the report. Now, the circumstances in which Parliament is at present situated are that we have the text books in the Library; but if we want to refer to those authorities on which the text books in main depend for their authenticity and value, and which contain full expositions of those decisions from which the text books draw their conclusions, we must either go or send down to the Library of the Supreme Court. I did not understand that such an arrangement would be tolerable at all on the present basis. I do not think that members of Parliament,

for the purposes of Parliament—I distinguish these from the purposes that a member may have in the discharge of his legal avocation while here—when called upon to consult a report, should be required to leave this building and go to the Supreme Court. I understood that the terms on which the reports were sent there were that they should not merely be accessible to us there, but that when we wanted any particular report, a messenger could be sent down and the report obtained. I also understood that it was not intended that the hours which the Supreme Court might please to occupy, and which the discharge of judicial duties rendered reasonable, should confine our access to those books. But as a necessary incident of the reports being transferred to the Supreme Court, that library would have to be kept opened as long as this House was sitting, and the officer should be kept in attendance for the purpose of supplying any report for which a messenger might be sent from this House. I maintain that unless a system of that kind prevails, we shall not have the facilities that we ought to have, to render the arrangement a proper one for the discharge of our Parliamentary duties. It certainly was not intended by the Library Committee last Session, when its report was presented to the House, that those text books which are in constant use by members of Parliament—for instance, text books on criminal law, which were cited as those to which we frequently have to refer—should be removed from our own shelves here. But there are a number of text books which do not partake of that character. You may want to see them, perhaps only once in the Session, when some particular question may be up. But, as a rule they are only for lawyers in the pursuit of their avocation, and not for the Parliamentarian. It seems, then, that it is reasonable to adopt this view—that the reports and those text books which are more lawyers' text books than those of the Parliamentarian should be given, but on the condition I have mentioned, that the Library containing them shall be open as long as this House is open, and that there shall be facility for a member to send down and get what he wants. Either that or you will have to retrace your steps, and bring the text books back. Now, on the whole, with the modifications I have suggested, the experiment might be tried of leaving the law reports, and the kind of text books to which I have referred, down there. But the present state of things is entirely unsatisfactory. I have not considered the matter from the point of view of the Supreme Court, because that, though not unimportant, is a secondary consideration, so far as the discharge of our public and Parliamentary duties is concerned.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I was glad to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Militia enter a protest against the transferrence of a portion of the law library from the Library of Parliament to the Supreme Court. I was glad to hear the objection come from him, because it seems to me that he and his colleagues have the remedy in their own hands. If it is necessary for us to have in the Library of Parliament the law reports as well as the text books, we ought to have them there. I think the country is rich enough to provide the Judges of the Supreme Court, and the profession practicing in the Supreme Court, with a proper set both of text books and reports. The cost of providing a set there and a set in our own Library would be so inconsiderable that it is a reproach to Parliament that it has not supplied the necessary funds for that purpose. However, if I recollect rightly, when I ventured on a former occasion, in this House, to object to the removal of the text books, my hon. friend who has just sat down was pleased, in a jocular remark, probably intended for my personal benefit, to make some allusion to members of this House following their professional avocation while professing to discharge their Parliamentary duties. No doubt I may occasionally do that, as all of us are obliged to do. But, apart altogether from the advantage and convenience to members of this House who happen to be lawyers of having access to such reports as they require to consult in the ordinary business of their profession, I do entertain the opinion that a complete set of law reports as well as text books is essential to a complete Parliamentary Library. When I take up the order paper, I see among the Public Bills and orders the titles of Bills respecting carriers by land, respecting the election of members of the House of Commons, respecting a Court of Railway Commissioners, respecting the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, respecting titles to land, respecting the distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors, respecting the Patent Act, respecting the law of evidence, and numerous other subjects of that kind upon which for the proper discharge of our Parliamentary duties it is necessary for us to refer to the reports as well as the text books. I therefore think the Parliamentary Library is not adequate for the purpose for which it was designed unless it contains them both, and I think that the removal of these reports to the Supreme Court was a deprivation of the Library of Parliament, and an injury to its usefulness. I think the cost of a duplicate set would be a mere bagatelle. Certainly under $5,000 would provide a complete set of reports for one or the other library, and a complete set, I think, should be provided for both. In order that we may satisfactorily discharge our Parliamentary duties here, we need the reports as well as the text books. It is absurd, as the hon. member for West Durham has pointed out, to separate the text books from the reports, for each is valueless without the other. We require the text book to guide us in finding those reports to which we must refer, and we need the reports to ascertain authoritatively what the law is, because every lawyer knows that if we cannot rely on any statement in the text books we ought to be able to verify it by referring to the report. For these reasons, and especially as I have heard the hon. Minister of Militia object to this severance of the reports from the text books, I hope the true remedy will be provided, namely, to supply a complete set both of text books and law reports for the Supreme Court Library and the Library of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think sufficient has been shown in the statements made to convince my hon. friend who moved the adoption of this report on behalf of the Library Committee, that it does not meet with the approbation of the House. My hon. friend, I think, had better withdraw his motion, and the Library Committee being made aware of the general feeling of the House, can take other action.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) has enormously underestimated the cost of supplying the two libraries with complete sets of reports, when he says $4,000 or $5,000 would do this. It would not do for the House to run away with the notion that this could be accomplished for less than $20,000.

Mr. MILLS. It would at least require that sum, and the observations made show that great inconvenience would arise, under any circumstances, from the division of the Library. This discussion shows the propriety of having the Archives, the General Library and the law reports placed in the same building so as to be easily accessible. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman could see his way to dispense with the Senate, the Supreme Court might occupy the second Chamber and the difficulty be thus got over.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I would like to see this House abolished on the proposition of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Not this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the second Chamber.

Mr. MILLS. This is the first.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the House of Lords is before the House of Commons. The question of the Archives is quite a different one from that of the Library. I quite agree with everything said against the divorce of the text books from the reports. The text books are merely a sort of analytical index of what the reports contain, and no lawyer would be satisfied to rest his legal argument on the text book without first verifying it by examination of the reports. It is better that the practitioners of the Supreme Court, and even the Judges, should be put to a little inconvenience, by having to come up here occasionally to the Library to examine the text books rather than that Parliament should be put to a great inconvenience when a discussion takes place late in the afternoon. If it be an important question that is under discussion, members run to the Library for the purpose of getting books to strengthen their argument or see whether the statement made is correct, and though a book may not be wanted more than once or twice in a Session, it still may be wanted for the discussion of a very important measure, and if not here, great inconvenience and injury may result. On the whole the House is not prepared, at all events, to concur in the report, and I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion rather than have a vote on it.

Mr. SCRIVER. Before withdrawing my motion, I might ask you Mr. Speaker, whether the proper way subsequently would not be to move a reference of the report back to the Library Committee with the request that this portion be reconsidered. If I withdraw my motion the report remains before the House, and some disposition will have to be made of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. You can withdraw your motion and then move that the report be referred back on an amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move in amendmen that all the words after "That" be struck out and the following inserted:

The said Report be referred back to the Joint Committee on the Library for further consideration.

Amendment agreed to.

SAN FRANCISCO, WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ORTON moved that Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the san Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company be withdrawn and the fees and charges paid thereon refunded, less the cost of printing and translation, in accordance with the Thirteenth Report of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

P. E. I. COMPENSATION CLAIMS.

Mr. DAVIES moved for copies of Orders in Council, relating to any claim made by the Government of Prince Edward Island for compensation for money expended in constructing or repairing piers in that Province, and to the examination of, and report upon the piers of that Province.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to asking for a copy of the Order in Council which contains a complete report. But if he asks for the reports on the wharves, he cannot expect to have that for months. It is a very voluminous work, and it is not required. If the hon. gentleman wants the Order in Council and statement, he had better confine himself to that, and I will bring it down on Monday.

Mr. DAVIES. Of course, in the position in which I am, I will have to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report would make more than a ream of paper with the plans, and of course it is a labour of several months. I simply warned the hon. gentleman that, if he wants the information, he had better confine himself to the Order in Council.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) to amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Bill contains very few changes of the Acts now in force. It is proposed to make a little clearer a certain clause for the classification of the different employés and the examination which those employés have to undergo. Another change concerns the promotion examination. Some difficulties have occurred under the law as it exists, as to whether the promotion examinations were not sometimes, I will not say out of the reach, but consisting of subjects which would not be necessary or would be outside of the reach of those who have passed several years in the Civil Service in their different positions. This new Act provides that the subjects of examination for promotion will have to consist chiefly of the different subjects concerning the requirements of each Department and of each branch of each Department, and that these subjects will have to be chosen after consultation between the Deputy-Head of the Department and the Head of the Department, and then submitted to the Board of Examiners for examination, the examination of course taking place according to the rules made by the Board of Civil Service Examiners. Another small change is made in the case of attorneys, barristers, military or civil engineers and some special officers, who by the law now in force are exempted from the promotion examination. It is to make it clearer. It is proposed to state that, in the case of attorneys, barristers, engineers (military or civil) officers of artillery in the Militia Department, architects, actuaries, land surveyors or draughtsmen, when employed or seeking promotion in the line of their profession, they may be dispensed from examination. We understand that, if a lawyer would like to enter into the Civil Service as an ordinary clerk, he will have to be subject to examination in the same way as other candidates, but, if a man is employed for special services, either as a lawyer or a member of either of the other professions mentioned in the Act, he would be exempted from this examination. Another small change is made on account of extra or additional remuneration, which might be paid to Deputy-Heads and other employés. The law said "unless such a sum should be put in the Estimates for such a purpose." It is proposed to change the wording to "unless a sum is voted by Parliament for the purpose." Then there is a change in reference to the office of inspectors in the Post Office Department. The assistant Post Office inspectors were appointed at a certain salary, and required ten years' service before they received the $200 increase, and ten years more before another increase. These officers will have at their appointment $1,200, and, as the clerks in the office over which they preside, they will have the ordinary increase of $50 a year to a maximum of $1,600. Superintendents of letter carriers is an office which has been created in the Post Office Department, and their salary, instead of $400 is to be $600, with the ordinary increase of $40. Those are the principle changes. The chief aspect of the Bill as a new departure is in reference to the examination for promotion, about which there has been a good deal

of complaint made. It will be also asked, as I stated before, that a salary of $600 be paid to a clerk to assist the Board of Civil Service Examiners. I have given notice of a resolution to that effect.

Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like the Government to make some statement as to public business during the remainder of this Session. I think the time has arrived when the convenience of all parties would be consulted by such a statement. It practically reduces itself into a question of the measures not yet brought down, and the Franchise Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When we got to the Orders of the Day I was prepared to have gone over the different items. I find that after sitting three months a majority of the members of the House are anxious, if possible, that we should prorogue on or about Easter, if the state of public business will permit.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have come to the conclusion that if we press the Franchise Bill we cannot hope to prorogue at that time, therefore Government have made up their minds to move to discharge that item and then, with due diligence, and short speeches, I think we may get through the rest of the paper. There will be some difficulty, I dare say, with measures that may come from the Upper House, but they will not take much time, and I propose to put a notice on the paper to introduce a Bill amending in some regards the License Bill of last Session. That, with the business on the paper, will, I think, very nearly dispose of the whole of the public business.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if there is any chance for us to get some of those undiscussed motions passed for returns. There are some papers that I would like very much to get down. Could we not come to an arrangement to pass those notices of motions upon which there is no discussion, at once, so that we may get out the papers next Session if we cannot get them this?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, and I would propose to-night, or Monday night, to go over the paper and call over those items that are not opposed. But as I had occasion to state before, my experience has been that the moment one item is opposed, the hon. gentleman who has charge of it gets angry and says: "Well, if that is opposed I will oppose every other motion on the paper." I have seen that done again and again. So that if we try that experiment once again it must be with the understanding that an hon. gentleman so moving shall make no remarks.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And that if any one says "oppose," the hon. gentleman must submit with good nature and not hurt his neighbours.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Suppose we do it now.

Mr. BLAKE. The happy result which the hon. gentleman has foreshadowed of an early prorogation is a little dependent upon the period at which he will bring down the measures which are not yet brought down. He mentioned the License Act, and said that a couple of other measures would practically conclude the business. Has the hon. gentleman altogether forgotten Quebec?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, we will take care of Quebec.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. BLAKE. No, but I am in earnest, because we want to know when. The hon. gentleman said he would bring the Quebec Bill down this week.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will not be able quite to bring it down this week; we will bring it down early next week. With regard to these notices of motion, if anybody says "oppose," then it must be dropped; but I hope hon. members won't oppose any motion for a return of papers.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite sure no hon. member will be so churlish, because his motion is opposed, either by Government or some other member, as to prevent other hon. members from getting their motions disposed of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the hon. gentlemen is an optimist.

Mr BLAKE. I have heard him several times make this statement, but I think it is not the general experience he refers to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would just say, however, since this arrangement has been made, that if any hon. gentleman does not happen to be present when his motion is called, the motion will not be dropped,

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

ENQUIRIES INTO SHIPWRECKS.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend the Act respecting enquiries and investigations into Shipwrecks and other matters, as to the powers of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.

Mr. DAVIES. There must be a mistake in inserting the second section, which has escaped the attention of the hon. Minister. The Bill was passed through Committee so hurriedly that I had not time to notice it. The second section reads as follows:--

"No confirmation by the Governor or person administering the Government of Canada, of any report under the Act hereby amended, is or has been required since the passing of the Merchant Shipping Amendment Act, 1862, the provision in the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, referring to such confirmation being expressely repealed as from that time, by the Merchant Shipping (Colonial Inquiries) Act, 1882."

There is no sense in enacting that; it is simply a mere instruction, or a memo which the Deputy-Head or somebody in the Department has made and which was incorporated in the Bill by mistake.

Mr. McLELAN. In the old Act such confirmation was required, and this takes it away.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the third clause should be eliminated as well as the second, for the third clause is also merely an explanation of what the law is.

Mr. McLELAN. The decision of the law clerk was that as the old law enacted that it was necessary the reports should be confirmed, it was necessary now to affirm that the Governor need not confirm them.

Mr. WELDON. Then simply repeal the clause. This does not repeal it.

Mr. BLAKE. This is not an amendment to the law it is simply an assertion of what the law is.

Mr. MILLS. It was evidently an instruction written by some officer for the draughtsman, and the draughtsman, instead of accepting it as an instruction, accepted it as a clause. It enacts nothing, but simply explains what the law is. The hon. gentleman might make a Bill of a hundred pages precisely in the same way by stating a hundred things that the law does not enact.

Order for third reading allowed to stand.

AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, the Esquimalt Graving Dock, and certain railway lands of the Province of British Columbia, granted to the Dominion.

Mr. GORDON. I desire to say that I regret very much that a matter of so great importance to Canada should be passed over in such a manner as it is passed over in this Bill. I desire before its final passage to enter my last protest against it. It has been stated by the hon. the Minister of Railways that the coal mines of British Columbia have lain there undeveloped for the last fifty years, and that one of the results of the passage of this Bill will be to create a greater development of the coal industries. If the hon. gentleman were to go back fifty years, he might have taken a voyage of discovery from the Isthmus of Panama to Behring's Straits, and he would scarcely have found a white man on the Pacific coast at that time. It is within the last ten years that the great industries of the Pacific coast have sprung into existence. During thirteen years of that period, these lands to which I am now referring have been absolutely closed from development, no matter how desirous capitalists may have been in any part of the world to secure those lands. It has been stated, and I am sorry to say with considerable emphasis, that these lands have not been closed, and that the reserve has been lifted. That, Sir, is not a fact. The reservation has never been lifted from what is known as the Island railway belt. It has merely been modified, its boundaries have been changed, but the same proclamation which changed those boundaries re-reserved the lands as they are to-day. The reservation may be found in the British Columbia *Gazette* of June 14th, 1883, in which they cancelled the reservation of 1873 placed on these lands at the instance of the Dominion Government. It merely rearranges the boundaries of the land proposed to be given away, and re-reserves the land in the same proclamation, so that my hon. friend the junior member for Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare) was entirely astray in his bold declaration that the Provincial Government had taken the reservation from those lands, and I am astonished to think that he would make such a declaration when the evidence to the contrary was to be found in the Library of Parliament. Another reference also was made to the fact that the company that had been incorporated, known as the Clements' Syndicate, were receiving more lands and more moneys than this present Bill proposes to give. That, Sir, is also a mistake, and that it is a mistake is proved from the maps that define the limits conveyed in this Bill. It may all appear very well to say that this land grant extends half between Courtney River and Seymour Narrows. At first sight it would convey the impression that this was the boundary of the land to be given to the company; but, if you look further, you find that all the alienated lands in the belt are to be taken out of the contiguous lands to the north of that line, which will include nearly every foot of land within the boundaries of the original reservation. Then again the boundaries were changed, running across, as it were, detaching the Victoria peninsula from the original twenty-mile belt, and it was so arranged that the line was to strike across the head of Saanich Inlet to Muir Creek, on the Straits of Fuca. Take a straight line from that point to Crown Mountain, and you will have a uniform width of twenty-four miles, and the whole of the land in the belt as now defined will be greater than the twenty-mile belt from Seymour Narrows to Esquimalt, especially when you consider that the original reservation included also the lands alienated from the Crown. On these points, I desire to set the matter straight, although I do not think the hon. gentleman did it with a view of deceiving the House, but it would have that tendency, it would have a tendency to reduce the quantity of land, and as a consequence reduce the value of the gift to this company. Now, the hon. the senior member for Victoria (Mr. Baker), I think, in his estimate of the value of this land, placed it at $4,631,100. He was very careful in his estimate.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Oh, it is pretty approximate.

Mr. GORDON. Approximate, I presume. Well, a letter which appeared in the Toronto *Globe* and was re-published in the Montreal *Gazette*, and which is not at all unlikely to have been written in the interests of this company, after giving a general description of British Columbia, states that mineral and timber lands within this reserve will be sold by the syndicate at the uniform price of $10 an acre, free from all reservations and conditions whatever. Now, $10 an acre on 2,000,000 acres of land is exactly what my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Homer) and myself have contended is being given to this company, $20,000,000 in round numbers, not taking into account at all the increased value of the coal at its real value. Now, $10 an acre is no price at all for good coal land; $40 an acre has been paid within the last three months.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Not to the Government.

Mr. GORDON. To individuals, within the belt, for the mineral rights only, to private holders. So that, in order to ease down the public sentiment of Canada, and prevent people from looking at what they the Company are getting and looking at it closely, they proclaim, or some one for them, proclaims that $10 an acre will be the price; but I venture to say that if the hon. the leader of the Government were to introduce a clause into the Bill making it compulsory for them to sell at a uniform price of $10 an acre, in alternate sections of 5,000 acres each, through the District of Comox, from the Qualicum River to Seymour Narrows, some effort would be made by them to prevent any such clause being put into their Act. It is not my desire, and it is a hopeless case, to plead against the Government and the Opposition united and to stand up here as an individual, or two or three individuals, to declare what we believe to be the facts. The question has been raised that this question has arisen out of the sectional differences between the mainland and the Island. That has no existence whatever. How could I, as an Island man, submit to such a proposition? I represent the largest part of Vancouver Island, extending from within five miles of the city of Victoria to its northernmost limit. I have a right to believe and to feel that the interests of these people are to be sacrificed, and consequently I have a right to act regardless as to the location. I do not regard the Gulf of Georgia as separating any part of the Province of British Columbia from any other part. It is a natural highway, and does not separate Vancouver Island from the mainland any more than a highway through the Island separates one part of the Island from the other, and in my view has no political significance whatever.

Mr. BAKER. Swim across it and see.

Mr. GORDON. It is a good thing we have it. So I think I have disposed of those points pretty conclusively, the reservation has never been raised, and the proof of that is that it has been impossible for any man to secure one foot of land, to get a Crown grant to any extent, within that country since the 1st of June, 1873. It is wrong to state that the non-development of that country is at all attributable to the lack of enterprise of the people. They have been debarred from availing themselves of those vast resources which have been lying there so long and are only now being opened up on account of the increased vitality that commerce and manufactures are now receiving on the Pacific coast. It is only now that our coal is beginning to be appreciated; it is only now that the people of San Francisco find they cannot do without our coal. Until a few years ago San Francisco was largely dependent upon the Coosh

Bay, the Newcastle and Bellingham coal mines. The Bellingham Bay mine has not produced any coal for years; the Coosh Bay mine is so exhausted that it cannot be worked profitably; and within the last few weeks I saw the Newcastle mine was on fire. None of this coal stands equal to ours in the markets of San Francisco. It has become a matter of necessity to them to have our coal. Why, Sir, I can remember twenty years ago when there were 20,000 or 30,000 tons of coal lying at the Vancouver Coal Company's pit's-head without any one making an offer for it, when they could not dispose of it, and when the men had to lie idle for months because there was no demand for the article. What is the case now? After the three months' strike last summer at the Wellington colliery was terminated, and when the steamship *Wellington* went into San Francisco with the first cargo after the strike had ended, the streets of San Francisco were blockaded for three or four squares with people wanting that coal. Draymen unhitched their horses from the drays and left them standing in position in order that they might secure their load in turn. That is the position our coal holds in San Francisco, and that position will be maintained provided that a lively and healthy competition exists, which can only be secured by a number of capitalists being engaged in the same enterprise, that is, in rival enterprises in that particular industry. Then, again, if this land is all thrown into the hands of one company what is to become of the other mines? Rivalry in coal mining will naturally bring the price to that point which would enable a company of capitalists, even though they were all interested in different mines, and perhaps induce them to take steps to develop our iron mines —at any rate far sooner than if all our coal resources were left in the hands of one company, who desired them for one purpose especially, and that is to serve their railway across the continent for all time to come, and then to serve their own interests by getting the highest price possible for their coal, which they could do if they had no competition, whether in San Francisco or at the various points north of that. I feel that I have been doing my duty in making one last protest against the passage of this measure I now move in amendment, seconded by Mr. Homer:

That whereas the Act respecting an arrangement with British Columbia provides for important changes in the terms of Union, be it therefore resolved that the modifications proposed by the said Bill be submitted to a direct vote of the people of that Province before receiving the sanction of this Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to make one observation in relation to that before this important motion is passed, as I was not here during the debate the other night. There is one fact which I have heard stated, and if it is true it has a very important bearing upon this question. I am told, but I do not know how true it is, that the people who control the Central Pacific Railway are the people who own the Pacific steamships, one of the largest fleets of vessels afloat, and who naturally control the steam navigation of the Pacific coast. One of the objects of building the great Canadian Pacific Railway has been to open up communication with the eastern world, China, Japan and the Indies. I am told that the gentleman who is at the back of the gentleman who has got this concession to build this railway in British Columbia, is a gentleman who is getting his support and his money largely from the Pacific Railway people: in other words, the gentleman who is building the road has his support, influence, power and means from the Central or Union Pacific Railways who control the great fleet of Pacific ocean steamers. And if, as I have also heard it stated, they have obtained by this concession, control of the most important coal deposite on the Pacific coast—certainly the most important owners of a portion of that territory—and if, as I am told, these are the only deposits in Canadian territory that are yet absolutely known to be of any great material value, I think it is a matter that demands the most serious consideration of this

Mr GORDON.

House, and that we should consider it deeply before putting it out of our hands and beyond the control of the Government and handing it over to the control of a rival company of a rival nation. It affects not Canada alone but the Empire. I do not know whether the information I have is correct or not, but if it is correct it is a position and a statement that ought to make us pause before we pass into the hands of a foreign company and a foreign people the power to control the great coal deposits without which the use of the Pacific Ocean is *nil* to any enterprise that Canada may hereafter initiate in connection with our great railway. I am not going to take up the time of the House in discussing this matter, but I have felt it to be my duty to make these remarks, having heard this information from New York—in fact, having had it upon very direct authority, coming from capitalists of that company, who are looking forward to the passage of this measure and expecting that in consequence they will obtain the monopoly of that coal, without which we cannot navigate that ocean; and, in view of these facts, I say it is a position which ought to make the members of the Government hesitate and pause before they pass a measure which will dispossess them of these important interests.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I do not desire to occupy the time of the House more than a few minutes. The hon. member for Vancouver District (Mr. Gordon) referred to the short time the coal mining industry had been established in British Columbia—the short time of ten years. To my own knowledge the coal mines of the Province have been worked for the last twenty-five years.

Mr. GORDON. I said so.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I have been in British Columbia myself twenty-two years, and I know they were worked two or three years previously.

Mr. GORDON. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I said that twenty years ago there were 20,000 tons of coal at the pit's head of the Vancouver Coal Company, seeking a market. During those twenty years trade has undoubtedly taken a forward movement, but more particularly during the last ten years.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. During that period gentlemen have formed companies for the purpose of working the coal mines of the Province, and the companies have failed. To my own knowledge three companies have thus failed. With respect to the reserve: I have not the documents before me, but I know that action was taken by the Provincial Government with respect to the releasing of the lands reserved on Vancouver Island, and if such action did not take place I am very much surprised, for I can assure the House that at the last General Election that very question was raised and brought up against some members who occupied seats in the Local Legislature, the charge being that of re-leasing the reserve. They were blamed for doing so and were charged with having thus placed themselves in the hands of the Dominion Government. So it certainly was, and is, the impression to-day that the reserve was re-leased by the Provincial Government as regards the lands on Vancouver Island. With respect to the extent of the line, to which the hon. gentleman referred, above Comox, and between there and Seymour Narrows, I contend that this company does not get the same quantity of lands as the Clements' Company were to have received. To my knowledge the Provincial Government have sold lands during the last year, since this settlement was arranged with the Dominion Government, beyond the line to which the company have got lands above Comox. That is proof positive that the company does not get the same quantity of land as the Clements' Company were to obtain. With respect to giving away the coal lands; if this settlement Bill were to be thrown out to-day those lands would be given; to some company for the purpose of building the railwaye the Provincial Government themselves would give the coal

lands rather than not have the railway built. So far as regards the remarks made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) with respect to the steamship line, I fail to see why any objection should be raised on that score, because it is, I believe, generally known that another company is about to place a line of steamships between Victoria or some other point in British Columbia and China—I refer to the Allan Company. I am informed on very good authority that it is their intention at once to place a line of steamships on that route, and also on the route to San Francisco. There need not be the slightest fear entertained that one company will monopolize the whole trade on that part of the coast. Capitalists are always wide awake to invest money wherever there is sufficient business to warrant it; and there will be not only the steamship line which now runs from San Francisco to Victoria, but there will be another steamship line. The Dunsmuir Company intend placing a line of steamers on the same route. So that there will be no monopoly in the hands of one company, but there will be two or three and possibly four lines running. British Columbia is only beginning to be known, and when the rich resources and the great wealth of the country are more generally understood, there will be a great desire on the part of capitalists to direct their attention to that quarter. I have no intention of detaining the House with any prolonged remarks, further than to state this: I am still of the opinion that one of the principal reasons why objections are taken to this measure is the little feeling of jealousy existing between the main land and the Island; and I do not think I would have said so much on this question but for the amendment which was introduced by the hon. member for New Westminster and Victoria District, asking the appointment of a committee to enquire as to a location for the graving dock, which is already located at Esquimault on the Island. That showed on its face a feeling of jealousy, a disposition to take from the Island that to which she is entitled, and that on which the Home Government have decided, the Home Government having agreed to give £50,000 sterling if it was located at Esquimalt. Yet those hon. gentlemen have advocated the appointment of a Committee of this House on the subject, and introduced an amendment to that effect. No further remarks on my part are necessary to show to every hon. member that jealousy is at the top and bottom and all through this matter.

Mr. HOMER. The general opinion of members of the House appears to be that this measure is entirely a local measure, because it has received a majority of the votes in the Local House of British Columbia. But it must be remembered that several measures which passed that House unanimously has been vetoed by the present Government, among the disallowed Bills being a railway Bill, which would have opened up localities which would have proved feeders to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Looking at this question from a national point of view, it is a very important one; and it is this view which the House should take, not a local view. This project will interfere very materially with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Parliament has voted millions of money for the construction of that railway, and to secure its early completion, so as to enable it to control the Pacific trade as far as possible. Why then should we vote a vast sum of money to enable a road to be built which will come into direct competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, especially on the Pacific coast. Some hon. members who were absent when the subject was previously discussed appear to understand that the grant of land which the company are to receive amounts to 2,000,000 acres, including 400 square miles of coal lands. And according to that report that would amount to 16,000,000 tons per acre, which would give 4,600,000,000 tons of coal, which, at 5 cents per ton, would amount to $230,000,000. Now let us throw off nine-tenths of that amount, and take only one-tenth, and we have the sum of $32,000,000, calculating it at 5 cents per ton. Let us even reduce the amount to $20,000,000, and we have that large sum, in addition to the iron ore and other minerals which are to be given to this monopoly, to build 70 miles of railway. Now, who are these men who control this monopoly? They are the men who control the Southern Pacific, the Texas Pacific, and the General Pacific Railway, and who have every prospect of controlling the Northern Pacific. Where, then, would be our trans-continental line, our Canadian Pacific Railway, with this company controlling these roads and controlling the immense coal monopoly which it is proposed to give them. I venture to say that Canadian Pacific Railway stock would depreciate 25 per cent. if this monopoly were established, upon the supposition that these men will control such large interests, centering upon the Pacific coast. I hope the Government will give the amendment favourable consideration, and not allow this property to pass into the hands of foreigners, so that in future times we may be able to utilize it for the benefit of the people of Canada.

Mr. BAKER. I can understand the hon. member for Vancouver offering some opposition to the passage of this measure, but I fail to see why the hon. gentleman from New Westminster should oppose it. The hon. member for Vancouver said that the Straits of Juan de Fuca certainly did separate the Island from the Mainland, but that was not an insuperable barrier to the matter. If the hon. gentleman thinks that that is an insignificant stream, the best thing he can do is to wade across it and see how he will come out of it in the end. Possibly every hon. gentleman here is not aware that these straits average some 25 miles in width. The narrowest part is from the N.E. point of Valdes Island to Point Grey, at Burrard Inlet, which is 19 miles. I remember this distance particularly, from the fact that a short time ago a cable was laid between these points, the cable required from Nanaimo to Point Grey being insufficient (some 23 miles) to cover that distance. Now, if the hon. gentleman from Vancouver thinks there is not sufficient water between the Island and the Mainland to make a marked and distinct difference, I beg to set him right on that point. He has laid great stress on the value of the coal lands, and has stated that they are worth $20,000,000, and that some of them could be sold at the present time for $40 per acre. That may or may not be correct; if he believes it to be correct, I presume he rather refers to the price obtainable from private individuals, because so far as the coal lands held by the Government are concerned, they are held at $10 per acre. The hon. member for Vancouver also says that he does not speak from a sectional point of view. Now, I wish I could think so; I wish sincerely I could accept the statement he makes, and which, doubtlessly, he believes to be correct, but I should require further proof of the fact that he is entirely disinterested in his expression of opinion in this matter. Of course I quite understand the position the hon. gentleman holds. In fact, I have had conversations with him on the subject, and I can understand his being obliged to oppose the sacrifice of these coal lands. But that does not apply to the hon. member for New Westminster, and inasmuch as he admits that millions are spent on the Mainland, surely to goodness he should allow the Island to have a small portion of the expenditure without opposing it. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver to the effect that the Terms of the Union will be thereby changed, I fail to see. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) stated that the promoters of this railway are essentially American. Now, the Bill distinctly shows that the persons who are interested, *i.e.*, the contractors for this railway, are Robert Dunsmuir, John Bryden, and James Dunsmuir—these are the three who have the controlling interest in the Island railway. The

others are Charles Crocker, Charles J. Crocker, jun., Stanford and Huntington, of San Francisco. It is true these gentlemen are largely interested in the Central and Southern Pacific Railways, but what difference does that make with us, since we have to have that railway to make connection with the Mainland in some way, otherwise the trans-continental railway, so far as British Columbia is concerned, is not of the slightest benefit to that particular section of the Province. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) was also good enough to say, in his usual nice and pleasant way, that the gentleman at the head of the firm was backed by the capital of the Union Pacific Railway. Now, I am in a position to know that that company or any person interested in it have nothing to do with the Island railway or with the Settlement Bill which we are now discussing. The Central Pacific have, and so have the Southern Railway people, but the Union Pacific people have nothing whatever to do with it. He also mentioned about the steamship line, but all I can say about it is that if we are always to wait for the most favourable thing which could possibly transpire, to satisfy individual or sectional interests, we might wait till doomsday. Long before I went to British Columbia, steamers were running between San Francisco and Victoria. The Hudson Bay Company endeavoured to start a steamer, with a view of fostering a regular line of mail steamers, but she was shortly afterwards lost, and they never prosecuted that enterprise. The result is, that the mail steamships have ever since been in the hands of Americans, and but for American capital and American enterprise I would like to know where we would have been to-day. If we cannot get what we desire, we must take what we can get our hand on, and wait for more advantageous arrangements when the time arrives. It is not necessary for me to go further into the subject. The matter was thoroughly discussed the other day, when we all stated our views, and what I stated a week ago when the debate came up, I rigidly adhere to. The hon. gentleman from New Westminster said that a number of Bills including some Local Railway Acts passed by the Local Government had been vetoed by the present Administration. Well, we can understand that there are Bills which should be vetoed, if the Local Legislature undertake to legislate upon matters not belonging to them, or which may be detrimental to Dominion interests as a whole, or to Imperial interests generally. Such Bills, of course, would be disallowed; but inasmuch as this Bill has been arranged between the two Governments, and passed the Local House by a very large majority, I cannot see that we have any other matter in particular to enquire into than—have we made a good bargain with British Columbia or not. If we have, we should pass the Bill without further discussion.

Mr. GORDON. I merely wish to remark that the hon. member for Victoria stated that the hon member for Vancouver was obliged to oppose the Bill. I am not obliged to do anything.

Mr. BAKER. I did not say obliged to do it, with the intention of conveying the impression which he evidently thinks I did, but I said I could quite understand his being placed in that position in which he had to do it, holding the views he does.

Mr. GORDON. That is a distinction without a difference. I took the words down to this effect—that the hon. member for Vancouver was obliged to oppose this Bill. I declare, Sir, that I am not obliged to do anything when I come to this House.

Mr. BAKER. You are obliged to do your duty.

Mr. GORDON. In opposing this Bill I am going to do my duty; I am opposing one of the best friends I ever had in British Columbia; but I am opposing this Bill because I believe it to be inimical to the best interests of Canada. I oppose it because I believe its being implemented will be detrimental, not only to the best interests of the commerce of the Pacific coast, but to those of every individual who lives in British Columbia or on that coast. These are the motives which induced me to oppose this Bill. I could have got unbounded praise, Sir, from certain quarters, if I had supported it and kept silent. But I do not come to this Parliament to look for any such favours, and I hope that while I am here, whatever opinions I do express will be formed after careful consideration as to how the matters before the House will affect either Canada, as a whole, or any of the Provinces of Canada. I think the hon. gentleman should at least withdraw that remark, which is objectionable in the highest degree.

Mr. BAKER. I think the hon. member from Vancouver knows me sufficiently well to understand that if I have made a remark to which he has taken umbrage, I must have done it unwittingly and with a view of palliating his opposition, inasmuch as it has been distasteful to him, I withdraw the statement which he alleges I made.

Mr. GORDON. I will simply say that no one can be more anxious than I am to see a railway built between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, believing as I do that it will be a benefit to all the people in that portion of the Province. But, Sir, when we give away all these lands, extending as far as Seymour Narrows, isolating the people of Comox from every chance of enterprise, shutting up from developement these vast reservations which are granted to the company, I say that, notwithstanding my desire to see that railway built, I am of the full belief that it would be in the interest of the Government to build that railway and to manage the coal lands in the wise manner in which they have managed the coal lands in the North-West, and I must oppose the passage of this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The clause which the hon. gentleman introduced into the Bill at the last stage was one referring to the boundary, in the meantime, between British Columbia and Canada; and the hon. gentleman, as he promised, has laid upon the Table and has been kind enough to send across to me, the map by which he supposes in this Act of Parliament to indicate the boundary temporarily. I was very much surprised to find that this map should be accepted by my hon. friends from the Province as a correct representation of British Columbia. It was my misfortune, Sir, to have been misled on a former occasion by this map; and I have often been reminded of that fact. After having looked at the map, and having examined it carefully, I was unfortunate enough to call that country a sea of mountains. This map is my authority for that expression. I understand that if any exception is to be taken to the country, it is that it is rather too level and champain a country for proper drainage, because there is not enough fall to the rivers. Therefore, how can we accept that map now as a proper record of British Columbia, when it has been decided for a number of years that it is not a true representation. Sir, I have been deprived this evening of one of the cherished illusions of my youth. I always hoped that when I came to join the assembly of notables, I should find these notables walking together in brotherly love; but having come into this great assembly, I find Shakespeare and Homer quarrelling. I hope I shall find them once again united to decline to accept this third clause, and to decline to recognize this aspersion on the country from which they come, which would be involved in our agreeing that this map is a correct representation of what British Columbia really is. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if he still persists in this clause, whether he proposes to make any, and if so what, arrangement as to the territory itself. He proposes to give criminal and civil jurisdiction; but, so far as I can judge from the boundary delineated here, there may be difficulties in reference to mining areas; and is it supposed which

country—Canada or British Columbia—shall deal *ad interim* with the interests of the lands?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The same as any of the others.

Mr. BLAKE. But it is not in the clause.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended to introduce a measure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the arrangemant be the same as that between Ontario and Canada, that each Government shall deal on its own side, and that ultimately they shall confirm, and so forth?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no difficulty arising out of territorial questions relating to mineral or timber lands, because the Imperial Act which lays down the boundary speaks of the meridian running in a southerly direction until it strikes the Rocky Mountains, and then along the Rocky Mountains. So that the boundary will be either the water shed, or what British Columbia claims. British Columbia claims that under the fair construction of the Imperial Act, the boundary of that Province is the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains. Well, it is quite clear that it must be the eastern base of the water shed. In the meantime, we take the water shed. Under any circumstances, all to the west of that line must belong to British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. But, as I suggested the other day, the difficulty is to find what the water is. You have not a continuous range of mountains here; you have three or four ranges, and no one can tell what the water shed is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Smyth, Premier of British Columbia, is here at present, and there is a sort of understanding that we shall make an immediate search in the Archives of the Colonial Office, with the view of finding what the intention of Her Majesty's Government was by the passage of that Act. After these papers have been thoroughly examined, the Government will come to some provisional arrangement, subject to the approval of Parliament next Session.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am afraid, Sir, that we are dealing with this matter without taking sufficient interest in it. Perhaps we may not be justified in intermeddling with the affairs of British Columbia, but we are placing vast franchises and powers in the hands of that thrifty Company which has amassed $186,000,000 on an original investment of $20 000,000; which has attempted to control the Legislature and the Supreme Court of the United States, and which has been productive of evil in that country and evil only; and I am afraid that we shall turn round at some future time and lament that we had not examined more carefully into this matter, and into the antecedents of the Central Pacific Railway Company, composed of Messrs. Huntington, Crocker and others, who attempted to get one of their own creatures appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and who have been fighting the United States Government to get them to help them to pay their indebtedness. I am afraid that we are putting into the hands of these men powers that we shall regret having put into their hands before many years pass over our heads.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have not done it. It is British Columbia.

Mr. CHARLTON. I know that we have not done it; but still it is to be lamented that it is being done.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 116) to amend An Act respecting certificates of Masters and Mates of ships, and The Seamen's Act, 1873.—(Mr. McLelan.)

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Small.)

CENTRAL ONTARIO RAILWAY.

Mr. PLATT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 73) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There are two or three important amendments proposed to this Bill which I do not think we can get through in the hour devoted to Private Bills. I would therefore suggest that we do not take it up to-day but go on with other Private Bills.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If the hon. gentleman proposes to move the amendment of which notice is given, and we are to have again the lengthy discussion that we had in the Railway Committee, I have no doubt it will be impossible to get through the Bill before the hour elapses; and as it would only be wasting the time of the House to have an unfinished discussion of the Bill, I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should allow it to stand until the amendment can be fully discussed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is unusual to move important amendments, to a Bill that has come from the Railway Committee where it has been fully discussed.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not unusual to move important amendments provided the House is not taken by surprise; and in order to prevent that, notice has been given on the notice paper two days in advance. These amendments have been on the notice paper since the Railways Committee rose.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I quite agree with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) that, after a Bill is so exhaustively discussed as this Bill was in the Railway Committee, it is almost useless to renew the discussion at this period of the Session in the House, but if my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White) insists upon his right to discuss at length the amendments of which notice has been given, I see no possibility of getting through them in the hour. I know that my hon. friend could talk, if necessary, for not one but three hours without stopping.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman must be aware of course that it means to kill the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. No; because next Wednesday, as I understand the practice of the House, or on Monday, if Private Bills come before Government business, there will be an opportunity of discussing it at length.

Mr. BLAKE. On Monday there is no doubt that, by the Order of the House, Private Bills will come on after questions, so there will be an opportunity of getting through the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. In that case, perhaps it would be better to let the Bill remain until Monday.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. member for East York is under a misapprehension, if he thinks I want to kill the Bill. I have never since I have been in this House tried to kill anyone's Bill, or desired to do so. He is under a mistake if he thinks I want to kill the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; I was under a mistake. I thought the Government had taken Monday. I was not aware of the arrangement.

Mr. PLATT. If it be the desire of the House, I have no objection whatever to let the matter stand until Monday. I only want to be assured that no advantage will be taken of the delay, and that a chance will be afforded for proceeding with the Bill.

Motion postponed.

NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No 80) to amend the Act incorporating the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, were read the second time.

Mr. BELL moved that the said amendment be concurred in.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have understood that the rights of the Napanee and Tamworth road are to some degree involved in the same question that is at issue in reference to the Central Ontario road. If that be the case, and as it is possible that some amendment of this Bill in reference to the Napanee and Tamworth road may also require to be made, I would suggest to my hon. friend who has charge of this Bill, that it also should stand until Monday, because, if these amendments are concurred in, there will be no possibility of amending the Bill without recommitting it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You cannot amend the Bill when it comes back to the House, except in regard to matters introduced by the Senate. You cannot introduce any fresh amendments at that stage.

Amendments concurred in.

AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The debate on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper for the third reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, the Esquimalt Graving Dock, and certain railway lands of the Province of British Columbia granted to the Dominion, and Mr. Gordon's motion in amendment thereto, was resumed.

Amendment (Mr. Gordon) negatived.

Mr. HOMER moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be read the third time this day six months.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost; carried.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the noes have it.

Mr. GORDON. Ring in the members, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not unless five members stand up.

Mr. GORDON. That rule has not been adhered to.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes it has, always.

Amendment (Mr. Homer) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Lennox),	Gillmor,	McCraney,
Cameron (Inverness),	Gordon,	McIsaac,
Catudal,	Homer,	McMullen,
Charlton,	Irvine,	Patterson (Essex),
Cuthbert,	Jackson,	Reid,
Dodd,	Kaulbach,	Somerville (Brant),
Fairbank,	King,	Springer,
Fisher,	Kirk,	Wallace (Albert),
Forbes,	Landerkin,	Wheler.—29.
Foster,	Lister,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Desaulniers,	McGreevy,
Amyot,	Dickinson,	McLelan,
Armstrong,	Dundas,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	Mills,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Moffat,
Béchard,	Fleming,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Fortin,	Mulock,
Belleau,	Gagné,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Paint,
Benson,	Girouard,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Guilbault,	Platt,
Bernier,	Guillet,	Ray,
Billy,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Hall,	Ross,
Bolduc,	Harley,	Scriver,
Bossé,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Small,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Smyth,
Bryson,	Hilliard,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burns,	Holton,	Stairs,
Burpee (St. John),	Hurteau,	Taylor,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jamieson,	Temple,
Cameron (Huron),	Kilvert,	Thompson,
Cameron (Middlesex)	Kinney,	Tilley,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kranz,	Trow,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Landry (Kent),	Tupper (Pictou),
Campbell (Victoria),	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Carling,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Caron,	Laurier,	Wallace (York),
Cartwright,	Lesage,	Watson,
Colby,	Macdonald (King's)	Weldon,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wells,
Coughlin,	McDonald (CapeBreton)	White (Hastings),
Coursol,	Mackenzie,	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Williams,
Davies,	McCallum,	Wilson,
Dawson,	McDougald,	Wood (Brockville).—121
De St. Georges,		

Main motion agreed to on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—RECIPROCITY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIES. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a subject which I think is of vital importance to the interests of this country. I had hoped to bring this matter forward in another shape when we could discuss it more fully, but the rules of the House, and the fact that we are drawing near to the end of the Session, preclude me from bringing it forward at any other time. I refer to the state of matters which will follow the expiration of the fishery articles of the Washington Treaty. It is known to hon. gentlemen that that Treaty will expire on the 1st of July, 1885, and I think at this present Session of Parliament it becomes the duty of the Government, or at any rate the duty of the House, so to express itself that some action may be taken, that negotiations may be opened which will prevent any interregnum occurring between the expiration of that Treaty and the coming into force of a new one, if a new one can be negotiated. I submit that nothing could be more injurious to the interests of Canada as a whole, and nothing could be more injurious to the interests of that particular portion of Canada which is more specially interested in the fishery question, than a return to the state of matters which existed when we had no Treaty between Canada and the United States; and my main object in bringing this matter before the House now is, if possible, to prevent that interregnum, because, unless steps are taken at the present Session of Parliament to discuss the matter, unless the Government assure us that they are about to take steps to open up negotiations, there will certainly be an interregnum. Hon. gentlemen know that whatever Treaty is negotiated must be submitted to this Parliament for final approval, and in order to be so submitted to Parliament it must be negotiated before the next Session. If we are not to take action until the next, Session the expiry of the Treaty will have taken place before a new Treaty can be submitted to Parliament. My excuse in bringing the matter before the House at this late period of the Session is, first,

that no other opportunity is offered to me, as appears by the notice paper; and secondly, that it is absolutely essential, in order to prevent the state of things I have referred to, that the matter should be discussed during the present Session. During the past nine or ten years we have had the fishery articles of the Washington Treaty in force. To some extent they have given satisfaction, and in some quarters they have given dissatisfaction, but I think the experience we have had, both under the Washington Treaty and in the interregnum which took place between that Treaty and the expiration of the old Reciprocity Treaty, and under the period the latter Treaty has been in force, has paved the way and enabled both this Government and the American Government to approach each other in negotiations on a better and safer footing than they were able to do before. There has been one or two opinions held in the United States and in Canada on the subject of reciprocal trade relations between the two countries, which I submit no have foundation whatever in fact; and I believe myself that those opinions which formerly were entertained are not now held to any great extent. There was an opinion held at one time in the United States that the abolition of the Reciprocity Treaty would have the result, if not of ruining Canada, at least of bringing her to sue for political union with the United States. If any such opinion ever was held I am sure the experience of the last ten years must have dissipated it. That opinion can no longer be held by reasonable men who have any knowledge of the history, or of the state of matters existing in Canada. They all know, or ought to know, that whatever may have been in times gone by, whatever feelings may have existed on the part of any portion of our people, whatever desires there may have been towards political union with the United States, that period has gone by. Although I believe it would be for the interests of Canada to have closer commercial relations with the United States than we have now, I believe that even the refusal of the United States to grant such closer commercial privileges would not result in the ruin of Canada, or in driving her to seek political union with that country. Moreover there was an impression held, which I for one did not share, but which was shared to some extent, at any rate, by the people of this country, and fostered to a larger extent by politicians, that Canada, by enacting a high tariff would be able to force the United States into granting her reciprocal commercial privileges. I think, Sir, that idea is also being dissipated, and that we have come to the conclusion that whatever Treaty may be negotiated, we never can hope to force it upon our neighbours, we never can hope to obtain it by resorting to threats of this kind. The bringing into force of a very high Tariff has not proved efficacious, and cannot prove efficacious to obtain reciprocity with our neighbours, when we consider the fact that we are but 4,000,000 of people as opposed to 40,000,000 on the other side. Now, from July, 1885, we will be face to face with the expiration of these fishery articles of the Washington Treaty, and we ought now to make up our minds what course we are going to pursue. There are a number of courses open to us. We may determine, if we are thick-headed enough and stupid enough in our own interests to do it, to endeavour to exclude the Americans altogether from our fisheries; we may determine to throw those fisheries open to them without any compensation; we may determine to levy a tribute upon them, as in times gone by, in the nature of a tonnage duty on their shipping; we may determine to sell them the right to fish in our waters as we did by the articles of the Washington Treaty for a limited number of years; or we might take another course and make the possession of the great national wealth we possess in those waters, the basis of trade negotiations with our neighbours. Now, if we were to adopt the course of throwing open our fisheries to the Americans without any compensation, it would, of course, simply result in ruining our own fishermen. It cannot be imagined for a moment that our fishermen could compete in our own waters on equal terms with the Americans if, when they went to the one market which, for certain portions of their catch, is open to them, they find themselves confronted with a duty of $2 a barrel, while their rival pays no duty. Fishing side by side with their American neighbours on equal terms, having all our ports open to the American fishermen, and then being handicapped with the duty, is a state of things which, of course, has only to be mentioned to meet with disapproval. If we take the second course I have mentioned, and revert to the state of matters which existed between 1866 and 1871, and levy tonnage dues on the American vessels which come into our waters, I think those who have a thorough knowledge of the subject will be prepared to join with me in saying that nothing could be more unsatisfactory. It is unsatisfactory from every standpoint. It is unsatisfactory, because the Americans constantly and persistently evaded payment of the tonnage dues. It is unsatisfactory because the efforts to enforce the payment of the dues resulted, during the five or six years the scheme was tried, a great deal of heart-burning, ill-feeling and national antipathy. I think the Government acknowledged it was unsatisfactory; and those who were present while the evidence was taken before the Halifax Commission, and those who have taken the trouble to read that evidence as printed, cannot but come to the conclusion that when the dues were raised beyond a nominal sum, a large portion of the American fleet constantly fished within our limits without paying such dues. As regards opening our waters on the same terms as we have opened them to Americans for the past ten years, namely, for a sum of money to be assessed by arbitration, I may say is an unsatisfactory mode of solving the difficulty. We know the difficulty that occured in settling the matter at the Halifax Commission; that the award was not satisfactory to either country; that Canada did not recieve half she claimed, or half what those who understood the question thought she was entitled to receive; that there was very great disgust felt in many parts of the Dominion at the small sum awarded. On the other hand, the Americans thought they paid too much, and those interested in fostering ill-feeling between Canada and the United States endeavoured by every means in their power, by misrepresentations in their press and other means, to induce the people of the United States to believe they had paid for the privilege a larger sum than they ought to have paid. To my mind, that mode of solving the difficulty is an unsatisfactory one. It is not a dignified position for a country like Canada to take, possessing, as she does, valuable territorial rights, which I venture to say are as valuable, if not more valuable, than those possessed by almost any other country in the world, to offer to sell them for so many dollars to her neighbour. There is another course which I have suggested, and it is one which our best statesmen and thinking men have approved of, not only the statesmen who have charge of public affairs to-day but those who had charge years ago, and that is, that those great territorial rights in our fishing waters should be made use of by us as a lever by which to obtain in return for them commercial privileges, advantages, and rights, from the United States. I find that in 1871, I think it was, when the right hon. gentleman, the present First Minister was in charge, he entertained the same idea that I have now the honour to submit to the House—that it was inconsistent with our dignity, and was not a proper mode of dealing with our fishing rights, to sell them to any one for a sum of money. At a meeting of Council on July 27th, 1871, at which the right hon. gentleman was present, and at which there were also the present Minister of Railways,

Minister of Public Works, and Minister of Finance, this subject was reviewed, and in an able Minute of Council they laid down the following as the correct principle :—

"The principle of a money payment for the concession of territorial right has ever been most repugnant to the feelings of the Canadian people, and has only been entertained in deference to the wishes of the Imperial Government. What the Canadians were willing, under the circumstances, to accept as an equivalent, was the concession of certain commercial advantages, and it has therefore been most unsatisfactory to them that Her Majesty's Government should have consented to cede the use of in-shore fisheries to foreigners for considerations which are deemed wholly inadequate."

I think the right hon. gentleman in that minute of Council struck the right key note. I think, though the Government were obliged at that time, owing to the pressure brought on this country by the Imperial Government, to submit to the cession of those privileges for a money compensation, that the opinion which the right hon. gentleman stated, did exist in the minds of the people against that course, and it exists to-day to a greater extent; and I hope before this debate closes, some expression of opinion will be given by the First Minister, showing that he entertains now the same statesman-like view of this great and important question which he entertained and expressed at that time in the minute of Council. I think anyone who looks at the current of public opinion in the United States, who looks at the expression of the official opinion that has been given there lately, will see that the Americans themselves are keenly alive to the importance of those fisheries, and are keenly alive to the necessity that exists that they should have access to them. I will take the liberty of quoting to the House a paragraph on this subject, which appeared in the Message of the President of the United States, on 5th December last. The President said :

"Notice of the termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington was duly given to the British Government, and the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of the Treaty will accordingly cease on July 1st, 1885.

"The fisheries industries, pursued by a numerous class of our citizens on the northern coasts both of the Alantic and Pacific Oceans, are worthy of the fostering care of Congress. Whenever brought into competition with the like industries of other countries, our fishermen, as well as our manufactures of fishing appliances and preparers of fish products, have maintained a foremost place. I suggest that Congress create a Commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries and the means of opening to our citizens, under just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

Every one will admit that it was prudent, proper and statesman-like to take time by the forelock and suggest the appointment of a Commission to investigate this question. I say nothing of the reference the President made to the consideration of the general question of their rights to the fisheries. Those rights I do not think require any clearer definition than the usage of a century has given them. The rights of the Americans are clearly defined by the Treaty of 1818, and it is too late in the day for any statesman to seek to reopen that question, which was once a burning one, but which was settled by the Treaty I have named. Under that Treaty the Americans have the right to fish outside of the three mile limit, and not inside of that limit. But I presume the President intended to refer, in the words I have quoted, to the contention the Americans make—and it is a very important contention—that they have the right to fish within three miles following the configuration or sinuosities of the coast, which is in opposition to the view maintained by Canadians, and maintained also by British statesmen, although in a half-hearted way, at times—that the Americans have only the right to fish outside of a three-mile line drawn from headland to headland. Into that question I shall not enter. I had an opportunity of looking into it at some length, and with some care, some years ago, and I formed a pretty strong opinion on it. I merely refer to it to show that in the absence of a Treaty there is a question which will almost surely give rise to a very great deal of international difficulty.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the men who command the American fishing vessels, when they are pursuing their trade eagerly, and when they find that their prey is escaping from them and going into limits which they should not go inside of, are apt to disregard ths law and the Treaty limits, and to take the fish where they can find them, relying upon the chances of escaping detection or of their Government backing them up if they are detected. They further rely upon their right to fish inside of the headland line. Well, I do not think they have that right. I think the evidence taken, and the series of State papers which are compiled and found in the records of the Fishery Commission, show conclusively that they have not; but we should never lose sight of the fact that while they may not have by law or Treaty that right, they have always persistently claimed it; and they are prepared, as I see by reports in some of their papers, when the Treaty expires, to claim it again. I mention this to show one of the difficulties which will arise unless this question is disposed of. Now, if time had permitted, and if I had had an opportunity at an earlier period of the Session, I would have liked to have called attention, at greater length than I can on the present occasion, to the importance of these fisheries. Many gentlemen who do not reside near the sea coasts have but a faint idea of the vast mine of wealth which encircles our coasts, and a faint idea even of the coasts themselves. We know that we have nearly 4,000 miles of coast, which is surrounded by waters teeming with the most valuable fish, and although we who come from the Maritime Provinces or have studied the question, know that, while in some years the fish are not as good or as plentiful as in others, still, taking it year in and year out, there are no fishing grounds in America, at least, equal in richness and vastness to ours. We know also that the United States have a vast amount of money and wealth invested in these fisheries. I made a small compilation of figures from their statistics, with which we I will venture to trouble the House. I find, leaving out of account the money invested in fisheries with which have no concern, confining myself to the cod and mackerel fisheries, the United States last year had 78,000 tons of shipping engaged in these fisheries alone. I find that, leaving the cod fishing out of the question, they had over 358 vessels engaged in the mackerel fisheries, employing over 5,000 men as sailors and fishermen, and making a catch of over 226,000 barrels of mackerel. Now, of that large number of vessels, I find by their own returns that sixty-three were engaged in fishing in our waters, and, that they caught there over 28,000 barrels of fish. I wish upon this point to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that while the American returns show that sixty-three vessels were engaged in catching fish in our waters last year, our statistics with reference to this important matter are so badly kept, that they show a very much smaller number so engaged. I turned up the Report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the only reference made to the number of American vessels engaged in the mackerel fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence last year was, that fifty vessels were so engaged. Well, Sir, this is a very important matter, and when the Halifax Fishery Commission sat, one of the greatest difficulties we had to contend with was the difficulty of obtaining accurate and careful information. In some instances this difficulty was found to be insurmountable, and I hesitate not to say that we could have obtained evidence as full as we hoped to have obtained it, as full as we had good reason to expect we could have obtained it, respecting the number of American vessels that fished in our waters, the award which we got would have been much larger. I had hoped, finding this difficulty which confronted us almost from the first day the Commission sat, and knowing the difficulties which might arise if a question of the same kind was again referred to arbitration, knowing that we would have met the same difficulty again—I had

hoped that steps would be taken to provide for the compilation of accurate statistics on this vital point. It has not been done, and I think it is a great pity. I think we may find some day that it would be a great loss to us that it has not been done. I think it might easily have been done, not with absolute accuracy, but with approximate accuracy—that is, to test the number of ships which enter our bays from year to year and the catch of fish they take there. Now, I find, as I say, that our fishery reports only show that there were fifty American vessels engaged in that trade. But on turning to the Annual Report of the Boston Fish Bureau, I find there were no less than sixty-three. I ask the House to allow me to read one paragraph from this Report:

"The Massachusetts catch the past season amounted to 168,811 barrels, against 258,382 barrels in 1882, a large decrease of 89,571 barrels. The Southern fleet numbering 129 sail, as usual of late years, they started early, sailing March 12, landing the first catch in New York, March 31. The early catch was followed with fair success, mostly being landed fresh accounts for the small amount of cured fish reported as taken South. The fish were found to be abundant and of mixed sizes. As the season advanced, the fleet worked off the New England shores, fewer fish constantly being seen. The fishermen being of the opinion that a large body of mackerel were off this coast, but did not show themselves, were not willing to leave the favoured grounds of the past few years. About 50 sail went to North Bay in July, returning with poor reports and few fish; later in the season the catch not improving and more favourable reports having been received from North Bay, quite a fleet once more went there, returning with fine fares of fish of a fair quality and size. The total number of United States vessels fishing in North Bay during the season being 63, with a catch of 28,666 barrels. The catch off the New England shores amounted to 185,019 barrels; the Southern catch, 13,000; total catch of salted mackerel by the New England fleet, 226,685; a decrease of 152,178 barrels from that of the previous year. The schooner "Edward W. Webster," Captain Soloman Jacobs, as for several years, is once more "high line" with the following fine record. Sailed from Gloucester March 15, hauled up November 20, during which time, with a crew of 17 men, caught 2,160 barrels of mackerel that were salted, and 400,000 mackerel were sold fresh, realizing gross $27,440.00, or net $25,700.00, the crew sharing $709.75 each. During the season three trips were made to North Bay and 1,100 barrels of the catch taken there. Captain Jacobs adds to his report: 'It is my opinion the body of large mackerel will be in North Bay in 1884, and the small fish off this shore.' The catch of the Prince Edward Island fishermen is estimated as 10 per cent. over that of the previous year, with a slight improvement in quality. The Nova Scotia catch also shows an increase. Of the provincial catch, 75,226 barrels came to this market, against 37,616 in 1882."

So we see that although we had not during the past season the large fleets of American vessels which once frequented the Gulf of St. Lawrence in search of fish, we have had the large number of sixty-three, or thirteen more than our report gives. And we must remember two facts in comparing the number of vessels which now frequent that Gulf with the number which were there years ago. One is, that the vessels are much larger now than they formerly were, and the other that the appliances they possess at present are much superior to those which the old vessels possessed, and therefore the same number of vessels would make a much larger catch than they would years ago. Now, Sir, I wish to make the same complaint with reference to our Trade and Navigation Returns. They do not show with any degree of accuracy the quantity of fish caught and exported from the Maritime Provinces, and this is a very important and serious matter. When we were at the Halifax Fishery Commission, and the evidence was being taken, the Trade and Navigation Returns were asked by the American counsel to be taken as absolutely binding against us, and when a certain number of barrels were shown by the returns to have been caught, the Americans asked us to accept the number as binding, because as they said the Canadians would be sure not to put down a less number than were caught; and this, I must confess, seemed to be a reasonable argument. Why, Sir, when I turned up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and saw the quantity alleged to have been caught and exported from Prince Edward Island alone, I knew from my own knowledge that the returns were inaccurate; and when I applied to the leading fish merchants and told them the number, they laughed at it, and said it was ridiculous. Those returns state that 45,285 barrels of pickled mackerel were exported from the Maritime Provinces to the United States last year. On turning up the Report of the Boston Fish Bureau, I find that 75,000 barrels are there stated to have been received from the Maritime Provinces in Boston alone. So that there was a mistake in these returns of 30,000 barrels in the article of mackerel alone. I say that these things ought not so to be. Our statistics in reference to this great fishing industry of ours should be more accurate; they should be so reliable that in any future negotiations we may be able to refer to them with the assurance that they have been compiled with approximate accuracy. Passing from that discrepancy in the returns, I wish to bring to the notice of the House the fact that while we caught 75,000 barrels last year, the Americans caught in our waters 28,000 barrels, making a total of 103,000 taken from our waters to the United States, or one-third of the entire consumption of mackerel in the United States.

Mr. McNEILL. About what would the value be?

Mr. DAVIES. That is a very fair question to ask. The value of mackerel depends very much on the class. These fish vary very much in price. No. 1 mackerel this year are worth $20 a barrel; No 2, $14, and No 3, $10. The hon. gentleman will be able to judge from these prices about what the value would be. The value of these fish is enormous; and this year the prices are a little higher, owing to the fact that the catch on the American coast has been smaller than usual. Hon. gentlemen will see that this is not the most certain industry in the world. Mackerel off the American coast are one year abundant, and the next year very scarce. This is a precarious business; and I want to come to that point, to show how absolutely necessary it is to the Americans to have access to our waters. You will find, on turning to their statistics, that they have now employed in the mackerel fisheries no less than 358 vessels, of over 40,000 tons, which are valued at over $2,000,000. The point I want to come to is the importance of these vessels having the right of access for fishing purposes in our waters. Some years you will hear the Americans say it is of no importance to them at all to get access to the Canadian waters. I say it is of vital importance, for this reason, that the immense amount of money involved in that industry requires to have a sure return and without that access they cannot have that return. In certain years the American fishermen go out and fish off their own coast and make a reasonable return. They may succeed, as they have sometimes done, in making a good catch off their own coast, for five years in succession. Then will come a cycle of years—perhaps three or four in succession—when the fish on their own coast are very scarce, and then it is absolutely necessary for them to have access to British American waters, because, if they do not, the vast amount of money invested in the mackerel fishing industry makes no return, and the immense number of men employed become dissatisfied and leave the business. Then, they will say again, we can catch all we want outside of the three-mile limit. I won't go into that matter, because, if there was one thing that was proved before the Halifax Fishery Commission, beyond all doubt, it was, that if the Americans were excluded from the three-mile limit they could not catch mackerel in paying quantities at all. The quantity of mackerel caught by them inside the limits just made the difference between a successful and an unsuccessful venture. Therefore, I say that admission into the three-mile limit is a very great boon to them; and I say more than that—looking at the vast amount of money invested in that industry, the great number of men employed in it, and the precarious character of the fishing off their own coast, it is an absolute necessity to them to have access to our waters, and I believe they will be prepared to give us in return a fair and reasonable trade compensation. Now, it has been argued by the Americans that they did give us compensation when they

took off the duty. I am not going into the great question of who pays the duty on the mackerel—the consumer or the producer. The general question has been debated very often in this House, but it is not applicable to this peculiar business. The question in this case depends simply on whether or not the home consumption at the time is equal to the home demand. If the Americans have a good fishing season off their own coast, if their vessels catch enough to supply their own demand, and we force our own fish in at a time when their demand is already supplied, the chances are that we have to pay the duty, or at any rate a portion of it; but under other circumstances, when they do not catch sufficient off their own coast to supply the demand, then, the demand not being supplied by themselves, the price will go up until the foreign producer is tempted to supply the market for them. In that case the consumer pays the duty. I acknowledge that in some years we have to pay the duty to some extent —and I am now speaking, mark you, of only one species of fish, for which the Americans give us our sole market; but ordinarily, we do not pay the duty, because they do not catch enough off their own coast to supply the demand, and the price goes up sufficiently to tempt us to supply it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a great politiea[1] heresy.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think it is a political heresy at all. I will repeat the proposition if you like.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman agrees with me he will have to reverse his policy in some other directions. There are particular exceptional circumstances, when if the Americans catch enough to supply the demand and we send in our fish, we have to pay a portion of the duty. But what I want to submit is this, that this business of fishing is so precarious in its character, the amount of money required to be invested to make it successful is so large and heavy, that every drawback to its successful prosecution should, if possible, be removed. We should not be subject to the possibility of being obliged, at the time we have made a fair catch, to pay a duty to a foreign country when we sell them our fish. A business which in itself is precarious, is made more precarious still by the chance, that under some conceivable circumstances, we may be obliged to pay, from time to time, a portion of the duty. The American market, as I said, is the best market we have for our mackerel; it is the only market for our No. 1 mackerel. I see the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) opposite me, and he knows we have a market in the West Indies for a certain portion of Nos. 2 and 3, but our chief market, the market where we get the best prices, where our best fish is consumed, where the demand is for our best fish, in the American market and the American market alone. That will be best seen by reference to the tables of our catch and export. I find, by our Trade and Navigation Returns, that last year of 67,449 barrels of mackerel exported by the Dominion, the United States took 45,285 barrels; of our export of codfish, 725,334 quintals, the United States took 175,439; of fresh herring, our export in all amounted to 1,409,050 pounds, worth $26,857, all of which was taken by the United States; and I believe nearly the whole of it came from the county of Charlotte, and, as my hon. friend who represents that county tells me, our statistics do not contain over a quarter of our export of this kind of herring, they are as faulty and incorrect as I have shown them to be with reference to other fish. It is a most deplorable fact, and one to which I hope the hon. Minister will direct his attention, that our returns do not show even one-quarter the amount of fresh herring exported. Of pickled herring, we exported 123,883 barrels, valued at $500,000, and of this the United States took to the extent of 80,915 barrels; of smoked herring, we exported 8,452,529 pounds all of which was taken by the United States; other sea fish we exported to the value of $150,000, and of this the United States took $143,000 worth; other fresh fish we exported to the value of $240,912 and the United States took it all. Those figures show that the great market for our fish is the United States; and we cannot expect for many years to come, at any rate, to have any other market for our fresh fish, nor can we hope, for years to come, to have as good a market for our salted or pickled mackerel or herring as we have in the United States. Those are the facts with reference to this fishing industry, and I think hon. members will see that it is vitally important for us, that this question should be so arranged, that the admission of our fish to the American markets should be so settled, that when the present Treaty expires the new arrangements made will be able to go into force without any intervening space, without any interregnum. It is important that we should not be subjected to any of the international difficulties which were caused from 1868 to 1871 by the seizure of American vessels for breach of the laws under the Treaty of 1818; no one desires to see that state of matters occur again. I remember very well the time when, every few months, an American fishing vessel was dragged into port for infraction of these Treaty laws, went through the Admiralty Court, was put up at auction and sold. The result was that heartburning and illfeeling was engendered, not only on the part of shipowners and crews, but also in the shipping ports, the towns of Gloucester and West Haven, and all the towns along the American coast. And this ill-feeling and heartburning was spread, through the medium of the newspapers, all over the country. No one desires that such a state of affairs should again recur. Therefore, it is eminently desirable that this important question should engage the attention of our statesmen without delay; it is eminently desirable that they should impress on the Home Government the necessity of giving it every consideration, and that that they should enter into negotiations, during the recess, so that the result of their action may be known to this Parliament at its meeting next Session. Let me call the attention of the House, for a few moments, to a few figures in connection with the Reciprocity Treaty which formerly existed, and to the importance of getting it renewed. What I maintain is this, that the existence of reciprocal trade relations is mutually beneficial to both countries. That is evident from the fact that the trade of both countries increased very largely under the existence of those reciprocal trade relations, and that after those relations ceased, and we were relegated to the old system of a Chinese wall between the two countries, our trade ceased to increase—has remained almost stationary; and a trade which might be four times as large as it is now, has been dwarfed and kept stationary by the erection of these Chinese barriers. In 1852, before the Reciprocity Treaty came into force, the aggregate trade between the British Provinces and the United States was $17,000,000; under the stimulus given to our trade relations by the operation of that Reciprocity Treaty, it rose from the small sum of $17,000,000, during the ten years the Treaty was in force, until it reached, in 1866, the last year of the Treaty, $82,000,000; and, Sir, these trade relations were not beneficial to Canada or Canadians alone, but were equally beneficial to our neighbours across the line. Trade does not take place between a man and his neighbour unless they both find it beneficial, and the profits reaped on both sides from that trade were very large. I remember well that before that time, in the Maritime Provinces particularly, we were considered what is called a poor people; the Americans had the idea that our soil was sterile and unproductive, and our climate cold and forbidding, but under the

stimulus given by the opening up of fresh markets on both sides, they found our country was a rich country; that it yielded handsome returns in agricultural productions. We found that we grew richer through this interchange of commerce under the reciprocity treaty. Land went up in value, people had more hope and confidence in the future, and, I venture to say, there never was a period in the history of the Maritime Provinces when the wealth of those Provinces increased in the same ratio as it did during the period in which the Reciprocity Treaty was in operation. Confining myself to the Maritime Provinces, I find that the aggregate trade between them and the United States in 1854, the first year of the Treaty, amounted to $6,899,792; in 1864—I cannot get the returns for 1866, but they showed a much larger amount than the returns of 1864—it had risen to $20,276,615. I believe myself, but I have not the returns at hand to verify my statement, that the trade reached nearly $30,000,000 in 1866; but, at any rate, confining myself to the returns I have, I find that during those two periods the aggregate trade had risen from $6,000,000 to $20,000,000. What has been the result since? The aggregate trade between the British Provinces and the United States had reached to $32,000,000 in 1866, the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty. What is it now? I am sorry to say that our trade has not since then increased. Last year the aggregate trade between Canada and the United States, excluding of course British Columbia and Manitoba, which I have to exclude for the purpose of my comparison—last year that trade, instead of increasing and being over $100,000,000 rather fell off, and it is a little below $82,000,000 —$81,729,894; so we have the extraordinary fact existing that while those reciprocal trade relations were in force, our trade multiplied and increased with a rapidity almost unparallelled, and since that time it has remained dwarfed and stationary, at the figures I have given you. In 1866, old Canada, comprising Ontario and Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, exported to the United States over $43,000,000 worth; in 1883 that export had fallen off to $35,910,404. We all know that we do not export our produce to a country without getting profits upon it. Hon. gentleman may say: But we have found new channels of trade, our trade, has gone elsewhere. It is true we have been compelled to go elsewhere, but the point I want to make is this: that we can trade with mutual advantage with our neighbours to the south of us, and more profitably than we can with those who live in distant climates; that nature has given us the power to produce certain things cheaper than they can produce them, and they can produce certain things that we want cheaper than we can; and the mutual interchange was mutually profitable, and a growing trade grew up which, since the abrogation of these reciprocal trade relations, has been warped and stopped. The total exports of this Dominion are $94,037,480, of which Great Britain takes $47,145,217, and the United States $37,620,399, leaving for all other countries $9,271,864. These figures show that, in spite of the barriers raised up by both countries and the high Tariff duties the United States put on our articles which their people require, and the taxes we put on the goods they produce and which we want, the exports of this country to the United States last year was $37,620,399 and of that $35,962,000 were the produce of Canada. If we analyze that, we find that, of the products of the mine, we sent to the United States $2,198,014 worth, and to Great Britain $443,831 worth; of the fisheries, to the United States $3,186,218, and to Great Britain $2,337,072; of the forest, to the United States $9,916,040, and to Great Britain $13,027,337; of animals and their products, to the United States $5,567,588, and to Great Britain $13,158,194; of agricultural products, to the United States $11,989,280, and to Great Britain $9,474,740; of manufactures, $1,603,274 to the United States, and $1,211,189 to Great Britain; and of miscellaneous, to the United States $502,050, and to Great Britain $19,741 worth. I will not go through other statistics that I have here, showing the effect upon the different Provinces, because I recognize the fact that the Session is drawing to a close, and that I have not the right, although this is an important subject, to occupy much time; but before I sit down, I will call the attention of hon. gentlemen to a few of the leading articles we export from Canada, and the proportion which the United States takes of those articles. Of horses, we export 13,019, of which the United States took last year $12,630; of horned cattle, we exported 66,396, of which the United States took 23,280; of swine, we exported 3,858, and they took practically all; of sheep, we exported 308,478, and they took 228,541; of poultry and other animals, we exported 161,229, and they took practically all; of eggs, we exported 13,451,410 dozen, and they took all. The trade in that apparently trivial article has increased to enormous proportions, and last year we exported over thirteen millions of dozens. Certain interested parties in the States are now proposing that a duty shall be put on our eggs. I think it would be a lamentable thing for the consumer, as well as those who export, if that should be so.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I have no doubt the hon. member from Cape Breton would find that his interests would be affected by it. Of hides and skins, last year we exported $460,983 worth, and the United States took it all; of wool, we exported 1,375,572 pounds, and they took it all; of barley, 8,817,216 bushels, and they took it all; of beans, we exported 142,422 bushels, and they took it all; of oats, we exported 1,024,053 bushels, and the United States took 607,953 bushels; of rye, we exported 1,047,809, and they took it all; of hay, we exported 93,740 tons, and they took 89,000 tons; of malt, we exported 1,329,958 bushels, and they took it all; and of potatoes, 2,424,979 bushels, and the United States took 2,181,631. Now, I have read over these main productions of our farm, in order to show hon. gentlemen that the main articles we export, the produce of the farm, are consumed and purchased from us by our American neighbours, and it is therefore of the greatest importance to us, as well as of importance to them, that the trade relations between the two countries should be made as free as the political exigencies and the revenue requirements of the countries will permit, and if it is so made, it will be mutually beneficial to both parties. I propose to submit a Resolution to the House, embodying my view on this point, and that resolution contains a statement that it is desirable, in any negotiations that shall be entered into between Canada and the United States, that Canada should be represented by a nominee of her own. I take it that will meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know it has met with the approval of the right hon. gentleman in times gone by, and I feel sure that it will meet with his approval now. We have had sad experience of trusting the regulation of our territorial interests to those who did not understand them, and the regulation of our commercial interests to those who were appointed by the Mother Country alone and who did not possess that knowledge which no one but a Canadian can possess. We have had experience, on the other hand, that when our negotiations are conducted by Canadians themselves they result, not in our being over-reached or in our coming out second best, but at any rate in our interests being fairly and fully and properly represented. I think, if we can only recall the Treaty which was entered into some years ago and negotiated by a nominee of the Crown without consultation with Canada, the Treaty known as the Ashburton Treaty, whereby Canada lost millions of acres of most valuable land, which I believe, and almost every statesman in Canada believes, belong to her, we shall see how dangerous

it would be that our interests in this matter should be decided upon or negotiated by a gentleman who does not possess the full knowledge he should possess of Canadian interests. I will not trouble the House any longer. I have taken up much longer time than I intended to do, and the importance of the question is my only justification. I move, seconded by Mr. Charlton, that all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted:—

In view of the notice of the termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that Treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken, at an early day, by the Government of Canada, with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new Treaty, providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States; the reciprocal privileges of fishing and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries; and that in any such negotiations Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government.

Mr. HACKETT. It is not my intention to make any lengthened remarks on this subject. The question, however, is one of great importance to the people of Canada, and I feel I would not be doing my duty were I to give a silent vote upon it. I listened with great attention to the hon gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davies), and, I think, it must be a matter of gratitude for us all that an hon. gentleman of the Opposition should rise in this House and completely justify the action of the right hon. leader of the Government as regards the Washington Treaty. I think that hon. gentleman must have forgotten the position taken by his party at the time the ratification of that Treaty was before this Parliament, in 1872; he must have forgotten that at the time the right hon. gentleman, in one of the finest parliamentary efforts of his life, introduced that Treaty to the consideration of this House, it was opposed at every step by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who now come forward and advocate a renewal of that Treaty. I will trouble the House for a moment by reading a few remarks made on that occasion by hon. gentlemen opposite. The mover of this Resolution stated that he feared Canada might be absorbed by the United States. Well, Sir, when the Washington Treaty was ratified, it was argued by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition that it would lead to annexation, and that Canada would eventually become a part of the United States. I find on folio 110 of the *Debates* of 1872, that the leader of the late Government (Mr. Mackenzie) said:

"They did not know what course the Administration might take, but they knew this, that as public men they were bound to take an attitude in relation to that Treaty, and having maturely considered everything in connection with it, they came to the determination that as patriotic public men their duty was clearly to reject the Treaty."

He also said:

"If the Government carries the Bill, as he had no doubt they would he would be able to refer at some future day to what he had said to-night in order to show that he, at least, had raised his voice in protest against the national wrong and degradation."

Now, Sir, what great change has come over the hon. gentleman since. Will he raise his voice to-night in opposition, when a prominent supporter of that party gets up and strongly advocates a renewal of that Treaty? I think he will not. I find that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated on that occasion:

"They should feel entirely satisfied that before the Treaty was ratified we did not make a mistake—by one fell sweep we should not destroy the hopes and blast the prospects of this country."

It was going to destroy and blast forever the prospects of the country at that time.

"Holding up the Treaty in his hands, he said: Here was the hole through which America would get possession of this country.

"As to the merit of the fishery articles, he maintained that the expense that would be incurred in preventing frauds of the revenue would be quite as much as had been hitherto expended in the total exclusion of Americans from Canadian waters."

Mr. DAVIES.

Mr. Anglin also said:

"It might be said that this was the best that could have been obtained, but he, for one, was not satisfied to barter away our fisheries for any such paltry price; and, as far as his voice and vote would go, he would resist any such attempt to dispose of them."

Now, Sir, it must be gratifying to hon. gentlemen occupying the Ministerial benches, and to their supporters, to find that after a lapse of ten years that Treaty has become so popular that hon. gentlemen opposite are very uneasy lest it should not be renewed. All the hon. members from the Maritime Provinces know that this Treaty has proved of great advantage to the fishermen of those Provinces. Much has been said with regard to who pays the duty. The fishermen of the Maritime Provinces are well aware that when they entered their fish for sale on the wharves of Boston or New York, they had to pay the duty. They knew their fish came into competition with the fish of the United States, and the American fisherman coming in with his cargo on one side of the wharf, and the Canadian fisherman with his cargo on the other side of the wharf, the Canadian found that he came into direct competition with the American fisherman, and before he could place his fish on the market, he was obliged to go to the American Custom House and pay a duty of $2 per barrel, while at the same time he did not receive one cent higher price. This shows that the consumer in the United States did not pay the duty, but that it was paid by the Canadian fisherman. On that occasion it was argued clearly and well that the ratification of the Washington Treaty would give such an impetus to the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces that the exports of fish to the United States would largely increase. I am pleased to find that that argument has been verified, and that a very large increase has taken place in the principal product of the fisheries finding a market in the United States. Although the hon. gentleman said much with regard to the United States furnishing a market for our fish, we know there are markets outside the United States for several of the articles of fish produced in Canada. There is one article especially, mackerel, caught in Canada, the principal market for which is in the United States, and which is always eagerly sought after in that country. I find that in 1874, one year after the Treaty came into operation, the exports of mackerel from Canada to the United States were 80,474 barrels, amounting in value to $712,448. I find that the exports, according to Provinces, were: From Quebec, 164 barrels; from Nova Scotia, 71,160 barrels; from New Brunswick, 2,561 barrels; from Prince Edward Island, 6,589 barrels. Now, I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1882—and the hon. gentleman endeavoured to make it appear that these returns are very inaccurate—however, I find that the exports in 1882 to the United States were 110,352½ barrels of mackerel, being an increase over the former period of 29,978½. Since that time the canning industry has been started in Canada, and I find that in 1882 we exported 42,600 cans from Nova Scotia; 120,642 from New Brunswick; 430,819 from Prince Edward Island, or a total value of mackerel exported to the United States from Canada, of $1,181,656.85, or an increase of $469,228.85, showing that the Washington Treaty has stimulated this particular branch of the fishing industry and has increased it 50 per cent. or more during the last ten years. This is quite sufficient to show that the Washington Treaty had a very beneficial effect upon the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces. The Treaty had been beneficial not only in stimulating trade between the two countries in this regard, but it has also been beneficial in this respect, that a very large amount of money has found its way into the Dominion Treasury. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said it is a wrong principle to barter away rights of this kind; but we know it was necessary in the interests of the two countries that this Treaty should be negotiated. We believe,

and our belief has been proved to be correct, that the privileges surrendered by the United States were less than those surrendered by Canada, and it was only fair that the United States should be called on to pay to Canada compensation for additional privileges thus obtained. So we not only gained by that Treaty the freedom of the markets of the United States for fish, but also $4,500,000 in cash. Although we gained those privileges, still the advantages were not altogether on the side of Canada, because the United States have found in Canada a market for a large quantity of their fish. We know that when our fish go to Boston or New York, it is not consumed at those points, but it finds its way to the western country. Under our policy of building up the North-West, with a large population going in there year after year, it is only reasonable to assume that in a few years we shall have a good market for our fish in our own North-West. Taking that view of the matter, I find, as I have said, a large quantity of American fish comes into Canada, and the United States have received some advantage in this regard. In 1882, we purchased from the Americans fish to the value of $603,440. I find, on looking over the descriptions of fish thus brought in, that the qualities are the same as our own, and that in one item alone, that of oysters, the import value was no less than $260,568. In Prince Edward Island we have valuable oyster fisheries, but they are not developed as they might be, simply because we find we cannot secure a market in Canada. The people of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, and Hamilton, and all the large cities in the west, are supplied with oysters from the United States, and we are able to sell a comparatively small proportion of our fish. It is of great importance to the fishermen of Prince Edward Island that they should be protected in this repect, and if the United States are going to tax our fish cans and resort to similar measures, the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces should be protected, and the oyster fishermen of Prince Edward Island should be protected in the markets of Canada. With respect to the general question, it is of great importance that the Treaty should be renewed if possible. It is very improper, imprudent and unwise to rise and make speeches and state that we are totally dependent on the markets of the United States. We should not approach the Americans in that manner; we should approach them, if at all, in a manly, independent spirit. In fact, overtures on this occasion should come from the United States and not from Canada. We have approached them on several occasions, and they have rejected the offers made by Canada. It would be more in accordance with the dignity of Canada and the genius of our people to allow the Americans to make the first overtures in this direction. While I think it is very desirable to enter into a reciprocal arrangement with the United States, I would say this: It would be very undesirable to have partial reciprocity. I know there is a Bill before Congress at the present time, providing that several articles of Canadian production be admitted duty free or at a low duty, and I know it is part of the policy of the Government, and is embodied in the Tariff Act, that when the duty is taken off Canadian articles, similar duties will be removed here. If we are to have reciprocity with the United States, and we find the people of the United States are desirous to treat with us in this regard, we should not have partial reciprocity; we should not have reciprocity as regards coal and lumber and leave the products of the farm in the same position as before, but we should have reciprocity in the products of the fisheries, the mine, the forest, and the farm. In Prince Edward Island we sell a large proportion of our produce in the United States. We grow a large quantity of potatoes. We are obliged to seek a market in the United States and we can only sell them there when there is a short crop there and high prices, because there is a duty of 15 cents per bushel. Our potatoes come into competition with those grown in Maine; and as regards the duty, we are aware that the consumer does not pay it, but that our growers are obliged to pay it. The potatoes exported from the Island for the year ending 30th June, 1883, amounted to 722,893 bushels, on which 15 cents per bushel duty was paid, making the value $108,441. The fact of the potatoes coming into competition with those of the United States would have a tendency to reduce the price after paying the duty. That is obvious to any person who has studied the question. Another article we sell largely to the United States is horses. Last year the people of the Island sold to traders in the United States from 800 to 1,000 horses, which were taxed at 20 per cent. That duty is paid by the people of the Island. I would, under these circumstances ask the Government, not to enter into any negotiations for partial Reciprocity; but if we are to have reciprocity, let us have it on the basis of the Treaty of 1854, a Treaty which would include the products of the fisheries, of the forest, and of the farm. I do not think I need deal with this question at any greater length. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has introduced this Resolution as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. It is not a proper time, it is not a fair way to deal with members of this House. Much as we desire to see reciprocity with the United States, we also desire to see this Government sustained, and I think it very improper that an important matter of this kind should be made a party matter, for, although the hon. gentleman said he ignored party, he treated the question from the narrowest party standpoint, and he brings it before the House in the endeavour to embarrass the Government, when they are trying to have the House vote the supplies to carry on the business of the country. Now, he has made it part of the resolution that a representative from Canada should appear in the negotiations between the United States and England for a renewal of reciprocity. I say that that is not necessary, for we have an hon. gentleman in this House at the present time who has been treated very harshly and severely by hon. gentlemen opposite—I mean the High Commissioner to England, who is perfectly competent to undertake that service. The present Government, in their wisdom, thought as the trade of Canada was increasing and extending to all parts of the world, and as we could only speak in these matters through England, that it would be proper and right and in the interests of the people of Canada that Canada should have a representative at the English Court to attend to Canadian matters. The High Commissioner was there, and I am glad that while hon. gentlemen are endeavouring to prevent him from going to England to attend to the affairs of Canada, that in view of the fact that these negotiations may be opened up within a year or two, we shall have a gentleman so near the Throne as the High Commissioner will be, a gentleman possessing the energy, the enterprise, and the ability of the High Commissioner, to attend to the affairs of Canada; and I know, coming, as he does, from one of the Maritime Provinces, he will see that in any negotiations which may be opened up, or in any new Treaty which may be ratified between the United States and England, the people of Canada shall be dealt with fairly and equitably, and that no injustice will be done to us, as was done under the Ashburton Treaty, which was referred to by the hon. gentleman. In the Treaty of Washington it was found important that Canada should be represented; and we know that the success of that Treaty depended largely on the exertions of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. We know that, as the hon. gentleman proved by his speech and affirmed by his Resolution, great and beneficial effects have flown into Canada from that Treaty, and that it could not have been carried out on a basis so favourable to us, had Canada not been represented by the leader of the Government. Having confidence in the gentleman who negotiated

that Treaty, who so ably represented the affairs of Canada, and who always takes a lively interest in the affairs of Canada—that gentleman being still at the head of the right Government, and having still around him the gentlemen composing his Cabinet who were with him in that day, we need entertain no fears that any more injustice will be done to Canada, in the event of negotiations being entered into, than was done to us in that Treaty in 1871.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett) laments the course taken by the hon. gentleman for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in bringing forward this motion upon going into Committee of Supply; but, Sir, no other course was open to that hon. gentleman. No member of this House needs to be informed that a notice of motion could not be reached, and if it was the hon. gentleman's desire to discuss this question this was the only course left open to him to pursue. I think, in pursuing this course, he is perfectly justified, and that he has acted in the interests of the country. The hon. gentleman from Prince (Mr. Hackett) seemed at first to suppose that the question before the House was the discussion of the merits of the Washington Treaty, and that it was incumbent on him to defend that Treaty. He went so far as to say that the hon. gentleman who moved the Resolution had, to a great extent, justified the Washington Treaty, and was in favour of moving for a renewal of that Treaty. Now, the Treaty of Washington was opposed by the Liberal party at the time it was under discussion. It was opposed first, because it gave away the claim of Canada for compensation for the Fenian raids. It was opposed, secondly, because it accepted a money compensation in place of seeking to obtain trade concessions from the United States. The Treaty was opposed also because it gave away the navigation of the St. Lawrence in perpetuity, without any adequate consideration, the only consideration being the granting to us the right to navigate the River Yukon, in Alaska, and the Stickeen, which we had before. So much for the Washington Treaty. The Resolution does not advocate a renewal of that Treaty. The merits of that Treaty were not in discussion, and the Reform party is on record distinctly in opposition to that Treaty; the leader of the Opposition having, at the time it was under consideration, moved a Resolution condemning the Treaty, on the ground that it gave up the claim for compensation from the United States for losses by the Fenian raid. The hon. gentleman tells us that he thinks it unwise to state that we are dependent on the markets of the United States. I do not know that that is a fact that we could conceal, were we to attempt to do so; and I do not know that it is necessary to conceal from ourselves or the country anything in relation to the trade of this country. These facts are spread on the Trade and Navigation Returns, and any man of intelligence can ascertain anything which can be of interest to discuss in this House. I dare say the authorities of the United States are as well aware of the state of our trade, and the extent to which we are dependent on their markets as we are ourselves. He says it does not comport with our dignity to approach the United States in this matter. Well, I suppose we are a much more dignified people than the United States; we have 4,500,000 of people, and we are much more dignified than the United States with 54,000,000. But it seems to me that the fact that the United States Government have given notice that the fishery clauses of the Treaty will be abrogated, opens up the question, and is, in some sense, an invitation to us, to open discussion and negotiation upon this question; and I cannot comprehend in what way we would be lacking in dignity and self respect if we did approach the Government of the United States in this matter, with the view of securing concessions in the trade relations existing at the present time between the two countries. He tells us, moreover, that it is unnecessary at this juncture to make advances for the purpose of securing these concessions, because, forsooth, we are to have these concessions without making such advances; because there is a Bill before Congress which is going to give some of the concessions we are asking for. Well, Sir, the Morrison Bill, which has been reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, provides for the admission of lumber and salt and iron ore, free of duty, but it is not supposed that Bill will pass. Those most conversant with American politics feel quite assured that, pending the Presidential election, which comes off in November next, no changes whatever will be made in the Tariff. That Bill probably is reported and placed before the country as a feeler to test public sentiment, and if the hon. gentleman expects that Canada is to derive advantage from the passage of that Bill during the present Session of Congress, I greatly fear he is doomed to disappointment. He says, in conclusion, that we should open up the whole question of securing the American market for all our products. Well, he is entitled to give advice on this question; I do not feel warranted in doing so. I hope, however, if the Government take the course which we hope they will take, and open negotiations with the United States for reciprocal relations to a greater or less extent, they will, if possible, secure the free admission of all natural products —fisheries, products of the soil, the forest, and the mines of Canada. But, Sir, I do not know that it is necessary to enlarge upon the advantages that are likely to be derived by this country from reciprocal trade with the United States, in so far, at least, as it may concern the admission of our natural production to that country. We all know, Sir, that the trade of Canada, during the continuance of the Reciprocity Treaty, did receive a very great impetus. We all know that whether that treaty was beneficial to the United States or not, it was highly advantageous to Canada. We have to the south of us, Sir, a great country—a country now possessing, it is said, at least 54,000,000 inhabitants—a country whose trade is rapidly extending and growing in importance; and, placed as we are on the borders of that country, with our boundaries coterminus with theirs, and extending from ocean to ocean, it is a matter of very great importanee to us that the trade relations between these two countries should be intimate. We may imagine that if the different sections of the United States had been separated from each other by hostile Tariff walls—if, for instance, the New England States, in one group, had a fiscal system of their own, the Middle States, in another group, had another fiscal system; the Western States another, the Southern States another, and the States on the Pacific slope another—if such a condition of affairs existed in that country, it would have seriously impeded the growth and prosperity of the United States. Of this we may be certain—that the Free Trade relations existing among the thirty-seven States of the American Union have been vastly promotive of the commercial prosperity of that country. Canada is another section of this continent, and we are just as much interested in having Free Trade relations with the United States in our natural productions as any one of these groups of States is interested in having Free Trade relations with any other group of States that I have mentioned. A few figures of the rapid growth of the trade of the United States will tend to show more conclusively than mere words the importance of our securing some modification of the trade relations existing between the two countries. We find that in 1871 there were 44,614 miles of railway in the United States, and that in 1882 they had increased to 107,158 miles. This increase fairly illustrates the great growth of the business of the country. In 1871 the freight earnings amounted to $294,430,000; in 1882, on a very much lower scale of rates, they amounted to $503,337,000; an increase of at least 120 per cent. The passenger fares, in 1871, amounted to

$108,898,000, and in 1882, to $202,140,000. The number of railway employees in the United States in 1870 was 154,027, and in 1880, 236,058. The exports of that country, in 1860, amounted to $316,242,000; in 1870, to $455,208,000, and in 1880, to $823,946,000. The internal commerce of that country, in 1880, was said to have increased to almost the incredible sum of $10,000,000,000, according to the report of the Statistical Bureau of that year; I have not been able to obtain any later report. These figures illustrate the great growth of the commerce of the United States, and the growing importance to Canada of securing more intimate trade relations with that great country; and fortunately, Sir, there seems at present to be a tendency towards a modification in American public sentiment with regard to the Tariff relations of the United States with surrounding countries. The exclusive sentiment of the United States seems to be giving way. Recently they negotiated a Reciprocity Treaty with the Sandwich Islands; this year they have negotiated a Reciprocity Treaty with the Republic of Mexico; and the utterances of public men in the United States warrant me in stating that the authorities in that country are anxious to negotiate reciprocal trade relations with all the American States in both North and South America. Now, Sir, this willingness which is evinced by the American authorities to have more intimate trade relations with surrounding States, warrants us in approaching them; and the fact that they have given notice of the abrogation of the fishery clauses of the Treaty of Washington, indicates that the circumstances at present are singularly propitious, and that we may enter, or attempt to enter upon these negotiations with better hopes of success than at any time for years past. Now, I wish to place tersely before the House a few figures with regard to our trade, which will illustrate, more thoroughly than words, the importance of attempting to secure that which the Resolution asks the Government to make the attempt to secure. The following figures are a comparison of our exports to the United States with our exports to all other countries:

PRODUCTS OF THE MINE.

To the United States	$2,198,041
" all other countries	772,872

Percentage of entire trade to the United States, 74 per cent.

PRODUCTS OF THE FISHERIES.

To the United States	$3,181,218
" all other countries	5,622,900

Percentage of entire trade to the United States, 37 per cent.

PRODUCTS OF THE FOREST.

To the United States	$ 9,916,000
" all other countries	15,454,000

Percentage of entire trade to the United States, 40 per cent.

ANIMALS AND THEIR PRODUCE.

To the United States	$ 6,567,000
" all other countries	13,717,000

Percentage of entire trade to the United States, 33 per cent.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

To the United States	$11,989,000
" all other countries	10,829,000

Percentage of entire trade to the United States, 53 per cent.

MANUFACTURES.

To the United States	$1,603,000
" all other countries	1,900,000

Percentage of entire trade to the United States, 46 per cent.

MISCELLANEOUS.

To the United States	$502,000
" all other countries	26,000

Percentage of entire trade to the United States, 95 per cent.

TOTAL EXPORT OF NATURAL PRODUCTS, INCLUDING MISCELLANEOUS, BUT NOT INCLUDING MANUFACTURES.

To the United States	$34,359,000
" all other countries	46,423,000

Percentage of trade to the United States ..... 43 per cent.

Total exports to Great Britain, not including manufactures	$38,461,000

Percentage of entire trade to Great Britain..... 47 per cent.

So that you see that the percentage of our exports to the United States were within 3 per cent. of being as great as our exports to Great Britain—a very extraordinary circumstance when you consider that our trade with Great Britain is entirely unhampered by duties, while our trade with the United States is hampered by protective duties which tend to exclude our products from that country. If we take a few specific articles and compare our exports of these articles to the United States with those to all countries, and take the proportion that go from the Province of Ontario to the United States, we shall have some interesting revelations:

IRON ORE—United States duty 20 per cent.

To all countries	44,944	tons, valued at	$138,775
" United States	44,635	" "	
From Ontario to the U. S...	42,745	" "	130,257

PLANKS, BOARDS AND JOISTS—United States duty $2 per 1,000 ft.

To all countries	632,148,000	feet, valued at	$8,022,000
" United States	537,517,000	" "	6,818,000
From Ontario to the U. S...	445,304,000	" "	6,092,000

SHINGLES—United States duty 35 per cent.

To all countries	100,411,000,	valued at.....	$283,530
" United States	76,615,000	"	233,615
From Ontario to the U. S...	59,353,000	"	197,251

SLEEPERS AND TIES—United States duty 20 per cent.

To all countries	2,126,000,	valued at	$554,000
" United States	2,074,000	"	484,000
From Ontario to the U. S...	1,185,000	"	309,000

HORSES—United States duty 20 per cent.

To all countries	13,019
" United States	12,655
From Ontario to the U. S...	5,706

HORNED CATTLE—United States duty 20 per cent.

To all countries	66,396
" United States	23,280
From Ontario to the U. S...	19,465

SWINE—United States duty 20 per cent.

To all countries	3,858
" United States	3,634
From Ontario to the U. S...	3,544

SHEEP—United States duty 20 per cent.

To all countries	308,474
" United States	228,541
From Ontario to the U. S...	164,610

POULTRY AND OTHER ANIMALS—United States duty 20 per cent.

To all countries	$161,000
" United States	157,000
From Ontario to the U. S	97,000

EGGS.

To all countries	$2,256,000
" United States	2,251,000
From Ontario to the U. S	1,612,000

WOOL—United States duty 10 cents per pound and 11 per cent.

To all countries	1,375,000 lbs.
" United States	1,207,000 "
From Ontario to the U. S...	1,153,000 "

BARLEY—United States duty 15 cents per bushel.

To all countries	8,817,000 bushels
" United States	8,741,000 "
From Ontario to the U. S.	8,558,000 "

MALT—United States duty 20 cents per bushel.

To all countries	1,329,958 bushels
" United States	1,329,641 "
From Ontario to the U. S.	1,329,641 "

BEANS—United States duty 10 cents per bushel.

To all countries	142,422 bushels
" United States	142,325 "
From Ontario to the U. S.	137,848 "

OATS—United States duty 10 cents per bushel.

To all countries	1,024,000 bushels
" United States	617,000 "
From Ontario to the U. S.	235,000 "

RYE—United States duty 10 cents per bushel.

To all countries	1,047,000	bushels
" United States	912,000	"
From Ontario to the U. S.	889,008	"

POTATOES—15 cents per bushel.

To all countries	2,424,000	bushels
" United States	2,181,000	"

HAY—20 per cent.

To all countries	93,700	tons	$902,000
" United States	89,000	"	843,000

It will be seen, therefore, that the United States take almost our entire export of iron ore, shingles, sleepers and ties, horses, swine, poultry, eggs, wool, barley, malt, beans, oats, potatoes and hay, and that they take a very large proportion of our lumber and sheep. Of this total export to the United States, Ontario furnishes over three-fourths in wool, eggs, barley, malt, beans, iron ore, rye, sleepers and ties, swine, lumber and horned cattle, and over one-half in sheep and poultry. Upon most of these articles the United States Government impose a duty. In 1883, they collected duties as follows: —

Barley and malt	$1,577,000 00
Beans and peas	51,000 00
Oats	61,000 00
Rye	91,000 00
Potatoes	327,000 00
Wool	169,000 00
Poultry and other animals	31,000 00
Live stock	570,000 00
Lumber and shingles	1,156,000 00
Iron ore	27,000 00
Total	$4,060,000 00

And the list I have given is not a complete one, for it does not include wheat, flour, meal, oatmeal, cheese, butter, the products of the forest other than lumber and shingles, meats, fruits green and dry, hops, hides, &c. If these articles were all included, we would find that the duties levied by the United States upon Canadian products entering that country would not have been less than $4,500,000 in 1883. Now, these duties are levied upon articles of which the United States raise the greater portion of the supply for themselves. Of course, when an article is imported into a country which does not raise that article, the consumer pays the duty, but if only a small proportion of the consumption of any article goes into a country, if the larger portion consumed is raised in the country itself, it is fair to assume that the producer of the smaller portion imported pays the duty, or, at any rate, pays a large portion of the duty. With reference to barley and malt, while we export to the United States 8,000,000 bushels a year, that country raises ten or twelve times as much as we export; and with regard to oats, our exportation to the United States of 1,000,000 bushels is a very small percentage of the crop of that country. The same remark holds good with regard to rye, beans, peas, potatoes, wool, and live stock; and with regard to the 600 odd million feet of lumber which we export to the United States, the effect of the duty is to deduct nearly the whole amount from the pocket of the producer here, for it would be absurd to suppose that the removal of duty on our exportation of 600,000,000 feet would affect the price of the immense quantity produced in the United States. The same observation applies with equal force to iron ore; in that also, we pay the duty. We may assume that to the extent of this sum of $4,000,000 levied on the importation of Canadian products by the United States for these duties, the receipts from the articles exported by us, were those duties removed, would be enhanced to the producer in this country by a considerable, if not a very large proportion of the duties levied. I do not know of any one article of the production of this country which would be more benefited by Free Trade than the article of iron ore. We have north of Lake Ontario and in various other parts of the Province of Ontario very superior iron mines, favourably situated for the exportation of ore to the United States, and which produce a class of ore that is in great demand in that country; yet the exportation last year to the United States amounted only to the total of 44,635 tons, valued at $134,037. I looked up the statistics, a day or two ago, of the Lake Superior iron mines, mines not more favourably situated for supplying ore to the American blast furnaces than the mines of Ontario, and I find a striking contrast in the volume of trade in iron ore shipped from those mines, and in the ore produced from the Ontario mines. I find that while we exported from ours but 44,635 tons of ore last year, the export of the Lake Superior mines was, in the same year, in gross, 2,948,000 tons, valued at $24,263,000; and I find also that the production in charcoal pig iron of the Lake Superior mines was 72,962 tons, valued at $2,006,000, giving a total volume of trade of the Lake Superior iron mines of $26,269,000, against a total volume of trade of $134,000 in the export of iron ore from the mines of the Province of Ontario. A great boon would be conferred on the mining interest of this country if the duty which excludes this ore from the United States should be removed, and we were allowed to come in for some share of that trade, of which to-day we have only the paltry sum of $134,000. I shall not detain the House longer on this subject. I have, as I said I would, put the figures tersely before the House, and I think the House must be convinced from them that reciprocal trade relations in these articles is very desirable. There can be no doubt that it is the duty of the Government to use such efforts as they may be able to put forth for the purpose of securing this great boon to the country. I believe the present time is a favourable one for making this attempt; I do not believe that since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty there has been so favourable an opportunity for attempting to re-open negotiations with the United States as the present time affords, and I hope our Government will act in the interests of Canada in this respect, by endeavouring to re-open negotiations with the United States, with the view of securing such modifications of the trade relations between the two countries as will allow the admission of as large a proportion of the products of the soil and mines and forests of Canada into the United States as may be possible. I beg therefore to second the Resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the few words I will say on the motion, I shall endeavour not to allude to the Washington Treaty, lest we might have the prolonged discussion we have had again and again on that subject. I am quite satisfied with my position with respect to it, and will allow it to rest, merely saying that there was a feeling of disappointment in the country when the notice for abrogation of the fishery clauses was given. I have no doubt that this country would have been quite satisfied if no such notice had been given, and the arrangement, which was to last for ten years, with two years' notice, had gone on without observation on either side. The country would have been well satisfied, the Maritime Provinces would have been well satisfied, and the fishery interests would have been well satisfied. Then the only thing which would have remained would have been to have a new arbitration, in order to get a new valuation of the difference in value between the American and the Canadian fisheries for the next ten years, or for whatever period might have been fixed. However, that is all gone, and we must meet the case as it is. I do not know any reason why the hon. gentleman who moved this, or the seconder, laid before the House these elaborate statements to show the value of reciprocal trade, or trade of any kind, with the United States. That is admitted. That goes without saying. We all admit that it would be well that we had a large

trade with the United States, rather than a small one; and I think Canada, as compared in her action with the action of the United States, has done everything that she could well do in order to secure that desirable object. In the first place, there was the original Reciprocity Treaty which was finally consummated in 1854. The merit of that, as far as Canada was concerned, rested altogether with the Administration of Sir Francis Hincks, the Liberal Government of that day. Although the Government of which I was a member in 1854 had accidentally, from the retirement of Sir Francis Hincks, the duty of carrying out the Treaty to its consummation, by introducing and carrying into law the Act which ratified that Treaty, still it was the merit of the Reform party; and it was a great merit; it did a great service to Canada. That, as we all know, was a Treaty for reciprocal free trade in the natural productions of the two countries. We regretted when the Americans, from, I must say, a rather natural feeling of irritation against England, gave notice for the cancellation and the termination of that Treaty. It was no fault of Canada that that Treaty was terminated. Canada, during the troubles which arose in the internecine war between the North and the South, did everything that she could to preserve friendly relations with the Northern States; and I can well remember the repeated statements of Mr. Seward, who was the presiding genius of the Northern States in those days, that he wished the Mother Country, Great Britain, had been as friendly in her action towards the Northern States as the Province of Canada had been. Then when the Treaty was ended, Canada attempted by every possible means, by sending agents to act with the British Minister at Washington, by stirring up her Majesty's Government in England to interest itself in the renewal of the Treaty, by doing everything that possibly could be done to induce the American States to enter upon a renewal of the Treaty, or a Reciprocity Treaty of some kind. We went so far, again and again, in pressing it, that a great many Canadians, in the press and at public meetings—and the voice was heard in Parliament—thought the Government had gone too far, that in fact it had humiliated itself by going, as it were, on its knees, to Washington to entreat for the renewal of that reciprocity. Well, Canada at first thought that a great blow had been struck at her prosperity in the future, but the people faced it manfully, and, strange to say, while it was a loss—we cannot deny it was a loss—Canada survived it and still was prosperous, and still went on in her development and expansion. Her prosperity was checked, but it was not destroyed. Then, the attempt was not ended by the failures of the Canadian Government to succeed at once. It was renewed again and again. It was renewed by the Government, of which I was a member. We sent one Minister after another. Sir Alexander Galt and Sir William Howland went to Washington. When my hon. friend opposite assumed the Government, he sent a very able leading member of his party, Mr. Brown, to Washington; but it was all of no avail; the Americans had taken a certain line, and we had to submit. And I believe that the feeling which then existed still exists, and that you will never get a Treaty between the United States and Canada for reciprocal trade in the natural productions of the two countries. The Americans said—whether truly or not I do not know—that it was a nominal reciprocity, but all the advantages were on the side of Canada. We had no market of sufficient importance to offer to them for their productions of grain and cereals and fisheries. We, on the other hand, had to gain everything by their markets being open for the articles which were specified in the Treaty. That feeling, I believe, still exists, and unless the United States will come at some time or other to a conclusion that they would be willing to enter upon a Reciprocity Treaty, not only for our natural productions, but for our manufactures as well as our natural products, we will never have a Treaty. I am quite satisfied the United States will not agree, the country will not agree, the voice of the country will be against a repetition of the Treaty of 1854. Then, Sir, the only question is this—can we have a Treaty on a larger basis? My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says there never was a more fitting or opportune time for opening negotiations. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see for the life of me what indication there is in that direction. The President, in his Address, which has been mentioned by my hon. friend who made this motion, stated that the notice had been given, and it might be an opportunity to have a Commission to enquire into the best means of acquiring permanently the advantages of our fisheries—some words of that kind, I forget exactly what they were. Has there been any response to that in Congress? Has there been any step taken to take up that recommendation of the President? It has fallen dead. There has not been a single voice raised in its favour, and I venture to state that there will be no voice raised in its favour during the present Congress. Then the hon. gentleman says there will be no success of any measure until the Presidential election is over. The Morrison Bill, I believe, has been dropped. No action has been taken in Congress to admit reciprocity in salt, or in ores, or in coal.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman will permit me—I did not say the Morrison Bill had been dropped.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; but I believe it has. I understand it has.

Mr. MILLS. It must have been to-day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hear it has been dropped. I was told so a few moments ago. But the hon. gentleman does not think any more than I do that that Bill will become law. If there is no indication that the United States people, that their representatives, their Congress, will accept the recommendation of the President and appoint a Commission, or go into the question and see whether there cannot be an arrangement, and if we know and the hon. gentleman admits—and it is evident he is correct—that by no possibility will there be a Bill to allow reciprocity in these articles, what indication, what sign is there that there would be any use in our going again, for the fifth or sixth or tenth time, on our knees to Washington, and asking them again, for heaven's sake, to enter into a Treaty with us? I think it would be a great mistake to pass this Resolution. I think it would hamper the action of the Government were we to say at once to the Americans what it is proposed to say by this Resolution. They had the opinion in 1854, and in 1865, and they will have it now if we adopt a Resolution of this kind—they will think: "Canada must have the Treaty; Canada must open our markets; Canada must come upon her knees." No, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Resolution is unfortunate, ill-timed, and as such we must oppose it. The hon. gentleman says the United States have begun to alter their policy, that a new feeling has arisen in the minds of the people. There are some faint indications that the very heavy, the very oppressive, the very unscientific Tariff of the United States, the war Tariff, that presses so severely on the people—there is an indication of a desire for an adjustment, but there is no indication of such a readjustment as will reduce their Tariff to an equality with ours, protective as it is called by the hon. gentlemen opposite. Until they do that, until they bring down their Tarifi to an equality, or nearly an equality, with ours, there cannot be reciprocity. I do not see how it can be. But the hon gentleman says that the United States have shown a desire to extend their trade by having a Reciprocity Treaty with Mexico and the Sandwich Islands. Who commenced negotiations in those cases? Was it the Sandwich Islands and Mexico? No; it was the Government of the United States in both instances, who was desirous of

getting control of the trade of those two nations, inferior in population, inferior in wealth, and very much subject to American influences. They desired to increase that influence and to obtain control of the trade of those two nations; but it was not King Kalakua, it was not the President of Mexico, who wanted the Treaty; it was the Government of the United States that pressed upon those almost auxiliary nations and forced upon them, almost forced upon them, these Treaties. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we must, to a certain extent, pursue the same course. They know that we are ready at any time; we have told them unmistakably that we are ready at any time to renew the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. They know perfectly well that we are quite ready to go on with the fishery arrangements made by the Washington Treaty on the same footing as they were before. They know perfectly well that Canada is always open to enter into any reasonable arrangement with them, and I think that we ought to leave it there. I think it would do no good, I am satisfied it would frustrate any hope of entering into an arrangement with them, if we passed this Resolution. I do not now feel it right to say what the course of the Government would be; I think it would be premature to say, what, after due consideration and consultation with Her Majesty's Government, may be done between now and July, 1885. I am quite satisfied the passing of the Resolution declaring that we must enter into immediate negotiations — because if that Resolution passes, we must do so; it is an Order of this House to enter into immediate negotiations for a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty—would be simply to bring upon us the same rebuffs we have got on so many previous occasions. I hope the hon. gentleman won't press this Resolution. I am quite satisfied that it is inopportune. The hon. gentleman's intentions and motives are good and most praiseworthy, and he has put his case exceedingly well, and has argued the interests with which he is charged, the interests of one of the Maritime Provinces, very well and very forcibly; still, I think it is inopportune that he should have made this motion. Had he made this statement and this argument without concluding with a motion, it would have been well; but I ask this House not to hamper the course of the Government by prematurely stating our anxiety for a renewal of the Treaty with the United States.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to say a word or two before the motion is put. I do not take the view that the hon. gentleman who leads the Government has taken on this question. I do not think the motion would be inopportune, nor do I believe the dignity of the country would be hurt, even though we failed in negotiations with the United States upon this question. I believe that the old notions of diplomatic dignity——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I say nothing of dignity.

Mr. MILLS—are gone by, and it is well, I believe, we should undertake to strengthen our position, and at the same time strengthen the hands of those in the United States who are in favour of more liberal trade relations with this country, and that we should show that we are disposed to enter into negotiations with them for more liberal commercial arrangements than those which exist at the present time. This is a practical question. The Treaty will soon terminate with regard to the fisheries, and the hon. gentleman will be obliged to meet the state of things that will arise after that termination. It is perfectly obvious that we cannot well go on as we were before this Washington Treaty was abrogated with respect to the fisheries. It is well known, also, that on the subject of coal duties, there are large quantities of coal imported into Canada from the United States, and there is a considerable quantity imported into the United States from the eastern portion of Canada. The same is true of the lumber trade, and when we look at the number of matters upon which there is international trade between the two countries, I do not think the difficulties will arise to which the hon gentleman has referred. There are certainly very important matters, affecting both countries, upon which negotiations could take place, where we would have, according to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, something to offer. Now, with regard to our claims within the three-mile limit, the hon. gentleman knows that. the argument that was made before the Fisheries Commission at Halifax, shows that the American legal counsel contended that the Convention of 1818 simply laid down a rule of public law, as applicable to that portion of the waters from which that country was excluded. Well, it is perfectly obvious, that if they laid down a rule of exclusion with regard to our bays and harbours, the same rule will apply in their own case. Then the hon. gentleman told us, some years ago, when this matter was under discussion, that we had large fishing interests in Hudson Bay, from which we had power to exclude American fishermen. Now, I understand that American fishermen go every year for the purpose of fishing in that bay, and no attempt has been made to exercise our rights of excluding them; and the hon. gentleman knows that the principle of acquiescence will there apply, and that if we permit them to go for a number of years into that bay, without protest, for the purpose of carrying on their fisheries, we will not have the power to exclude them at no distant day. When we look at all the matters connected with the termination of the fishery arrangements provided for by the Washington Treaty, it is apparent that the interests of the people are so large and important in their character that this House should express an opinion on the question. It will not be any disadvantage to us as a people, but a very great advantage, to show the American people what we are prepared to do, and those of them who are disposed to adopt more liberal trade relations than those which have hitherto existed and who are ready to renew arrangements with respect to the fisheries, will know precisely what our views are and what our position is. I am certain that those who are favourable to more intimate trade relations will have their hands strengthened by our action in this particular. At all events, we shall have asserted a principle, one of good neighbourhood, and one in the commercial interests of the two countries, and having done so, it will be no discredit to us if the Americans choose to adopt towards us an illiberal policy, one detrimental to their interests as well as to ours.

Mr. GILLMOR. The constituency which I have the honour to represent is very deeply interested in this question. It is just on the border, and the termination of the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty will affect us very seriously. I had expected to have heard from some member of the Administration who is acquainted with the fishery interests of the Maritime Provinces better than I am. I have been very seriously exercised with respect to this matter, since the announcement of the termination of the fishery clauses was made. I do not know the intention of the Government; of course, the Government alone can enter on negotiations. I have been exceedingly anxious that they should feel it to be their duty to see if negotiations could not be renewed. Those members who represent Maritime constituencies know how very seriously this change will interfere with their fishing interests. My constituency must be seriously injured if any interregnum occurs between the expiration of this Treaty and the renewal of it, or the completion of some other arrangement. The free trade we now have in fish is of very great importance to us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. GILLMOR. There can be no doubt of that. I am glad to hear the leader of the Government express that opinion; and although we may not be able, under our fiscal

policy and the fiscal policy of the United States, to make the arrangement broader, yet I had hoped the Government, for the sake of the Maritime Provinces, would have considered it their duty to see if some arrangements could be made with the United States, and while not going on our knees, not under-valuing our fisheries, not under-stating our position, not going begging to any person, they could fairly approach the Government of the United States and see if a new arrangement could be made with respect to the fishery clauses. Whatever may be said of the Washington Treaty, and I know very little about it except so far as it has affected our interests in the Maritime Provinces, with respect to fisheries it has been beneficial to us. The House is aware from my trade views that the largest amount of reciprocity that could be obtained would suit me best; but I do feel that this question of the fisheries is one of vital importance. We on the sea-board know how the matter stands. It is almost impossible to protect the fisheries. I am quite satisfied, from the stand which the British Government has taken, that if the fishery question is re-opened, it will have nothing to do with it, and it will involve a great deal of trouble to protect the fisheries. I desire the Government to feel that this matter is one of such great importance that they should endeavour to make some arrangement whereby matters will go on as peaceably as they have done. With regard to statistics, it is almost impossible for the Government to obtain correct statistics on the frontier. It is like people going to market. There are hundreds of boats daily fishing, and many of them go to the American side to dispose of their fish. With respect to herring in Charlotte County they take thousands of dollars worth, and in a few hours afterwards have them in the American market. I am satisfied we do not keep an account of one-tenth of our fish. With respect to this Resolution, I did not wish it to be considered as a vote of want of confidence; I know the mover took the same view, and I am glad that the leader of the Government did not so consider it. I feel it is of the utmost importance to our fishermen, I repeat, to have some arrangement made. Whatever the value of our fisheries may be, and I will not go into that question now, I think we were pretty well paid—that is my honest opinion—a free market of 50,000,000 of people, without any restriction being imposed on trade, is a great boon to us. And it is a great advantage to us to have American fishing boats coming there in the winter season and leaving in those communities not $10,000 but $100,000. They come and purchase our fish, and our fishermen must suffer very much if some arrangement is not made whereby matters can proceed as they have been proceeding. I know the case rests entirely with the Government, and I hope and rather trust, from what the leader of the Government has said, that he is not unmindful of this matter but feels its importance.

Mr. KIRK. I regret very much that the First Minister has not given us some stronger assurance that efforts will be made to secure a renewal of the Washington Treaty in so far as the fishery clauses are concerned. When we consider the condition of affairs in the Maritime Provinces prior to the Washington Treaty, there is no wonder that the people feel considerable uneasiness. I remember well when fast-sailing armed schooners were employed by our Government to watch American vessels which attempted to fish within the three-mile limit, and if they fished there or bought fresh fish for bait, ice or stores, they were liable to be seized. There is, I repeat, considerable uneasiness in regard to this matter in the Maritime Provinces, lest the old state of affairs in the Maritime Provinces be renewed, and I did hope that the First Minister would have given the House some assurance that efforts would at least be made to have the Treaty renewed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will only make one remark. I quite understand the spirit in which the two last speakers have addressed the House; but I would have the House remember that those speeches, showing the wonderful advantages accruing to Canada under the Washington Treaty, will be read and quoted at Washington, and will not help us to make a new Treaty.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to allow the House to dispose of the motion under any impression that can possibly be drawn from the speeches from this side of the House, that it is considered in this House that all the advantages of reciprocity are on the side of Canada. I think the speech of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), showed very clearly, that so far as from us going cap in hand asking Reciprocity from the people of the United States, we have a *quid pro quo* to offer them, of fully as great value as anything they can offer us. The hon. gentleman who moved the Resolution before the House, as he was well able to do, from his information on everything connected with the Fishery Commission at Halifax, showed the enormous value to the United States fishermen of our fishing grounds in the Lower Provinces. I think he showed very clearly that we have great value to offer to the United States, and that the United States will not be slow to appreciate that fact. But there is another thing which has shown very clearly the advantage which the United States must derive from any Reciprocity Treaty with us. Allusion has been made to the Reciprocity Treaty that the United States made a short time ago with the Sandwich Islands, and we know from the discussions which took place in Congress, that notwithstanding the small population of those Islands, notwithstanding the fact that the United States had a much larger population in proportion to theirs than they have in proportion to the population of Canada, it was shown that the advantage to the United States was so enormous that that Treaty must be maintained even at considerable sacrifice. Now, if it is important to the United States to obtain a Reciprocity Treaty with the Sandwhich Islands, apparently having a small population which could not be compared with ours, it must be much more important to the United States to obtain a Reciprocity Treaty with the Dominion. While saying that the United States do and will derive great advantage from reciprocity, an advantage which, I believe, they felt at the time we had that reciprocity, there is no use of our attempting to deny that the Dominion will also obtain great advantage from it. It stands to reason that, lying as we do alongside another nation, it is of great importance to our people that the utmost freedom should be maintained in our trade relations with them. Believing as we do that any restrictions placed upon trade are generally an evil, we can quite understand that we would gladly hail anything which would tend to remove those restrictions. I think it is an unfair construction to put on the hon. gentleman's speech in any way to let it be believed for an instant that we are going to derive the only, or the chief, advantage from reciprocity. As to our right to discuss the matter at the present time, it is very clear that unless it is discussed now, the time will come when this Treaty is abrogated before our country can make any preparations for its abrogation. If it had not been brought before this House, as it is now, there would have been no opportunity to do so at a sufficiently early hour, and I think that is a sufficient reason for the hon. gentleman bringing it up and for its being fairly discussed this evening.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). As I am one of the few who had the honour of voting for the ratification of the Washington Treaty in this House, I hope I will be pardoned for making a few observations—and very few they shall be. I believe, Sir, that my vote on that occasion was one of the great reasons why I was left at home for ten years. But I am happy to say now that those who contributed to my defeat for that vote have changed materially since that time, although I am far from believing that the course

which they are now pursuing places us at any advantage to secure a Treaty on the same terms. I am really amused to listen to the free-traders of this House advocating a Reciprocity Treaty, while they hold that always the consumer pays the duty. They are most anxious to secure the free admission of all the products of the soil, the sea, the mine, and the forest. We find after considerable experience that in exporting the products of Canada to the United States, we contribute to the revenue of the United States to the extent of about $4,500,000 a year. Now, I say, while the United States compel us to contribute that amount to their revenues, on the products of the soil, the sea, the forest, and the mine, we would be pursuing a very foolish policy indeed, unless we compelled them to contribute a portion to the revenue of the Dominion of Canada.

Amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	De St. Georges,	McIntyre,
Allison (Lennox),	Fairbank,	McIsaac,
Auger,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	Mills,
Béchard,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Harley,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Thompson,
Cartwright,	King,	Trow,
Casey,	Kirk,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Catudal,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Charlton,	Lister,	Wells,
Cockburn,	Livingstone,	Wheler,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Wilson.—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dundas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Amyot,	Dupont,	McCallum,
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	McDougald,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	McGreevy,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	McLelan,
Beaty,	Foster,	McNeill,
Bell,	Gagné,	Massue,
Belleau,	Gigault,	Moffat,
Benoit,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Benson,	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Orton,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Bolduc,	Hackett,	Reid,
Bossé,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hay,	Scott,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hickey,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Sproule,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tilley,
Colby,	Kinney,	Tupper (Pictou),
Costigan,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Lesage,	White (Hastings),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Kings)	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Dickinson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (W'tmorel'd).—105

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Messieurs	
White (Cardwell),	Yeo,
Abbott,	Armstrong,
Chapleau,	McCraney,
Riopel,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Gault,	Cook,

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

PUBLIC WORKS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA.

100. Additional Public Buildings, Wellington street $150,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last Session $200,000 were appropriated for this work, and the contract was given to the lowest tenderer, Mr. Charlebois, for $295,000. When the work is complete, it will have cost $593,000, including the site, which cost $85,000.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, NOVA SCOTIA.

101	Sydney Quarantine Hospital—To complete...	$2,500 00
	New Glasgow Public Building.....	10,000 00
	Truro Custom House, Post Office and Savings Bank—To complete.....	17,000 00
	Windsor Post Office, Custom House, &c.....	11,000 00
	Pictou Marine Hospital—Including extension	550 00
	Amherst Public Building	10,000 00
	Arichat Post Office, Custom House, &c.—Site	10,000 00
	Yarmouth Post Office, Custom House, &c	10,000 00
	North Sydney Post Office, Custom House, &c	7,500 00
	Baddeck Post Office, Custom House, &c..	4,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote for the Sydney Quarantine Hospital will complete the work. The contractor is Hugh McDonald and the amount of the contract $3,750. For the New Glasgow public building, that is, a Post Office and Custom House, there is a revote of $6,000 and a new vote of $4,000. The probable cost will be $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the revenue there?

Mr. BOWELL. It was $51,219 last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the Truro building the contractors are Messrs. Townsend & McKay, and the amount of the contract is $21,000, in addition to which there will be expenditure for furniture, fences, heating apparatus and incidentals. The whole cost will be $36,000, including the land.

Mr. McISAAC. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the public building at Antigonish is finished or not. Last year $3,500 was voted for it, and there is nothing provided this year. Am I to infer from that, the building is finished.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Antigonish building is completed. We had only to repair or change the interior of the building.

Mr. McISAAC. What I wanted to know was, whether a sufficient sum has been voted to make all the repairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Quite sufficient for all the repairs required. The next item is the Windsor Post Office, Custom House, &c., for which there is a revote of $4,000, and a new vote of $7,000. A contract has been given to J. McIntosh, and the amount of the contract is $19,800, in addition to which there will be furniture and fittings, fencing, heating apparatus, &c., which will bring the whole cost up to $35,000. The next vote, a small sum of $550, is to complete the Pictou Marine Hospital. For the Amherst public building, there is a revote of $5,000, and a new vote of $5,000. No contract has yet been given, but it is supposed that the whole, when complete, will cost about $28,000. There is a vote of $10,000 towards the erection of public buildings at Arichat; the site cost $1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the revenue of Arichat?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The value of exports is $33,000 and of imports, $34,000, and goods entered for consumption, $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the cost altogether?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There it will be on a smaller scale, about $15,000.

Mr. WELDON. What is the quantity of land purchased?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An ordinary lot, I suppose, costing about $1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt this was discussed last year when the hon. gentleman asked the original vote; but if the total Customs revenue is only $3,000 or $4,000, an expenditure of $15,000 for an edifice to house the Customs officers who collects that sum seems rather a wasteful expenditure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We put all the offices together, the Post Offices as well; the expenditure seems large, but when we consider that we have to pay rent and so on, and the service is not so well performed by having different offices through the town, the hon. gentleman will see that in the long run this expenditure will be to the advantage of the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the population of Arichat?

Mr. PAINT. Isle Madame, by which this public building will be served, has about 6,000 inhabitants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to know the population of the district, but of the town or village of Arichat.

Mr. PAINT. About 5,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman give me a concurrent statement, showing the amounts heretofore paid for rents of buildings, in the various places and a memorandum of the total cost of these several buildings. The Committee ought to know how much has been paid heretofore for the rentals of Custom Houses and Post Offices, in these places, and what the additional expenditure, in the shape of interest and probable repairs will be.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will do my best, but the hon. gentleman must see, by the number of works, it will be very difficult to obtain that in a short time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman must recognize the fact that it is very important the Committee should have this information.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not say otherwise, but the time is rather limited.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will take a note, I do not think he will find it such a serious business. The question is one that is becoming of considerable moment, as to the policy the hon. gentleman is going to adopt. He knows every new building put up in a small town means demands from a great many others for similar buildings, and if it is to be the policy of the Government to accede to those demands everywhere, it will entail a considerable capital outlay in the first place, and in the second place a considerable outlay for repairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At Yarmouth we will have the Post Office, Custom House and Revenue Office in the one building. We had a vote of $15,000 last year and I ask for a revote of $10,000. The population is 6,280; the Postal revenue, $5,000; Money Orders issued $78,000; Customs duties, $87,000; other revenues, $1,300; exports, $718,000 and imports, $623,000; goods entered for consumption, $583,000. That this is a place of considerable importance, I cannot say, because we have not yet the site; therefore we have not prepared the plans and specifications, but I suppose this will be between $30,000. North Sydney Post Office and Custom House, we took a vote of $15,000 last year, and this is a revote of half of that sum. This is in the same position as the other. The works have not been begun because we have not obtained the site. The population there is 5,484, the Custom House revenue is $36,000; other revenues, $2,000, or $38,000 altogether. The exports are $128,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the total expenditure?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be about the same, The Baddeck Post Office—this is a smaller place. We took a vote of $8,000 last year, and we have asked for a revote of $4,000. The site has not been selected. We have had some difficulty in finding a proper site, and, therefore, I prefer to delay the matter and obtain a site that will suit well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the population now at Baddeck?

Mr. PAINT. It is about 2,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have it here. According to the Census, the population is 1,765. Well, that is a very small population for the hon. gentleman to indulge with a Post Office and Custom House. What is the revenue?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The revenue from Post Office and Custom duties and other revenues is about $5,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And what total expenditure does the hon. gentleman estimate?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, this will be a small vote. It will cost about $15,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $15,000 on a revenue of $5,000. The hon. gentleman will find it expensive if he gives Custom Houses at that rate all over the country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps this is an exception.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say it is, but I would like to know why. While we are on that, I would call attention to the fact that Arichat is reported to contain 910 people. That is the statement in the Census—910 souls for Arichat, under the head of Richmond.

Mr. KIRK. That must be a mistake. It must be 9,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I looked at the Census, and found that the population given for East and West Arichat was 3,552, and the natural increase since 1881 would give at least 4,000.

Mr. PAINT. I may explain it this way. The population of the Isle Madame was about 6,000 souls. That is divided into four districts, and the whole centres in this town. This public building serves the 6,000 people, and it is like the wards of a city—probably the hon. gentleman will understand that.

Mr. MILLS. There must have been twins there since the Census.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Many of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Census return puts down Arichat at 910 souls.

Mr. PAINT. And the ward of a city might be said to contain so many inhabitants, and there might be six wards.

Mr. VAIL. It is an island.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Arichat is an island, it appears. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) says it is an island.

Mr. PAINT. No; it is on an island.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

102. Summerside Public Buildings $12,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost here?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract is for $21,225. When completed, with the furniture and fittings, and the heating apparatus and contingencies, it will cost between $27,000 and $28,000.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, NEW BRUNSWICK.

103

St. John Marine Hospital—to complete	$12,000
Woodstock Post Office, Custom House, &c.	12,000
St. Stephen's Post Office, Custom House, &c.	7,000
Moncton Post Office, Custom House, &c.	17,000
Dorchester Penitentiary	25,000
Newcastle Post Office, &c.	7,000
Carleton Post Office, &c.	6,000
Bathurst Post Office, Custom House, &c.	6,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost of the St. John Marine Hospital will be $25,000. This is to complete. For the Woodstock Post Office, we had a vote of $15,000 last year. We ask a revote of $8,000, and a new vote of $4,000. The contractor is Mr. Limerick. The amount of the contract is $14,450. The amount expended up to now has been—1881, $4,000; 1882, $1,600; 1883, $1,200; last year, $10,250.

Mr. WELDON. What is the whole cost to be, including the land?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $28,000 complete.

Mr. MILLS. What is the price of the land?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it was $4,000 altogether. It was two lots. We purchased one and it was not large enough, and then we purchased the adjoining lot.

Mr. MILLS. Then this is costing a good deal more than the hon. gentleman estimated. I think he said the contract price was something over $14,000, and the cost will be $28,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract price is $14,450; then there is $4,000 for the land, making $18,450; then the furniture and fittings, the heating apparatus and the contingencies for grading, fencing, and so on—all that takes the $28,000. The next is St. Stephen's Post Office and Custom House. A site has been purchased at a cost of $3,000. There is no contract yet given.

Mr. GILLMOR. Will the hon. Minister say why these buildings have been delayed so long? It was thought important three years ago to make this appropriation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site was purchased, I think, only in October last, but we were not in a position to go on with the work at that time. We have now got a title and the work will at once be commenced. The site was purchased from one Mr. Marks, for $3,000. We have not yet got an estimate of the cost of the building.

Mr. GILLMOR. The residents there are surprised there has been so much delay. I have been charged with having asked for this building, but that is not true; I never asked for it. A Customs officer visited my county in 1881, just before the election, and he was very much surprised that there was no public building there. But we never asked the Government for an appropriation for this building. I had asked the previous Government for an appropriation, and the leader of the Government told me that public buildings would be erected only in the most important and populous places as fast as the revenues would admit of it; but as he thought St Stephen did not come within that category, I failed to get public buildings there. But before the old Government went out, I did get an appropriation of $2,000 for a small breakwater on the Island of Grand Manan, that would serve the fishermen as a protection for their boats in a case of storm, but the present Government did not see fit to hand that money over after they came into power. As I said, an officer of the Customs Department visited the town, and was much surprised that such an important place as St. Stephen was without public buildings, and he was surprised also that I had never presented the case to the Government; he thought it was so important that the case would at once be attended to. That was three years ago, and the surprise is that there has been so long a delay, because this site has always been in the market, and could have been bought three years ago as well as now. However, we ought to be grateful for the favour. I certainly am very grateful for getting a Custom House without asking for it. Many of my friends here have asked for appropriations for Customs Houses and have not got them, and I advise them in the future to say nothing about it and they would be more likely to succeed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman objects to the vote?—because I would be much pleased if he would tell me, for example, that he does not think it is wanted.

Mr. GILLMOR. Well, that has been put to me frequently; I think the Finance Minister put that question to me; but the Finance Minister and the Government can do just as they please about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It shows that the Government has been looking after the public interests in that county as well as elsewhere. He may be sure I will do my best to give him a good building that will be a credit to the county.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am very grateful for it, as the representative of the county.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a difficulty about the title; the papers were sent to the Minister of Justice for investigation, and that is the reason of the delay. Moncton Post Office, Custom House, &c., $17,000. The contractor for these buildings is Mr. J. T. O'Doherty, for the amount of $21,480. Dorchester Penitentiary, 25,000. This is to continue the works. The contractor is G. A. Duffy. The penitentiary, up to the present time has cost, from the beginning, $370,000. This is for a new wing; and there is the expense of heating it, of fitting up the machinery, the dry-houses, the blacksmith shops, the storehouses, materials for repairs, the architect and contingencies. In 1883-84 we had an appropriation of $30,000. We have carried from that appropriation to 1883 a balance of $8,000, making the expenditure on that vote to October, 1883, $24,000, leaving a balance of $14,000. Total amount applied for, $29,000.

Mr. WELDON. Is the fence around the building completed? Last year a prisoner was shot in attempting to escape.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We must go on by degrees. As soon as the main buildings are completed we will replace the wooden fences by stone fences. Newcastle Post Office, &c., $7,000. There is a revote of $6,000. The total cost will be probably $20,000, and the fittings, furniture and heating apparatus, about $10,000 more. The building will cost $15,300. The site was purchased from the corporation.

Mr. WELDON. Who selected the site?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was selected as other sites are selected, in this way: when a Government building is to be erected in a town or city, the available lots are, as a rule, offered to the Government, and then an officer of the Department is sent to examine and report. I always send an officer who has no interest in the place, so that his actions will be quite disinterested. He reports on each site separately, and then we decide the lot which shall be purchased.

Mr. WELDON. The Post Office is not situated so as to accommodate the people of Carleton, for it is not in the centre of the population, and is only a few minutes walk from St. John Post Office.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is in the middle of the three wards, and is in the business centre of the town.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not heard any complaints of the site since the lot was selected.

PUBLIC WORKS, QUEBEC.

	Quebec Examining Warehouse	$30,000 00
	Three Rivers—Conversion of former Custom House into Post Office—To complete	3,550 00
	Sherbrooke Post Office, Customs House, &c.	20,000 00
	Hull Post Office and Inland Revenue Offices—To complete	4,000 00
	Montreal Drill Shed	25,000 00
	Montreal, Dominion Buildings—Improvements, &c.	4,000 00
104	Chicoutimi Marine Hospital—To complete	2,800 00
	St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Buildings, materials and tools for use of convicts in construction	30,000 00
	Quebec Military Buildings, including Drill Shed	15,000 00
	Sorel Public Buildings	10,000 00
	Lévis Immigrant Buildings—Additional amount required	15,000 00
	Montreal Immigrant Buildings	15,000 00
	Montreal Examining Warehouse	28,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much will the Quebec examining warehouse cost altogether?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have paid already $7,665, the balance to be paid to the contractor, Denis O'Brien, together with boilers, machinery, heating, furniture and incidentals, will bring the amount up to $69,000. With respect to the Sherbrooke Post Office, the work has been performed in a very unsatisfactory manner, and the Government have been obliged to take the contract out of the contractor's hands. We are now calling for new tenders to complete the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister give some explanations respecting the Montreal Drill Shed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A large lot which belonged to the corporation of Montreal, was handed over to the Dominion Government for the purposes of a drill shed. The walls of the old drill shed were standing, and the architects considered they could be used up to a height of three or four feet. An examination showed, however, that the structure was in a worse condition than was anticipated, and that it would be required to be built from the foundations. Even the piles were found to be very unsatisfactory, and to be not perpendicular. Under these circumstances, the building will cost more than was first intended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the $15,000 for the Quebec military buildings, including drill shed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This whole vote is for the Drill Shed, which will cost $30,000, but there was an agreement made last year with the Quebec Government and the city of Quebec, that they should furnish together $30,000, which, with the amount voted last year, will make $60,000, and in case of their holding exhibitions, &c., the building may be used for that purpose, though it is under the control of the Government. As to the Sorel public building, $10,000, I may say that a lot has been given by the town of Sorel 130 by 110. We take a portion of that, about 10 feet, to make a wider street, in order to be safer from fire, and to give the building a better appearance. The plans and specifications have not been made because the title has only been lately passed upon by the Minister of Justice. The buildings to be erected there will cost, I suppose, about $30,000.

Mr. AMYOT. Will the drill shed at Quebec be begun this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The difficulty about that buildings is this: We have called for tenders and tenders have been received, but I advised my colleagues that we should not sign the contract until the city of Quebec and the Quebec Government would deposit to the credit of the Minister of Public Works the sum of $30,000, because I cannot undertake to construct a $60,000 building with a vote of only $30,000, and if anything happened by which the city corporation would not pay, or could not pay, the Government would have the building on their hands, and would be bound to complete the work at a cost of $60,000, instead of $30,000. If the money is not placed to my credit, we will have to reduce the work to $30,000, and have a drill shed of our own without any communication with them.

Mr. AMYOT. I hope the Government will do their utmost to erect new buildings in one way or the other, as the present building is very unsuitable for its purpose, the roof being almost useless to exclude the rain.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say that the Government of Quebec have voted $15.000, but it was contingent on this Government furnishing $60,000 We find, however, that our $30,000 and $30,000 from them would erect a building, so we did not accept that proposition. The Government of Quebec will ask the Legislature to give $15,000 more upon this Government expending $30,000, and I have no doubt they will put the money to the credit of the Minister of Public Works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the Sorel public buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A Post Office, Custom House, Inland Revenue Office and Weights and Measures Office. As to the Lévis immigrant station, nothing has been done, and therefore I ask a revote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Montreal immigrant buildings are going to be gone on with, I suppose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the Minister of Agriculture told me before he left that he would be able to give me the lot in a short time. The Montreal examining warehouse I must say is in a very poor condition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not this the same building which was erected ten or eleven years ago at a cost of $200,000 or $250,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the whole cost of that building up to 1878 was $203,000; up to the present time, $233,000. The joists are all rotten, and we had to prop the floors quite lately. The inspector of buildings condemned the building unless the floors were propped. The contractors are now going on with the work. I think the money that we are asking will complete it; but I do not promise that, because as we go on, we find that the defects in the floor and joists are greater than we had thought in the beginning.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ONTARIO.

	Cornwall Post Office, Custom House, &c.	$10,000 00
	Brockville do do	22,500 00
	Kingston Penitentiary	8,000 00
	Hamilton Post Office, Custom House, &c	60,000 00
	Stratford do do to complete	2,500 00
	St. Thomas Post Office	15,000 00
	Chatham Post Office, Custom House, &c	15,000 00
	Amherstburg do do	16,000 00
	Galt do do	10,000 00
105	Cobourg do do to complete	2,000 00
	Clifton Post Office, &c.	12,000 00
	Barrie do	16,000 00
	Port Hope do	15,000 00
	Toronto Dominion Buildings—Alterations, renewals, &c.	1,000 00
	Toronto Examining Warehouse	25,000 00
	Orangeville Post Office, &c.	6,000 00
	Peterborough Post Office, Custom House &c.	7,000 00
	Berlin do do	15,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the Cornwall Post Office, Custom House, &c., we ask a revote of $8,000, and a new vote of $2,000. The contractors are Gordon & Ross, and their contract is for $37,000 odd. In 1882, we expended $8,000; in 1883, $11,000, and in 1884, $11,000. It is expected that this $10,000 will complete the contract. The furniture, fittings, heating apparatus, incidentals, &c., will cost altogether $26,000. We voted $2,000, and the balance of the old vote is $17,000, making $19,000. The balance to be still provided to complete is $7,000. For the Brockville Post Office, Custom House, &c., a contract has been let for $37,320, and the contractors are Thomas Tomkins, Crain & Co. The expenditure in 1882 was $3,000; in 1883, 3,600, and in 1884, $3,700 - altogether $10,300. The furniture and fittings, heating apparatus, &c., will bring the total cost up to $44,000. On the 31st of October, we had a balance of $9,400, and we take a new vote of $17,500, making $26,000, so that to complete the work we shall have to ask for $17,000 more. The vote for the Kingston Penitentiary is all for small works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman intend to do anything in connection with the matter I mentioned to him—the drainage of that institution?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I had a statement the other day from the Chief Architect in my Department, to the effect that the drainage is good, that there is no complaint about it; that the ventilation is also good. The only difficulty is in connection with the small cells. I have not been asked by the Department of Justice to put two cells into one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that this vote is in addition to a vote of $15,000 for the present year, altogether $23,000. What do the two together mean? There is no new building going on at Kingston, I believe.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have the statement here. The breakwater has been extended eastward, by 100 feet, by 30 feet depth, and encloses a place 300 feet long by 100. feet wide, for the protection of vessels. The west wharf was in bad repair and had to be strengthened. The heating of the building, workshops, &c., was provided for, and the docks were also overhauled and improved. Three large heating boilers were put in the building. The laying of a new main pipe was attended with much difficulty, in order to obtain the quantity of water required. A new water main was laid, and branches carried to the storage tanks; a large section, 55 by 30 feet, of the roofing was complained of and had to be repaired.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to call the attention of the House to some bills of costs which have been ordered by the Public Accounts Committee to be laid on the Table of the House, with reference to the Hamilton Post Office. As the discussion of these will require some time, I will make no objection to the item now passing for this Post Office, provided the matter can be discussed with equal freedom on Concurrence when the Speaker is in the Chair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to this, and will enquire into the matter, so as to be able to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the Stratford Post Office and Custom House in round numbers?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About $350,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much did the site cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was bought three years ago, and it I think we paid $40,000 for it.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that last year I moved for returns concerning the removal and repairs of the St. Thomas Drill Shed; unfortunately that return did not come down in time to enquire into the expenditure then. In it I find that it is stated that instructions were given by the Department to Mr. Ware, the architect, to the effect that the whole work, comprising expenditure for superintendence and other expenses, was not to cost more than $2 500. The report shows that the expenditure was $2,844.86, although Mr. Ware was told that, under no circumstances, the cost should exceed $2,500, and although he reported back that by reducing some of the repairs he would be able to get the work done inside this figure. I desire to know why there should be this difference of between $300 and $400.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of what the hon. gentleman has said, and I think I will be able to explain the difference. It is most likely some additional work that was asked for by the Department of Militia.

Mr. WILSON. The returns came down only this Session, though moved for last Session. With reference to St. Thomas Post Office, I regret exceedingly that the work has not progressed more rapidly. I do not blame the Government, who have perhaps done all they could to push on the work. During last summer I know the contractor complained that he was unable, under any circumstances, to get labourers to go on with the work in an efficient manner. Although I am glad this money is being expended in St Thomas, I feel it is necessary there should not be any waste or extravagance in the construction of the building. My predecessor urged very strongly on the Government that they should construct this building, and it was intended that a certain kind of stone, a grey stone, should be used; Mr Arkell urged on the Government the necessity of changing it for the Credit Valley red stone, and in one of his letters, dated St Thomas, 20th Sept., 1882, he writes to Mr Thomas Fuller as follows: —

"Mr. Lindop is anxious to order the stone and I would like to know your views. If possible, give him the orders. The Government have lots of money."

Well, it appears ultimately that the Government did decide upon changing the stone and allow an extra cost to be incurred thereby of some $2,000. But we find another letter written by him, a very peculiar letter indeed, a strange letter, coming from a citizen of St. Thomas, one who had been a representative of the people, one who ought to have had the interests of that locality thoroughly at heart. It put me in mind very much, when I read the letter, of a saying I heard when the First Minister was up there during an election campaign. The remark then made was that, if St. Thomas should be so unwise, so foolish, so thoughtless, so regardless of its own interest as to select an Opposition candidate, they did not deserve the public expenditure upon public buildings there. Well, Mr. Arkell appears to have re-echoed that, because I find him writing, on the 9th October, 1882, to the Minister of Public Works, stating:

"DEAR SIR,—I feel very anxious that we shall have public buildings here that will present a good appearance, and the only way to do it will be to stick to the original plans, and to use the red stone"—

It appears there was some conversation at that time about changing it—

"the difference will be $2,000. I have written Mr. Fuller on the subject. The people here do not deserve it."

Well, I cannot say what the people here had done to cause such censure, unless their rejecting him at the polls—"The people here do not deserve it." However, I must congratulate the Minister of Public Works on having paid no attention to his previous supporter. He did not feel that what had been stated by Mr. Arkell ought to be carried out. I, too, have something to complain of in reference to the way in which the expenditure has gone on up to the present time. I do feel that there ought to be, in carrying on a public work, that same economy, that same care, that same caution taken as in any person's private affairs. I find, in the first place,

an item, in a return brought down this Session, for examining the title for property there That item amounts to what?—$145 and some cents. Now, I know perfectly well there was no earthly necessity of any such an expenditure as that upon the investigation of the title. The title originally was from the Crown to one Lawrence, from Lawrence to his nephew Scott, from Scott it was made to the Presbyterian Church, from whom the Government bought the property, and that was the title, the search that this individual, a Mr. Macdonell, really required was to make into the title. And this is not all. A lawyer there, by the name of MacLean, who was paid by the Presbyterian, Church, which formerly owned the property, made out all the papers, made all the transfers from the Presbyterian Church, and charged them for the work performed, and yet we have the nice sum of over $145 charged to the works of that locality. Then we go on a little further. We find the original cost of the land was $7,087.26. I do not think that an unreasonable price; in fact, I think they bought the land very cheaply. We find Mr. Henry Lindop, the contractor of the place, for the time he has been working, receives $17,820. We find also that Mr. Ware, the architect in that locality, a very good man I have no doubt, a painstaking man, receives $559.51. We find W. E. Lindop, a brother of Henry Lindop, the contractor, and what do we find him there for? We find him receiving for photographic views of the building, $45. Now, as anyone who had been there would see perfectly plainly, the building is very little above the ground, very little work has been performed, and what in the world is $45 here charged for photographs, unless it is charged to cover the expense of photographing those who are engaged there—masons and others.

An hon. MEMBER. Perhaps the Minister.

Mr. WILSON. And perhaps the clerk of the works was on the top of the building at the time, and we will soon come to the clerk of the works. I do not think the Minister would hardly have stood upon that building, if he had been there, to be photographed. We come to another item—James W. Harper, to pay Chief Architect's staff. Now, they have not expended a very large amount of money in this locality yet—$17,820. What does the clerk of the works cost this building, charged to this locality?—$2 559.77. Mark you, they had an architect there, paid him between $500 and $600, and yet the other architect and the staff are charged to that work, $2,559.77. They are not satisfied with that. They must have a clerk of the works. They have an architect; that is not sufficient. They must have somebody else, and who is he? This same individual, the same person who is shouting so freely that the Government had lots of money, and to be sure and get the building completed in a creditable manner. We find Thomas Arkell clerk of the works; and what is he getting?—$1,350. And it is notorious—it is known fullwell that he devoted precious little time in looking after these buildings. It is well known that he is a grain merchant, and that a good portion of the year he is not in the city at all. He may have written a few letters. He may have notified the Minister of Public Works that he had better have another photograph taken, so that his friend, Mr. W. E. Lindop might have another opportunity of photographing the stone as it rose above the ground. But the idea of having a clerk of the works getting $1,350, and doing comparatively very little! Those are not all the charges in this famous return. We come to another—advertising. To advertising is charged $260.64. What that is for—very little advertising was ever done there—I really cannot say. It may be that the advertising is a very nice thing to cover up the doubtful transaction. It would require something of that kind to do it, and "advertising" is just as good a heading as anything else, I suppose. Printing, $7.62. Perhaps that may be in the Government Department here, but certainly the charge to the clerk of the works in the Public Department here I think is ample and sufficient to cover the cost of printing. Another is contingencies. They are not satisfied with printing, but they must have contingencies, and to that article we find $436.90 charged. We find, too, that the expenditure on the works at St. Thomas, for which the amount paid to the contractor is $17,820, runs up by charges for clerk of the works, for architects, for printing, for contingencies, and in other ways, to $30,272. Now, we have only had a vote taken of $48,000 to build these buildings; they are not up to the first storey yet, and, if the buildings are to go on at this rate, the Minister of Public Works will well understand that there must be a much larger amount voted. What I complain of is, that if the same kind of expenditure is to take place in the coming year as took place in the last year, the Minister ought at least to put in another $20,000, or at least another $10,000. Therefore, I really do hope a little more care and caution will be exercised in the manner in which the public money is expended, and I might say here, that if the public building in St. Thomas is any true criterion as to the manner in which moneys are expended in various parts of the Dominion of Canada, it is no wonder that our public buildings cost more than they ought.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very thankful to the hon. member for calling our attention to these different items. Of course he is a new member and is not accustomed to the necessary expenditures connected with these works. For instance, he is very much surprised to see $7 or $8 for printing, and asks what printing there could be at St. Thomas. He thinks it must have been done here. No doubt it was done here. The hon. gentleman knows that we have to print forms of tenders and specifications which cost money, and in this case the printer's bill amounted to $7 or $8. Then, as to the architect. As usual an architect has to prepare the working plans, but the ordinary plans are prepared at the office here, as a rule, by the Department. The architect on the ground has to look after the building as it proceeds. He has not, like the clerk of works, to look at every stone that is laid down, at the mortar or cement, but to have general supervision of the building, and for that he is paid in accordance with the ordinary rules of the Department—I cannot remember exactly the percentage, but I think it is between 3 per cent. and 5 per cent.; therefore, he is paid for that. As to the clerk of work, he happens to be Mr. Arkell, who was formerly a member of Parliament. He had ceased to be a member of Parliament, and as I had confidence in Mr. Arkell and thought he would be a good clerk of works, I employed him as such. He has done his duty well, and has been paid like any other clerk of works, neither more nor less. Then with regard to the photographs. It must be remembered that these works are at a long distance from headquarters, and we have to have photographs from time to time of the works as they proceed. Sometimes a difficulty occurs in relation to the work and I cause a photograph to be prepared and sent down; otherwise we would have to be constantly on the road, and I have no time to lose in travelling. When I have to decide about a difficulty, I want to see it with my own eyes, and a photograph gives a great deal better idea than four or five pages of description.

Mr. WILSON. They must be very dear photographs to cost $45.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman was a photographer he would not find it too much, and perhaps if he had the misfortune to lose his election, and his friends were in power and he consented to be clerk of works, he would not find the pay given to Mr. Arkell too much. As regards the people there, I have great confidence in them,

and if they sometimes make a mistake they always try to correct it afterwards.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt the hon. gentleman makes very satisfactory explanations, as a rule, but I really think the facts disclosed here warrant some notice. Now, $17,800 were spent up to date in the erection of these buildings. The services of the architect, the clerk of works, and Mr. Edmond Ware—who is something of an architect, I suppose—amount to $4,500 in round numbers, as professional services for supervising the expenditure of $17,500. Now, I hardly think the Minister himself would contend that this is a fair proportion; I regard it as a monstrous disproportion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will remember that the whole amount expended is $30,272, and, as I said just now, the work has been very much delayed by the contractors. The right kind of labour could not be obtained, and they could not obtain the right stones, hence the delay. There must have been some good reason given to the Chief Architect that he did not recommend taking the contract from their hands. Of course, when we see contractors doing their best to fulfil their contract, we have some consideration for them. Now, as to the amount expended for the examination of the title, that amount was expended by the Department of Justice in investigating the title. The hon. gentleman just now has given a history of it. The Department of Justice is very careful about getting good titles. When we are to expend a sum of money, $30,000 or $40,000, on a lot, it is better to expend $150 in securing a good title than to leave it in doubt and perhaps afterwards lose a large sum of money. Besides that, all those bills of costs are taxed in the ordinary way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know something of bills of costs, and have had to pay a considerable number of them for the examination of titles, and I say distinctly, regarding these bills of cost in the present instance, that some of them seem to me simply scandalous. I think it would be well that that particular item should stand over to be investigated.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, along with the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There will be further charges for clerk of works and for architect's staff.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. gentleman will hardly wish the Committee to understand that it is necessary to expend $4,500 for superintending the erection of a building to cost $17,500.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total expenditure will be $30,000; building, $23,000; land, $7,000. The amount paid to the clerk of the works was necessarily larger than usual, from the fact that delay has occurred in putting up the building. An officer was also sent from the Department to see how the work was proceeding, and his expenses had to be paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the architect, Mr. Ware, is stated in the return to have received $3,118. I think the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has done a great service in eliciting these details from the Government.

Mr. WILSON. I suggest to the Minister of Public Works that he should insist on the clerk of the works attending to his duties a little more energetically. I have nothing to say against that officer, but if he would act a little more energetically, the contractor might expedite the work. I also desire the Postmaster-General to make a note of the fact that the entrance to the Post Office is too narrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to Amherstburg Post Office, $15,000 will be required to complete the work after this vote is taken.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Has the Department any rule in regard to the erection of public buildings in towns?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sometimes they are erected on account of population, and sometimes on account of the business done in the town. At Amherstburg there is a large trade going on. The Customs duties amount to $71,000 and the other revenues to about $2,500. The value of the export is $555,000; imports, $343,000; goods entered for consumption, $321,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I can well understand the hon. gentleman's argument with regard to Amherstburg, but I think there are other places where the argument does not hold good. The population of Amherstburg was 2,672, according to the last Census, and yet the public buildings there cost a considerable sum. Now, I find that Berlin, with a population of 4,000, has public buildings costing $15,000. The population of Orangeville is 2,847, and the hon. gentleman is erecting, or proposing to erect, buildings there costing $5,000; Gananoque, with a population of 2,800, is having public buildings at a cost of $8,000; Barrie, with a population 4,800, is having public buildings to the extent of $16,000; Port Hope, with a population of 5,500, has public buildings costing $15,000; Clifton, with a population of 2,347, has public buildings costing $12,000. Now, of course, I do not know the system on which the hon. gentleman is acting with respect to these public buildings, but on that basis of population there are many towns of three times the population of some of these which have no public buildings. In my county there are two or three towns exceeding several of these in population, and yet I do not see that he is proposing to erect any public buildings in that important county. The hon. gentleman knows that in that county there is the town of Goderich. He knows the beauty of its situation and the importance of the place, for he has been there, and while he is dealing out his favours so extensively to other places, I hope he will not forget the capital of the great county of Huron, and will see the propriety of erecting public buildings there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is true I visited the town of Goderich more than once. It is a very pretty place, as the hon. gentleman says, and it is a place where one is hospitably received, especially by the hon. gentleman himself. But we have been expending a large sum of money on the harbour there, and I am afraid we will have to expend some more, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would not have me erect public buildings there, to the detriment of the harbour, which is a very good one, without which the place, though it is very pretty, would be rather a poor place. I do not say that public buildings may not be erected there—that may come afterwards—but my attention has not been called to it more than once, and that not so very far back, and I could not do it at the time. I have no doubt that good years are in store for it, and that public buildings may be required there, but I am not in a position to say positively now.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not see that the hon. gentleman has anything for Goderich harbour.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will find that it has not been forgotten before the Session is over.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am glad to hear that, as h has not forgotten other harbours in that locality. I ma say, however, that I give him the fullest credit for bein open to argument, and I think that on that side of th House he is the most accessible gentleman who has eve occupied his Department.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has not paid a visit to the section of country from which I come, because there are some places there considerably larger in population than some of the points at which public buildings are either erected or are in course of erection. Some of his colleagues have recently been visiting in that direction, and I hope these places have impressed them sufficiently to enable him to do something in that locality, more than has been done in the past. The town of Strathroy is the most populous town in West Middlesex, having a population of over 4,200—much larger than some of these other places. There is also the growing town of Glencoe, which is looking for consideration of this kind, and I trust that the recent visits of the Postmaster-General and the Minister of Finance, looking forward as we do to a visit of the Minister of Public Works, will endorse what I have said, and show that these places are in every way entitled to consideration.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). How much has been expended on Galt public buildings, and how much is required to complete them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site has been given by the population, and the plans are being prepared.

Mr. BAIN. I believe the corporation of Dundas in the adjoining county recently made application for a grant for public buildings there. Have they any prospect of receiving that grant in the Supplementary Estimates this Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer that question, because these grants in the Supplementary Estimates must remain my secret until the Governor sanctions them. If, however, the hon. gentleman does not find a vote in these Estimates, he will have great hopes for next year.

Mr. BAIN. I understood the corporation sent a deputation to wait on the Minister at a recent date, and I have no doubt they urged their claims with all that eloquence which some of those gentlemen know well how to use. Recently the Department over which the hon. gentleman presides sold a public work in that locality, for which they have realized a respectable sum—a work which a good many people thought belonged to the Province. I may remind the hon. gentleman that the town of Dundas showed its faith in the National Policy by its works, during the last election contest. I should be happy to hear that they will have an opportunity of sharing the surplus.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The vote for Clifton Post Office, $12,000, seems a large one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; it is large, but I am sure the hon. gentleman will admit that a place situated so much in sight of our American cousins should have a better building than a place in the interior. The business there is large. The contract is for $28,000. The furniture, fences, graining, heating apparatus, &c., will bring the total cost up to $43,000; we have expended already $14,000. For the Barrie Post Office, &c., there is a revote of $6,000, and a new vote of $10,000. The total cost will be $40,000. It is expected that we shall require a balance of $4,500 to complete the Port Hope building next year. When I was in Toronto last year I saw the Collector of Customs, and afterwards conversed with the Minister of Customs about the Examining Warehouse there. It was found that the work could not be performed properly without extending the building. Instead of completing the whole work now, we intend to go by degrees. The contract is for $72,000, and the fixtures, furniture, incidentals, &c., will bring the entire cost up to $83,000. After this has been paid, we shall have to provide about $22,000 more. Nothing has been done at Orangeville yet, besides selecting a site, which will cost, I think, $1,200. We obtained it from the corporation of the town, and the title is yet to be given us. I suppose the entire cost of the buildings will be $22,000 or $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the revenue there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The postal revenue is $3,583, and the money orders $4,000. The site for the Peterborough building has not yet been selected. A number of lots were offered, and I had to send an officer to make a report upon them. For the Berlin Post Office, Custom House, &c., the work is going on. The contractor is Mr. W. H. Lewis, and his contract amounts to $23,900. When completed, the whole work will have cost $38,600.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). A few days ago I had occasion to bring before the hon. gentleman a petition which had been presented to his colleague, the Postmaster-General, praying for the erection of a public building in the town of Paris; and that hon. gentleman, with his usual courtesy and his pleasant smile, said that I would have to look in the Estimates for it; and I have been looking here for some time, and have not found it. The printer has evidently made some mistake, and it can only be rectified in the Supplementary Estimates. The hon. Minister is evidently not taking votes for any new building this year. If he were I would be disposed to press him a little more strongly on, that point. But I would like to have his explanations.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If there is a mistake, I think it is my hon. friend who is making the mistake. He will remember that on the day on which he spoke of Paris, these Estimates were before the House. He never called the attention of myself or of my Department to the wants of Paris, and therefore I am not surprised at his finding nothing in these Estimates. We did not wish to put into these Estimates votes for any new buildings. The Supplementary Estimates are yet to come. If Paris is not found there this time, the hon. gentleman will remember that Paris was not built in one day, and therefore he may expect that Paris will be built another day. We have to examine the place and its population and revenues, and to make arrangements about obtaining a lot—to see whether the corporation will give us a lot, or whether we shall have to purchase one. All these preliminary examinations must be made before we can submit a request for a vote. But the hon. gentleman may be sure that I have not forgotten his request, though I cannot tell him that I will recommend a vote this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the hon. gentleman has not introduced any new votes here; but if he introduces new votes, he should either put them in these Estimates, which are more easily discussed than the Supplementary Estimates, or bring down the Supplementary Estimates earlier than usual. It is very awkward having new votes on totally new subjects brought in in the Supplementary Estimates. The practice heretofore—I am not speaking of last year—has been to consider in the ordinary Estimates new appropriations, and to use the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of supplying any additional votes that might be wanted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The practice of the last two years is the best—that of putting down in the ordinary Estimates the continuation of works already undertaken, so that Parliament can then see how far we can go for new works. We then take the list of new works asked and select the most pressing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to that course, provided the Supplementary Estimates are brought down at a period which will allow us time to discuss them. I doubt whether, at the date they are brought down, they can be reasonably discussed; and if the hon. gentleman

brings down new propositions, some discussion must be had on them.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, MANITOBA.

106	Parliament Buildings, Winnipeg—To complete.	12,000 00
	Lieutenant-Governor's residence and stables, Winnipeg—To complete	7,500 00
	Winnipeg Post Office	40,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must explain, with reference to the Parliament Buildings in Winnipeg, that this is only to complete them. We have had in the Suplementary Estimates of the current year a large sum of money for these buildings which are authorized by Order in Council. The Manitoba Government represented that the buildings they had were not suitable to be used for the purposes in question, and we have, therefore, to ask Parliament to give us the vote of money for this purpose. These buildings are now far enough advanced to allow the Legislature to sit in them, but of course we will require to complete the ground, &c. As to the Lieutenant-Governor's residence, we have paid up to the end of December last, since 1881, $74,000, and we require $7,500 more; altogether the expenditure will amount to about $90,000. With reference to the Post Office, it is under contract. We are building on the site of the old one, as it is central, and the price asked for new lots was so high we did not think proper to purchase another site. We recommended last year, under these circumstances, the erection of a temporary Post Office on Government land which may be removed, if necessary, when the new building is completed.

Mr. WATSON. What is the total cost of the temporary Post Office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think between $12,000 and $13,000. It is a large building, with a vault, &c.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

107	Dominion Lunatic Asylum or Hospital	$10,000 00
	New Jail and Lock-up	10,000 00
	Public Buildings, North-West Territories generally	5,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nothing has been done about the Lunatic Asylum or Hospital, and the Department of the Interior has not selected the site.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The same remark applies to the jails.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We voted, last Session, $7,000 for public buildings at Regina. I do not see a revote this year. Have the Government abandoned their intention of erecting public buildings there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The buildings intended to be erected there have been erected, and I have been informed by the Department of the Interior that no new vote was required.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is evidently hardly the case. The intention was to put a court house and jail in that town within the year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That may come in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. CAMERON. I was there in the fall, and the officials told me the buildings were to go on this spring. The intention was to put the buildings up, and I am surprised not to find them in the Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt a court house is required, and a vote for it will likely be found in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

108	Vancouver Quarantine Station and outbuildings	7,500 00
	Nanaimo Post Office, Custom House, &c.—To complete	3,500 00
	British Columbia Penitentiary, New Westminster	15,000 00

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I desire to ask the hon. Minister whether he has selected the site, the particular spot, in that objectionable place, Plummer's Bay, for a quarantine station, and of the sum of $75,000, how much is to be expended on the purchase of a site?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not been informed by the Department of Agriculture where the exact spot is that they intend to select for this work; therefore, I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman must see that the vote is the same as last year. It is a revote. Therefore we have not expended a dollar. The next is the Nanaimo Post Office. This is to complete the work. This is for the outside, the grading and so on. For the British Columbia Penitentiary, New Westminster, there is a sum of $15,000 in the revote column. It should not be there; it is a new vote.

109.	Public Buildings generally	$15,000 00

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c.

110	Repairs, furniture, heating, &c.	$175,000 00
	Grounds, Public Buildings, Ottawa	7,500 00
	Removal of snow, Public Buildings, Ottawa	2,000 00
	Heating Public Buildings, Ottawa	53,000 00
	Gas, Public Buildings, Ottawa	22,000 00
	Water, Public Buildings, Ottawa	13,0 0 00
	Allowance for fuel and light, Rideau Hall	8,000 00
	Telephonic service, Public Buildings, Ottawa	4,000 00
	Salaries of engineers, firemen and caretakers &c., of Dominion Public Buildings	31,000 00
	Heating Dominion Public Buildings, fuel, &c.	31,300 00

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would like to ask if that $4,000 for telephone service is an inclusive amount, or if it is according to the number of telephones.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is what it costs per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems a large amount.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The annual expenditure is $1,500. We have $2,500 towards purchase of sets of instruments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was the same last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year we had to put in the cables.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these for the Public Buildings at Ottawa alone?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Public Buildings, and also connected with the outside, with the city, between certain residences or offices and the Buildings here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect to pay $4,000 every year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Between $1,500 and $2,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an enormous increase, apparently, for salaries of engineers, caretakers, &c.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is apparent, but it is not real. It was paid by different Departments, and, as stated last year, all these salaries and employés have been put under my Department. The increase for fuel is required, as we have some new buildings outside that have to be heated. Besides, the fuel costs more now than it used to.

Mr. MILLS. I thought the National Policy would have put down the price.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is any portion of this first amount of $175,000 to be appropriated towards building a new Railway Committee room?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; there is nothing for that. Last year hon. gentlemen spoke generally in the House of improvements to this Chamber, for example, and they complained of rooms being required for Committees and to be used by the members generally. As there was no vote for that, and I had to comply with the request of the House and make the improvements that hon. gentlemen must have seen in this room, for the ventilation and for the skylights, and for other improvements, arranging the seats so as to give more space to members and also prevent the draughts that they were complaining of in the rear seats; the amount for these improvements has been put in the Supplementary Estimates for the current year that will come down early next week. I know that members, as well as some of my officers, have been speaking of a new room to be erected near the present Railway Committee Room over the yard, where there is a large space for that purpose, but the Government have not decided upon making that improvement now. I have not heard that there were complaints this year about the want of space. Of course, if the House would wish to have a new room, we would have to see where it could be erected, and we would have to ask the money from Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that the Committee is already too large. It consists of over 130 members, and by reducing the number, the room we occupy now might still be large enough, for a few years at all events, for the time is not far distant when the Senate will be abolished, and then we may use that room.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is bespoken.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that will take some time.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the experiment with electric lights has proved successful, and whether this Chamber is to be lighted with electric lights.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, the experiment has been successful to a certain extent. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press me as to that, because we have to decide between two companies, and if we have to choose one and put the other aside, the House would not wish that by a statement here we should damage one company, and therefore the hon. gentleman will prefer not to press me on that point. As to lighting this Chamber, it is my wish to do so, but I am not in a position to say that we can do it this year. I am informed that the electric light has not yet been introduced into Chambers of this kind. In England, they have not introduced the light into the House of Commons. They have it around the House, in Committee rooms and in corridors and so on, but not in the Chamber. I understand that at Washington they have not introduced it either, nor at Albany; but we are watching the progress of the electric light, and as soon as it is introduced in a public building of that kind, we will have to follow suit. I do not suppose the House would wish me to try the experiment. I think it would be better to leave those that have more money than we have and are more important countries, to try the experiment, and then we may follow suit. As soon as we can do it, we will.

Mr. SPROULE. As far as your experience goes in the House, what difference do you find in cost between the electric light and the gas light?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have not had it long enough in use to be able to say that. It would require to be used at least six months or a year before we can show the difference. However, hon. members may judge for themselves about the beauty of the light. It is a much softer light, and it does not throw any heat; and it will be a Godsend to us here in this room if we can have this light and be able to use it whilst we are writing and remaining here; but, if it flickers, then hon. gentlemen would complain at once, and in case they might complain, because it is one of the privileges of member of this House as well as of every British subject to be able to grumble, I will take care the gas is not removed, so that if they complain of the other light, we may take the gas again. As soon as the electric light is used for the upper part of the Chamber, no doubt we will have a good deal more gas on the lower level.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see an item for heating the Public Buildings at Ottawa, $53,000; and heating the Dominion Public Buildings—fuel, &c, $31,000. Why are these items separated?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will remember that last year the heating of the Custom Houses, Post Offices, and other public buildings throughout the Dominion, was put under my Department, which accounts for the second item.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and reports made by any officer of the Department of Public Works, in reference to the erection of a public wharf and bridge at Upper Woods Harbour, in the county of Shelburne, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Return showing the location of the life-saving stations of Canada, with description of life-boats, buildings, wreck guns and other life-saving apparatus of each station. Also, statement showing name of captain and number of men in each crew, the articles of enlistment, the months during which such enlistment or engagement is binding, the salary of captain and pay of men in each case. Also, copy of instructions and regulations issued by the Department of Marine for the guidance of life saving crews, and reports received from captains of crews and others, as to the number of imperilled mariners rescued and amount of property saved by life-saving service during the year 1883.—(Mr. Platt.)

Copies of report and plans of the Civil Engineer, on surveys made by him last summer, in St. Anne, Kamouraska and St. André, in the county of Kamouraska.—(Mr. Blondeau.)

Return—1st. Of all correspondence and papers relating to certain charges or complaints made against J. E. Gaboury, Esq., as postmaster of St. Césaire, and to his subsequent dismissal from the said office of postmaster; 2nd. A copy of the instructions given to the person who investigated the charges against said J. E. Gaboury, if any investigation took place, and a copy of the report made by such person. —(Mr. Béchard.)

Copies of all reports made by Messrs. Scott and Fuller, Architects of Public Works Department, respecting claims of the late James Goodwin, for extras in connection with erection of fence or wall in front of Parliamentary Grounds, together with copies of all estimates and correspondence in reference thereto.—(Mr. Lister.)

Copies of all reports, maps and estimates of the Engineer or Engineers employed to make surveys of the River Thames, at the village of London West, in the county of Middlesex, in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. McMillan, Middlesex.)

Copies of all correspondence with the American Government relating to statistics of emigration from Canada to the United States, since the year 1873.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the several proprietors of Beaumont (or their agents), expropriated in connection with the St. Charles Branch of the Intercolonial Railway; also a statement showing in detail: 1. The bills of costs claimed by the counsel and attorneys of the said proprietors; 2. The said costs as allowed and taxed by the Court or Judge; 3. The sums paid to the said attorneys, or to be paid to them as costs so taxed; 4. The amounts granted and paid or to be paid to the said proprietors; the persons to whom the said amounts have been paid, and the names of the agents who acted for them, or who received the said amounts.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Statement showing the present constitution of the North West Council, the number of elected members, the districts for which they are elected, the number of votes polled, the names of the candidates, and the qualifications required of the voters.—(Mr. Mills.)

Statement of all moneys paid by the Dominion Government to the Local Government of Ontario since Confederation; stating the amounts in each year and stating on what account.—(Mr Farrow.)

Copies of all despatches, correspondence and papers having reference to the notice given by the United States Government terminating the fishery clauses of the Treaty of Washington, or relating to any negotiations that may have been opened, or steps taken by the Government, on the subject of the use by American fishermen of the sea fisheries of the Dominion, in view of the approaching termination of those fishery clauses.—(Mr. Davies.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports of Engineers with maps and plans, relating to the improvements required to be made in order to secure a better supply of water to the Rideau Canal, as well as to open up a large section of the country bordering on lakes in the counties of Frontenac and Addington.- (Mr. Bell.)

Statement showing the names of all stockholders in the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, with the amounts of stock held by each of said stockholders at the close of the first year after the charter was granted or operations commenced. Also the names of all stockholders in said Company and the amounts of stock held by each on the first day of the current year.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Copies of all documents, complaints and reports made against Clovis Caron, fishery overseer for the counties of Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska; also of all documents relating to the appointment of the said Clovis Caron to the position of fishery overseer and to his duties as such.—(Mr. Blondeau.)

Statement showing the amount of bonuses that have been granted for railway purposes by the townships of Artemesia, Bentinck, Egremont, Glenelg, Normanby and the town of Durham; also for statement showing the amount expended by the Provincial Government in aid of railways within said townships.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Copies of all tenders and advertisements for tenders, with statement showing where published, for furnishing supplies and transport of all kinds for both the Mounted Police and Indian Departments of Manitoba and the North-West; also copies of all contracts entered into for the same between 1st January, 1880, and the 1st January, 1884; also statement showing quantities purchased and prices paid for all supplies and transport without tender between the above dates. —(Mr. Casey.)

Return of the amount of salary or allowance made to Mr. George Hutchinson as the person in charge of the Meteorological Service at St. John, N.B. Also, amount of expenses of Mr. R. J. Stupart, going from Toronto to St. John, and other expenses preparing and fitting up office and instruments. Also, any instructions from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the Superintendent at Toronto, in reference to the change of officers at St. John, and the removal of Mr. Gilbert Murdock. Also, all correspondence between Mr. Gilbert Murdock and the Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent of the Meteorological Service at Toronto. Also, copies of any petition, memorial or other documents in regard to the above changes.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Copy of contract entered into by the Government and John Sinnot for the building of a breakwater at the mouth of St. Peter's Harbour, King's County, Prince Edward Island; statement of all amounts paid for the partial building of such work; also the names of the sureties and the name of the inspector.—(Mr. McIntyre.)

Copies of all memorials presented by the Government of the Province of Quebec to the Government of Canada, in relation to the readjustment of the Dominion Subsidy, as well as to any other claims of the said Province; also of all correspondence in relation thereto between the two Governments not already brought down.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Statement of receipts and expenditures chargeable to Consolidated Fund to 20th March, 1883, and 1884 in each year, respectively; also for return of exports and imports to 1st March, 1883 and 1884, respectively.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copies of all tenders for the enlargement of Sections 4 (Rapide Plat) and 10 (Cornwall) of the St. Lawrence Canals, received on the 4th December, 1883, and 12th February, 1884, respectively, as well as copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and reports of Engineers on the same since the 28th September last. Also copies of the quantities of the several items under bills or schedules of said tenders respectively, in which the aggregate sum of each tender has been computed, and a copy of the engineers estimates in detail of the prices of each item in each of the said schedules.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Copies of all correspondence, of a date subsequent to 1st January, 1883, upon the subjects of repairs to, hauling out and launching of the steamer *Sir James Douglas*, in the early part of last year, between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and their agent at Victoria, B.C., or between the Department and any other person or persons in the Province of British Columbia upon said subject; also copies of reports sent in to the Department by the agent of the Department in British Columbia, and the master of the steamer above referred to, in connection with an unpleasant and serious difference of opinion which arose between them, reflecting discreditably upon themselves and the Department.—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)

Return of the expenses of the Senate and Senate Chamber, and all matters or items of expenditure connected therewith, from 1st January, 1 79, to 1st January, 1884, showing each year's expenditure by itself.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copies of all petitions and correspondence relating to the recent appointment of a Postmaster at Solway, County of Bruce, vice Duncan McIntyre resigned.—(Mr. Wells.)

Copies of all correspondence with the United States Government relating to alleged violations of the neutrality of Canadian Territory by United States Troops pursuing and arresting deserters from the American Army upon Canadian soil.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all Orders in Council and of correspondence between this Government or the High Commissioner and the Imperial Authorities, in regard to restrictions on the live cattle trade with Great Britain, from 1st January, 1883, to date.—(Mr. Casey.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, complaints, Reports or other documents in connection with the suspension, superannuation or retirement of W. F. Whitcher, from the Public Service—(Mr. Casey.)

Copy of any award or report made by the Arbitrators appointed to settle claims of contractors for Section B. Canadian Pacific Railway; and Statement of all sums paid in consequence of such award; also, Statement of claims submitted by said contractors before said Arbitrators; also,

statement as to which items of said claims are still undecided by said Arbitrators.—(Mr. Casey.)

Copies of Orders in Council appointing Alphonse Audet to his present position in the Civil Service. (Mr. Casey.)

Copy of memorial presented by the Dominion Grange to the Minister of Finance, regarding legislation in the interests of the farming community.—(Mr. Casey.)

Copy of petition to Postmaster General from residents of Duart and vicinity, complaining of the appointment of Ephraim Britton as Postmaster of Duart, and asking that his appointment be cancelled, and that C. Macdonald be appointed in his stead; and of any correspondence relating to such petition.—(Mr. Casey.)

Return, in detail, showing the expenditure in each year since Confederation: — 1. For the purchase and maintenance of Rideau Hall and grounds, with all additions and improvements; 2. For furniture and all other moveables supplied for Rideau Hall; 3. For fuel and light, Rideau Hall; 4. For return similar to that contained in 1, 2 and 3, connected with the Quebec Citadel; 5. For salaries of Governor General and his officials; 6. For the contingencies of the Governor General's office; 7. For travelling expenses of the Governor General and staff, besides those included in 6; 8. For labour and supplies of Dominion steamers while conveying the Governor General, and for all expenses of every character connected with Rideau Hall.—(Mr. McCraney.)

Return showing the total cost of old and new works, with expenditure for repairs and maintenance in each year since Confederation:—1. For cost of Welland Canal; 2. For new works, repairs and all incidental expenses connected therewith; 3. For maintenance; 4. For revenue derived therefrom; 5. For return similar to that contained in 1, 2, 3 and 4, connected with the St. Lawrence Canals; 6. For estimated cost for deepening and completing the St. Lawrence Canals to a depth of twelve and fourteen feet, separately.—(Mr. McCraney.)

Return of all papers and correspondence respecting that portion of the Pajot farm in the town of Sandwich, which is claimed by the Indian Department on behalf of the Wyandottes of Anderdon.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Copies of all tenders received by the Department of Militia and Defence from June 1st, 1883, to December 1st, 1883, for the manufacture of clothing for the Militia Force.—(Mr. Vail.)

Copies of the contract awarded by the Government for the rebuilding of the drill shed at Montreal, and of all reports made by the Government Architect on the state of the old drill shed and the work to be done; also, copies of all Orders in Council and Departmental Orders, modifying the terms of the contract, and of all correspondence between the Government and the contractor for the said work, as well in relation to the work originally ordered as to an increase of the work to be done on the said drill shed.—(Mr. Bernier.)

Return showing all sums received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of rental of rivers and streams; also showing sums paid into the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of fines imposed for violation of the fishery regulations, the return in each case to show amounts so received during years 1882 and 1883, with the date received and the names of depositors, and the date on which such sums were deposited to the credit of the Government.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

All correspondence between himself and the Minister of the Interior in relation to a timber limit or limits on Jack Head River, with the plans submitted in connection therewith; also all correspondence between the same parties, and plans in connection therewith, in relation to timber limits on the Lake of the Woods.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Return showing the number of steam tugs, steam dredges and dumping scows bought by the Government or built for the Government, during the year 1883, for use in the Dominion of Canada, showing where they were built, the builders' name, and the price paid for the same.—(Mr. Jackson.)

Statement showing the number of passes given on the Intercolonial Railway, in each year, from 1st January, 1874, to 1st January, 1884; by whom given and to whom given. —(Mr. Montplaisir.)

Copies of all correspondence and reports of engineers, with maps and plans, relating to the extension of the Rideau Canal from the village of Morton to Charleston Lake and the village of Gananoque, in the County of Leeds.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Return—1st. Correspondence, papers, draft, notarial transfer and telegram respecting Survey Contract No. 10, of L. J. E. Garon, of the season of 1881, by which Joseph Adhemar Martin, merchant, of Rimouski, has received the sum of $800. 2nd. Correspondence, papers, draft, notarial transfer and telegram between the Minister of the Interior and the said Joseph Adhemar Martin, concerning the balance remaining due on the said transfer of the said Survey Contract No. 10 of L. J. E. Garon, of the said season of 1881.—(Mr. Billy.)

Return of all certificates given by medical men under the Temperance Act, 1878, in Prince County, Prince Edward Island, since that Act came into force in that county, showing by whom granted, to whom granted, and dates when granted.—(Mr. Yeo.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:15 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 31st March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved that the petition of the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company, presented this day, be now read and received.

Petition read.

Mr. BLAKE. What is this for?

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I understand, as those gentlemen who are members of the Railway Committee will understand from the discussion which took place a few days ago in that Committee, that an Act was passed last Session to sanction the amalgamation of two railways projected from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay—one from Winnipeg to the Nelson River, and the other to another point on Hudson Bay. The Act provided that the two companies should hold a meeting by the 1st of November last, and should pass resolutions to carry out the amalgamation. It also provided that the companies to be amalgamated should have certain extensions to their charter; and under that Act one of the companies called a meeting, passed the requisite resolution for amalgamation, and transmitted it to the Government. The other company called its meeting, but it has not passed any resolution for amalgamation, and has, I understand, withdrawn from the proposed amalgamation. The hon. Minister of Railways stated in the Railway Committee, the other day, that the Government were anxious to aid the construction of that line by a land grant bonus, and that as the two companies had not succeeded in their amalgamation it

would be necessary for the Government to decide which of the two should have the aid from the Government. The Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company, the one which passed the resolution favouring the amalgamation, requires certain amendments to its charter—an extension of the time for constructing the line, and other alterations which were given to the amalgamated company by the Act of last Session; but inasmuch as that Act became inoperative, in consequence of the non-carrying out of the amalgamation scheme, it was necessary that the company which has done all it could to carry out the amalgamation, should have the powers which would have been granted under the Act of last Session. I believe the present Bill is for that purpose.

Mr. ORTON. When the matter was before the Railway Committee the other day we were led to believe that this amalgamation clause had been strictly conformed with, and that the charter was still in existence. It was stated then by the hon. member for Kent, and also by myself, that we had reason to believe that this clause in the Amalgamation Act had not been complied with, and that therefore the charter had ceased to exist. But one of the promoters of the Hudson Bay and Winnipeg Company's amalgamation charter distinctly led the Committee to believe that it did exist, and in consequence of the expression of opinion by the Committee and the Minister of Railways I was induced to withdraw the Bill, which I had temporarily taken charge of for another member. Now we find that such has not been the case, and hence the application to Parliament to have this unusual course taken, without any notice being given. I may state that there is another railway company which have a charter to Hudson Bay, the Nelson River Railway and Steamship Company, and it certainly seems not unfair that this course should be taken. If it is not unfair to others they propose to construct a road by the east side of Lake Winnipeg, as I understood it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in stating that it was said to the Committee that the amalgamation had taken place. I can understand how such an impression was created, but the discussion arose upon the point taken by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that the charters of these two companies had lapsed; and that point was met by the statement that, irrespective of the lapsing of the original charters, an Act was passed last year authorizing them to be amalgamated and given Parliamentary sanction to their existence. Then the promoter of one of these existing companies which had been authorized by an Act of last Session to amalgamate, stated that a meeting had been held between the companies, as provided for by the Act, and had been adjourned from time to time; but I did not understand him or any person to say that the amalgamation had actually taken place.

Mr. ORTON. I understood distinctly, and I think many other members of the Committee understood, the hon. member to state that the clause with reference to amalgamation has been complied with. He certainly led the Committee to believe that the companies had amalgamated.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think that the hon. member for Selkirk stated that section 5 had been complied with; but he went on to say further that a meeting of his company had been held in September, and that it had been adjourned to another time, but whether the other company held a meeting or not was not clear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not understand him to say that the amalgamation had taken place?

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). What the hon. member for Selkirk said was that the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Company had held a meeting and passed a resolution for amalgamation, and transmitted it to the Secretary of State; and that a meeting of the other company had been summoned before the 1st of November, but had been adjourned from time to time, and had not yet passed a resolution for amalgamation; showing that the amalgamation had not been completed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, that is it.

Petition received.

CENTRAL ONTARIO RAILWAY.

Mr. PLATT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 73) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WHITE (Hastings) moved that the following words be inserted after the word "line" in the third line of the section:—"*Viâ* Bancroft, in the township of Faraday in the county of Hastings."

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it is in accordance with the rule that that amendment should be put, as no notice has been given of it, and it proposes to define or limit the route of the railway.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I did not think it was necessary to give notice of it. I do not think the promoters of the Bill will object to it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is an important change in the character of the Bill, and I think notice should be given of it.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I move that the following clauses be added to the Bill—notice has been given of these:

"6. The Company shall at the point of junction of their railway with the Midland Railway of Canada, in the township of Madoc, in the County of Hastings, afford all reasonable facilities for the exchange of traffic passing to or from points on the Midland Railway system, from or to points on the said Central Ontario Railway north of said junction, and shall, at said point of junction, take from the Midland Railway of Canada without unreasonable delay, and with all convenient despatch, all cars, trucks, and such like means of conveyance, which may be consigned to points on the said Central Ontario line north of the junction as aforesaid; and will also receive upon their line of railway, north of the said junction, all cars, trucks and freight destined for points upon the Midland Railway; and shall haul, carry and convey the same, as the case may be, to or from the said junction, with all reasonable despatch, and deliver the same at the said junction, or to the consignee thereof, as the case may be; that they will permit and allow sidings at points on their said line connecting therewith and under their control, for the loading of timber, lumber, wood or other freight carriage by such cars as are above mentioned to points south of said junction on said Midland Railway, such sidings to be worked and used on reasonable terms, and that the Central Ontario Company will, in respect of said freight, give every reasonable facility, and all this shall be done and afforded at a mileage rate of freight to be agreed upon and failing agreement as shall be fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council.

"7. The Midland Railway Company shall, at the said point of junction of their railway with the said Company's railway, afford all reasonable facilities for the exchange of traffic crossing to or from points on the Central Ontario Railway, north of the said junction, and shall, at the said point of junction, take from the Central Ontario Railway, without unreasonable delay, and with all convenient despatch, all cars, trucks and such like means of conveyance, which may be consigned to points on the said Midland Railway south of the said junction; and will also receive upon their line of railway, south of said junction, all cars, trucks and freight destined for points upon the Central Ontario Railway, north of the junction, and shall haul, carry and convey the same as the case may be, to or from the said junction, with all reasonable despatch, and deliver the same at the said junction, or to the consignee thereof, as the case may be.

"8. That the Midland Railway Company will, to and from points on their line south of the said junction, carry and convey by the car-load or otherwise, freight and passengers to and from the said junction with the Central Ontario Railway, at the same rate per mile at which freigh

and passengers are carried, for the time being from the said junction to the city of Belleville; and in the event of any dispute as to the said rate, the same shall be fixed by the Governor in Council.

"9. That the Central Ontario Railway Company will to and from points on their said line north of said junction, carry and convey by the car-load or otherwise, freight, and will convey passengers to and from the said junction with the Midland Railway, at the same rate per mile for which freight and passengers are, for the time being, carried from the same point to the point on Lake Ontario or the Bay of Quinté used as a shipping point by the Central Ontario Railway Company, and in the event of any dispute as to the said rate, the same shall be fixed by the Governor in Council, so that in either case the freight and passenger business to and from the front may take such line to the point of junction as may be deemed best, and that Belleville shall, as regards the business to and from the county north of the said junction, have equal facilities with other points reached by the said Central Ontario Railway south of said junction."

These amendments have been agreed to by the president of the railway. When the hon. member asked me if I would have the kindness to take charge of the Bill, the president of the road said he was most anxious to make arrangements for connection and running powers with the Midland system. I said that if he and those who were interested would come to some arrangement I would support it in every way I possibly could. I went to a great deal of trouble to get the solicitor of the Grand Trunk and the president of the Central Ontario and the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) together. After two or three meetings, they agreed to add to the Bill certain clauses, which were drawn by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott). He and the hon. member for North Hastings and myself met and the clauses were read over, and at the request of the president of the Central Ontario Company they were printed and added to the Bill. After they were added to the Bill he consulted a member of this House, who I understand informed him how they would injuriously affect this Bill. I then told him we could agree to other clauses, which would be satisfactory to all concerned, to have the railway extended to the northern part of the county of Hastings. Now I think that I have fully explained to the House why I moved those resolutions. They were got up with the advice, consent and knowledge of the Central Ontario Railway Company, through the president, who now would not allow them to be inserted in the Bill. I will not divide the Committee on the clauses because I intended to divide the House on them when the Bill came before it. I hope these clauses will be added to the Bill.

Mr. PLATT. The explanations given by the hon. gentleman do not seem to be such as should recommend themselves to the members of this House. He bases his claim to the right to impose these amendments on the fact that certain conditions were agreed to by the president of the company which is asking this extension of the charter. Whatever agreement may have been come to between the president and those who are negotiating for other companies and localities, was never intended to become a part and portion of the Bill. I had no knowledge that these amendments were made, nor did I know they were printed. The printing was simply an experiment to see in what shape the Bill would appear with these amendments, and it was done with the knowledge of the promoter of this Bill. That is the proprietor of the railway. As soon as they were printed he saw their effect, and although he was perfectly willing to make these arrangements with the managers of other railways for the purpose of carrying freight on reasonable and fair terms, he was not willing to have such arrangements inserted in the Bill because to do so would seriously effect his financial arrangements. The people with whom he was negotiating for capital to construct the road, as soon as they found out that restrictions were proposed to be placed in this Bill such as are not found in other Railway Acts, refused to assist him in his financial arrangements. He was willing to agree to such arrangements, but wished to have them made in the usual way. If these conditions are to be imposed in this case, they should be imposed on all railways; and to do this they should be added to the General Railway Act. It is not right or reasonable that the promoter of this charter should be so singled out and such conditions imposed to his prejudice; by so doing his financial arrangements would be seriously interfered with. These amendments were made and printed solely because the president of the road desired to show his willingness, a willingness which he often expressed beforehand, to enter into any sort of bond or agreement with other corporations for the purpose of carrying freight, and he is still willing to do so, but the objection to these clauses is that, in the first place, they are unusual amendments, amendments which are not inserted in other railway charters; if anything is to be done of this nature, it should be done in the General Railway Act, so as to bring all railways under the same provisions. The House will hardly see fit, at this stage after the Bill has been fully discussed in the Railway Committee, to put in this charter restrictions which would seriously interfere with the promoters of this enterprise in their financial arrangements for the construction of the road. I need not at present dilate upon the vast importance to the promoters of this Bill of its passage this Session nor of the vast importance to the country of the carrying out of this project. The chief objection to these amendments, and a fact which must prove fatal to the claims to those who are now seeking to impose these restrictions, is that this company has been allowed to go on and construct 40 miles of railway out of their own means through a very difficult portion of the country, and while this construction was going on, we heard of no restrictions. They were, on the contrary, encouraged to go on, but now, however, after these 40 miles have been constructed, and when the company wish to extend the road further, the city of Belleville and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and I do not know who else, step in and wish to impose those restrictions.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I told the hon. gentleman there were negotiations going on between the Grand Trunk Railway and the president of the Ontario Railway Company, and that the arrangement I propose was agreed to by the promoters of this Bill. The promoters of the Bill were anxious to carry out the very arrangement which I now submit to the House, and the hon. gentleman himself has told me that whatever the president of the road agreed to would be quite satisfactory to him. The president of the road wrote letters, which were published in the Madoc *Review*, and which will be read by the hon. member for North Hastings, and those letters will be put in the possession of hon. members of this House to show that these amendments which I now propose originated with and were supported by the promoters of this Bill. It is said that this company is getting nothing in return for what we are asking in these amendments, but they will get running powers over the Napanee and Tamworth road when it reaches Bridgewater, over the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, and, if necessary, over the whole Midland Railway system which amounts to 500 miles, at the places where their road will connect with this system. The Napanee and Tamworth Railway Company has a charter, passed this Session, for a road over the same section of country to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but this charter they are prepared to abandon if the Central Ontario Company will give these powers asked for to the other roads.

Mr. PLATT. I did not know the nature of these amendments at all until I saw them printed in a Bill which was laid on my desk. I knew that negotiations were going on; but as soon as I saw the president of the railway and asked him if he would agree to these amendments, he refused. He said they might be fair enough between one company and another, but should not be put into the B...

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Then did I not propose to alter the amendments to suit him?

Mr. PLATT. Yes, such proposition was made by you.

Mr. BOWELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the president of the company did not agree to these amendments?

Mr. PLATT. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). This subject was very fully discussed in the Railway Committee a few days ago. There were three different divisions taken in that Committee, after the most ample discussion, every member thoroughly understanding the question. The Committee decided that it was not right to impose upon this company traffic arrangements of a peculiar character, such as those covered by the amendments of my hon. friend, when the company simply asked power to build an extension of its line and to make certain alterations in its internal economy in regard to bonds and capital stock. My hon. friend says the Napanee and Tamworth road has this very Session got a charter allowing it to build in the very same direction; and if it has got a charter without having any such onerous conditions attached to it as are proposed to be attached to this Bill, that is an argument attaching them to this Bill. If we have chartered a company to extend its line in the same direction as this, crossing also, as it does, the Belleville and North Hastings line, and have not imposed any conditions upon that company, why should we now impose conditions upon this company? The very argument he advances is conclusive against the position he now takes. The whole discussion in the Railway Committee proceeded the other day upon the supposition that the Belleville and North Hastings road, now part of the Midland, had the right to extend its line——

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to call the hon. gentleman to order. He had no right to discuss what took place in Committee. We had better adhere strictly to rules, especially as the leader of the Opposition began it.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not understand the rule in that sense at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that, after the Committee has reported, it is not out of order to refer to its discussions.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not think it is.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it is.

Mr. CAMERON. I can only say that, in my experience, I have in this House repeatedly heard such discussions referred to.

Mr. PLATT. The member for East Hastings (Mr. White) has already referred to them.

Mr. CAMERON. However, if my hon. friend is so captious, I will put it in another way. There are various ways of getting over a difficulty in this House and elsewhere. He objects to my referring to what took place in Committee. I will say simply that, in the discussion that has taken place and the arguments which have been advanced in favour of these clauses which my hon. friend from East Hastings now proposes, he bases the claim to have been imposed on the supposition that the charter of the Belleville and North Hastings road now exists authorizing it to extend its line in the direction this company now proposes to extend, and it is expressly upon that ground, that, as that is still in existence, if we charter a rival company, we have a right to impose conditions, that he proposes now to impose them. Looking at the Act of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, which became law on the 24th March, 1874, I find it provided that

"The said railway shall be commenced within two years, and completed within four years to the village of Madoc, and within five years to the Seymour Iron Mines, and within ten years to some point in the free grant territory in the northern part of the county of Hastings, after the passing of this Act, or else the charter shall be forfeited as regards so much of the railway not completed."

It appears to me that the charter of the road, *quoad* any extension beyond the Seymour Mines, or the point to which it has already gone north of that, expired on the 25th March, 1884; and, that being the case, what possible foundation have we now for attaching to this Bill conditions relative to the Belleville and North Hastings road north of the point where it has gone now, on the supposition that it has the power to build further north? The fact that this charter has expired is a conclusive answer to the proposition to add these clauses to the Bill. There is a very important view affecting the public interests of the whole country in reference to this road. The proprietors of this road are Americans, who, in order to develop iron mining properties of great value and extent which they have in the North Hastings region, have come here and built a railway at their own expense from Trenton some seventy-six miles northward. They have brought in and expended American capital to the extent of upwards of $2,000,000. They have not asked for public aid to the extent of a dollar. They have not received any public aid. They have built this road with their own money. They come to the House now, and ask power to extend their road further north to a junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they also ask power to increase their capital stock and certain powers in reference to their bond issue. Is it right that we should now say: "We will clog your enterprise and attach conditions which will prevent your financing in order to carry on your enterprise, in which you have already put so much money and by which you have done so much to develop that great interest; we will clog that with conditions which will render the extended charter perfectly valueless to you." I do not propose to discuss the merits of the conditions. I am aware that negotiations did take place between my hon. friend representing that part of the country and the president of the railway, in reference to certain traffic arrangements which he was perfectly willing to enter into. If the conditions come within the General Act, this proposal is not required; if they go further than the General Act, they should not be imposed. It would be hampering this Act to impose them. The General Act gives power to make a traffic arrangement for 21 years, which would answer the purposes of both companies, and all the president intended to intimate was that he would accede to any reasonable traffic arrangement with the Grand Trunk, as representing the Midland Company, and running it; but when it is proposed to impose onerous conditions upon him and his company, he says: "What consideration have I for yielding to this?" If the Government are going to grant a bonus to the road, they can impose any conditions they like having reference to a fair interchange of traffic; the Government have everything in their control if they propose to grant Government aid to this road, but, if not, no other conditions except those which the General Railway Act imposes upon all companies ought to be imposed upon this company.

Mr. BOWELL. It is just as well that the Committee should be placed in possession of all the facts connected with this Bill and the amendments which are now proposed. I confess I was not a little surprised when my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) denied the statement of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) in moving the Bill, that the amendments were agreed to by the president of the company, Mr. Ritchie.

Mr. PLATT. I did not deny that.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood that the hon. gentleman did.

Mr. PLATT. I denied that I agreed to them.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know what the hon. gentleman agreed to or did not agree to; but I know that, without any solicitation on my part, representing the North Riding of the county of Hastings, Mr. Ritchie waited upon me in connection with this Bill and related what he proposed to do. He said he understood I had some objections to the Bill. I replied that I had no objection to the extension of his railway to any distance, that I trusted it would even ultimately extend to the Pacific; but, as the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, which was now a part of the Midland system, had a charter for the extension of the road from Eldorado northward as far as Bancroft, I thought the interests of that company, which were the interests of the county generally, should be looked after and preserved. His reply to that was that he had already—it was something new to me, because I knew nothing of the negotiations which had been carried on—made suggestions by letter to Mr. Bell, the solicitor of the Grand Trunk, and also, I suppose, of the Midland at the present time, for making such traffic arrangements and giving just such privileges over the road northward to Bancroft as I had proposed to him. He further informed me that he had made the same proposition to Mr. Wood, the local member for the North Riding of the county of Hastings, who was originally not only a promoter but a director of the North Hastings Railway. I at once said to him: "If that be the case and you are prepared to carry it out, it may as well be put in the Bill to prevent any doubt arising in the future." He agreed, but he said he did not know why an arrangement could not be made without putting it on the Statute. My reply was that, if he was desirous of extending the privileges he proposed to give to the Midland system by the letters he had written to the parties I have mentioned, there could be no possible harm in placing it in the Bill in order to prevent any difficulty in the future. At his suggestion, I had certain amendments prepared. Those amendments, when read by myself and presented to Mr. Ritchie, I thought were unfair, as they were one-sided, asking him to extend privileges over his road which were not given to him over that portion of the Midland which was formerly the Belleville and North Hastings, from Belleville to Eldorado; and I said I would have them so changed that just such rights and privileges as were asked from him should be conceeded to him over the other portion southward from Eldorado. He agreed to that, I then asked a member of this House who is a lawyer of much railway experience, if he would kindly put those amendments in shape so as to meet the views of Mr. Ritchie and myself. Acting on my solicitations he did so. I took those amendments to Mr. Ritchie. I read them over to him two or three times calmly and deliberately, and then in addition to that I asked the gentleman who had drafted the resolutions to meet us in the Committee Room. The three of us sat down and went over those resolutions; he agreed to the amendments in every single particular, and the suggestion was then made that as the amendments were of a somewhat important character, the Bill had better be reprinted before it went to the Railway Committee. He replied that he thought that the suggestion was a proper one, and that it was only fair to the Committee who would be asked to consider them. With his consent, knowledge, and approval, and in fact at his suggestion, I caused the amendments to be printed, and I knew nothing of any objection to them until the Railway Committee met. The House can well understand why I should have been somewhat surprised on learning that he objected *in toto* to the whole amendment. I then stated: "If these amendments go further than you intended originally, and if you still intend to give traffic arrangements over your road to freight that is going south, we will retire and so amend the Bill in order to meet your view." However he declined that, I suppose, upon certain advice—what it was, I do not know. That is the history of the affair in so far as I or the hon. member for East Hastings have any connection with this Bill. But let me go a little further. In 1874, as my hon. friend says, a charter was obtained for the construction of what is known as the Belleville and North Hastings railway, running from a point on the Grand Junction Railway about 14 miles north to Belleville and still on northward. After the road had been constructed as far as Eldorado, the Central Ontario obtained a charter from the Legislature of the Province of Ontario. I think my hon. friend opposite said that we allowed him to go on and construct his road without any interference, until he applied for an extension of the charter. That is very true, because we had no power, no authority, and no right to interfere with it. The Local Legislature had given him a Bill containing most extraordinary powers—as I may relate before I sit down—and under that Bill he proceeded to construct his road. But in the construction of that road he crossed the Belleville and North Hastings at the point of junction at Eldorado, and when the question of carrying freight from that section of the county, which is a vast mineral territory, came up, those with whom he was connected distinctly told the parties owning mines in different parts of that Riding, and in that section of the county, that unless they acceded to their request and demands in selling their mines to this Company, they never would carry freight over their line. It may be said in reply that they are compelled under the General Railway Act to carry this freight; but we know very well from experience that if a railway company have made up its mind not to give facilities to any person in carrying freight, they can find plenty of pretexts for doing so, and I do not know where they could be used to a greater extent, and where more damage could be done than in a mineral region. If a farmer, as is the case there, owns valuable mines in close proximity to the line of this railway and to its depot, and he desires to mine the ore and send it to market, he goes to the railway company and says: "I want you to carry my freight," it is very easy for the company to say, "We will carry it, but we have no means just now at our disposal to enable us to do so." It is easy for the company to say that they have the locomotive power, but have not the freight cars to enable them to carry his freight, because if they do it will be to the detriment of their own business. These amendments provide that in case any farmer, or any person owning a mine desires to have freight carried either to the Trenton terminus of that railway, or to Belleville by the Belleville and North Hastings from Eldorado southward to the Bay of Quinté, and they are not prepared to furnish the freight cars and other appliances necessary to carry freight, the Company shall be compelled to take empty freight cars at the junction northward from Eldorado to the point where the mine is situated, and to return them loaded over to the Midland system in case they desire to go by that route; and on the other hand, if they have any freight that they desire to send to the Bay of Quinté—whether it be lumber, or square timber, or logs, or anything else—when they bring it to the junction at Eldorado the Midland Railway will be compelled to carry it for them under the same terms and at the same rates as they carry their own freight. Threats had been made by the parties connected with the road, and naturally created distrust in those who are interested in the townships and town of Madoc, in the city of Belleville, and the community generally, Belleville having contributed $150,000 towards the construction of these roads, the town of Madoc $30,000, and the county $-0,000, in order that they might not have the whole traffic taken from the northern portion of the county to the front by another route, thereby depriving them of all the advantages they expected to derive from the expenditure of their money. Now when they knew this to be

the case, and knew that threats had been made that freight would not be taken, that the Company had built a road exclusively for themselves, those interested in the prosperity of Madoc and Belleville thought it but right in the interests of the whole county to take measures at once to extend the line of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway. They raised subscriptions, they paid their money, and they explored two lines for the extension of their road. The moment that was done the parties holding a charter for the Central Ontario Railway at once applied for the extension of their line to the northward; and in order to allay the feelings of the people, the residents wrote a number of letters to various parties interested, telling them that they were quite prepared, if they would not go on—that was not in their letters, but they made such an intimation personally—that if the Belleville and North Hastings line was not extended, the traffic arrangements which they asked on behalf of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, should be conceded to them. In order that there may be no mistake about that I will read a letter published in the North Hastings *Review*, published in the village of Madoc, written by Mr. Coe, a gentleman who is largely interested in that mining district, and who sold what is termed the Coe Mine to this Company, who owned besides vast tracts of land in the mineral districts. I repeat to the Committee that as soon as the survey was begun, in order to secure the traffic for the south, they began to assure the people that it was quite unnecessary, inasmuch as they were desirous of receiving all the traffic they could possibly obtain for their road. On 6th March, 1884, Mr. Coe published a letter in the North Hastings *Review*. I may state that Mr. Coe has been a resident of Madoc since 1867, and has been constantly since that time, engaged in mining operations. In that letter he says:

"SIR,—Having been so long a citizen of Madoc, I feel fully alive to everything that will promote its interests and improve its business facilities. I have been approached by numbers of my fellow townsmen who feel that the Central Ontario Railway, having no direct connection with our town, will, in the near future, do Madoc great injury, by carrying to another quarter many of the passengers and a great deal of the trade and freight traffic which in the past and now has been tributory to Madoc. Feeling quite satisfied in my own mind that the President and Directors of this railway had no motive in making any arrangements in respect to the working of this line except a purely commercial one, I wrote the President, and afterwards had an interview with the Directorate of the road on the whole subject, and was very much gratified on doing so, to find that they were disposed to do everything in their power to accommodate not only the people of Madoc, but the residents of North Hastings. Of course, I pointed out in the interview that took place very fully the desires of the citizens here, and also that I understood the people of the city of Belleville were greatly interested in the facilitating of the intercommunication from the extreme north to the southern borders of Hasting."

"That a great deal of business, commercially, had for years been the outcome of the enterprise of the Belleville merchants, that the county and land business had to be transacted in Belleville, and that the educational institutions located in Belleville and Madoc to our northern residents is evident. In view of these facts I urged that everything should be done to meet the desires of those who were interested in having a proper harmony of working between the two roads—the B. & N.H. and Central Ontario."

Then Mr. Coe says:

"In reply these gentlemen said they were inclined to do all that lay in their power to bring about such arrangements as would be satisfactory to these interests, and to show their good faith the President, Mr. Ritchie, addressed the following letter to myself, handed me a copy of one already mailed to Jno. Bell, Esq., Belleville, and another to A. F. Wood, M. P. P., on the subject. They are as follows:—

"TORONTO, Feb. 20, 1884.

"JOHN BELL, Esq.,
"Att'y G. T. R'y.

"DEAR SIR,—The Central Ontario Railway is desirous of making some arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway for a connection with their line at Eldorado by which we can have communication with Belleville and Madoc. On our part we are willing to place these points upon as favorable terms for the traffic of the North Hastings district as any points upon our own line.

"Yours truly,
"S. J. RITCHIE, Pres.

"OTTAWA, Feb. 25, 1884.

"WM. COE, Esq., Madoc.

"DEAR SIR,—Your favour 23rd received. In reply to the complaints you speak of that Madoc and Belleville are to be shut out of the north country, I can but answer you by inclosing you a copy of a letter which I addressed to A. F. Wood, M.P.P., in reply to a similar complaint. I also inclose you copy of letter to John Bell, as Attorney for the G. T. R'y, which he assured me would be entirely satisfactory to them. So far from wishing to drive away any business, we are only too anxious to get it from any source that may present any just as soon as we are in shape to take it. Neither Belleville nor Madoc need have the slightest concern about lack of facilities for getting into North Hastings. Your neighbours need lose no sleep on this account and you can assure them of this.

"Very truly yours,
"S. J. RITCHIE."

"TORONTO, Feb. 20, 1884.

"A. F. WOOD, M.P.P.

"DEAR SIR,—Referring to our verbal statements to-day. I have to say that the Central Ontario Railway is ready and very anxious to make any arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway that will give Belleville and Madoc equal facilities for the traffic with the North Hastings district with those enjoyed by any point upon its own line.

"Very truly yours,
"S. J. RITCHIE."

Mr. Coe in conclusion said:

"You will perceive that this matter is now in a fair way of being arranged in some way that will be mutually advantageous to the different railways as well as in accommodating the citizens of all parts of the county."

With these declarations and letters—the declaration of the president to myself and to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), the letters which he sent to the local member (Mr. Wood), who was deeply interested in this matter, the assurance to a gentleman acting on behalf of the Midland system and the Grand Trunk stating he was willing to carry out those arrangements, and the voluntary declaration on his part to me that he was still prepared to carry them out, and the fact that it was with his knowledge, consent and advice that the amendments were prepared—I ask the Committee whether it is treating fairly members with whom he was in communication and the companies represented by appearing before the Committee at the very last moment and declaring that he would not now accept any amendment to the Bill. He lured them on to silence until the last moment, preventing further operations going on in the way of surveying or locating the road, those interested lying under the impression that such was not necessary because he would grant the traffic arrangements which he pledged himself to do; and now this gentleman asks for an extension of the road and refuses pointedly and peremptorily to carry out that to which he had agreed. Some hon. gentlemen will say: "You should take his word and the word of the company." If the pledges made in those letters and the promises given to hon. members in connection with this matter are of no more value than they appear to be, it is the duty of the House in granting the Company further privileges to provide that they shall not interfere with the rights of others, but shall carry out that which, while not to their own detriment, is in the interests of the country. But the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who is a lawyer, and I am not, tells the Committee that the charter of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company has lapsed. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would deliberately attempt to mislead the Committee, but I think he has not carried his research sufficiently far to justify the statement he made. Since the passage of the Acts incorporating the Belleville and North Hastings, the Grand Junction Railway and the Midland system they have been amalgamated by an Act passed by the Ontario Legislature. If power was not given in that Act to enable the Midland system to construct this road, then I admit there would be a great deal of force in the hon. gentleman's contention. But if he will turn to the Act of amalgamation, passed on the 10th March, 1882, he will find the following clause:—

"The company shall have power in order to connect their railway with the iron mines in the townships of Snowdon, Glamorgan, Galway, and Lutterworth to build sidings or branches from what is now known as the lines of the Victoria Railway, by such routes as may be found best to the said mines, and they may extend what is known as the Grand Junction Railway its present terminus in the township of Madoc to the village of Bancroft, in the township of Faraday, to the iron mines situate between said points; and for said purpose all the Acts relating to the said consolidated company."

This clause gives the Midland Railway Company power to extend their road from Eldorado to Bancroft, so that even if the time given in the Belleville and North Hastings charter has expired as contended by my hon. friend, it is more than revived by this charter, because the time is unlimited as to the period at which it can be built.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). No; the existing time would still apply.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a question between lawyers and I am advised to the contrary. The clause says that they shall have power to extend their line from the northern terminus of the Belleville and North Hastings, then the Grand Junction; for I may say parenthetically that these two lines had been amalgamated before they became part of the Midland system. It goes on to say that they have a right to construct as far as Bancroft; and I may say that before venturing this opinion I consulted a legal gentleman in this House of eminence, who gave me the opinion that they had the power under that clause to construct a line no matter at what period, unless it were repealed. Knowing that to be the case we went on and had the line surveyed. Now, what we ask is this: That having the power under that Statute to extend our line from Bancroft northward, no other charter should take its place, unless something commensurate should be given in lieu thereof; in other words that they should be compelled to carry freight from the northern part of the country to the junction, at rates which would be fair and equitable, and if no arrangement can be come to as to what would be fair and equitable rates, the clause provides that the tariff should be arranged as between the two companies by the Governor in Council. Having promised this to the parties most interested we say that it is too late now to repudiate and say that they will not grant these privileges, because they think they are going to interfere with what they consider to be their rights; in other words, to keep the people of North Hastings and South Hastings in the position in which they have been in the past; that if they do decide now to go on and construct the road, then there will be two competing lines. I say it would be better in the interests of both companies that there should not be two competing lines, that one line will be able for years to come to do all the business that there will be to do; and all that the parties interested in the town of Madoc, and township, who have taxed themselves for the construction of these roads, ask, is no more than ordinary traffic arrangements. They ask that this Company shall bring their freight to a certain junction and allow another road to take it to the south; that the Midland system shall bring the traffic that may be required from the county of Hastings to its northern terminus, and hand it over to the Ontario Central to carry still further northward, and not allow them to charge any more than they would for ordinary carriers, so that there may be no difficulties thrown in the way of a free interchange of traffic between these two parties. I might mention as another reason why I think this Committee should agree to the amendment, the declaration on the part of those connected with the road that they would not carry freight for the others unless they were prepared to do so.

Mr. PLATT. When was that declaration made?

Mr. BOWELL. In the Riding itself, to different parties.

Mr. PLATT. Let us have the proof. This is the first that we have heard of it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has not heard everything, and he may not have heard this declaration, but Mr. Ritchie has.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). He denies having made such a statement or that it was made on his authority.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that it was made by him or on his authority, but it was made by the manager of the Company, and those associated with him; and if the hon. member for Prince Edward county is desirous, I can furnish him with the name of one of the gentlemen to whom the threat was made. I say more, that under the extraordinary powers given to this Company they are enabled, strange as it may appear, to locate their terminus, and to expropriate mining lands on the ground that they are required for their purposes,——

Mr. PLATT. We cannot interfere with that.

Mr. BOWELL—and so grossly has that privilege been abused, that last Session, in the Ontario Legislature, a Bill was passed defining what rights they and all other companies have in that particular. This very company passed over their own lands, and the terminus which they proposed to adopt, and located all their works and the end of their road on the very top of what the owners of the land believed to be a valuable mine, and expropriated it under the clause which they have in their charter, in the same manner as they would expropriate ordinary lands for railway purposes. When I was told that they had done that I said that it could not be possible; I called my hon. friend's attention to it, and he could not believe it; he said there could be no such authority under the law. But the president of the company pulled out of his pocket a judgment of the Court—because the owners of the mine had taken it into Court,—deciding that by the privileges given to them under the Act of the Ontario Legislature, and under the expropriation clause of the different Railway Acts, they had a right to locate their terminus upon lands in which there were valuable mines, and to expropriate and take that property from the owners. I know further, that in the carrying out of what they consider to be their rights, in passing through valuable farms, the Ontario Central Railway Company refused to pay what they declared to be the exorbitant demands for the land—to which I do not think any one would object—and when it was referred to arbitration, and the arbitrators were about to decide that the farmers were entitled to so much money for the injury done to their property as well as for the land itself, the company at once applied for some process of law—I forget what it is called—before the award was made, paid the expenses and demanded another arbitration. Another award was about to be made for the same thing and I am not sure but that a third award was made.

Mr. WELLS. They cannot do that legally.

Mr. BOWELL. I am coming to that; but the law was so worded that they did do it and the arbitrators did not give their award. The parties put the case in Court and the company had to pay it, but for months and months in the meantime the terrorism which existed in that section of the country had induced the farmers to take what was offered for their land, rather than be driven into Court. As the hon. gentleman says, it was not legal, and the Courts decided against them, but meantime the mischief had been done, for rather than be driven into Court, not knowing what the result would be, the parties accepted what the Company thought proper to give. I say that when we find a company, and they are not all foreigners—the manager is a Canadian as are others connected with the road—I say when the Committee and the country find that such advan-

tage is being taken of the innocent and honest farmers along the line of the road, the Legislature of the country should step in and forbid them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does this Bill deal with that subject at all?

Mr. BOWELL. No it does not; and though these facts may not be acceptable, though they may not be palatable, I am giving them as a reason why we should——

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). They are irrelevant, not unpalatable.

Mr. BOWELL. They are unpalatable, but not irrelevant. I am giving these facts to show how they are conducting their business, and to show the absolute necessity of the Legislature intervening and placing on the Statute Book of the country that which they say by word of mouth they are willing to extend. That I do not think is irrelevant and I shall be very much surprised if the rights of the people are not guaranteed in this matter. The Railway Act I am aware makes certain provisions, but when we consider the difficulties which have always presented themselves in enforcing those clauses, where the railway company is determined not to accede to the wishes of the people, and give them the desired accommodation, we should make such provision as to compel the companies to do it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why does not the Government amend the Railway Act for that purpose?

Mr. BOWELL. I might retort by asking why did not your Government do it when in power?

Mr. MITCHELL. We did not experience any difficulty then which you say exists now, but which I do not believe exists.

Mr. BOWELL. I have nothing further to add. I have explained to the House precisely the position which these two companies occupy. I have pointed out what is asked in these amendments, which were suggested by the company themselves and accepted by others who were interested in that section of the country, and who had privileges out of which they were legislated by the Ontario Legislature when these companies were amalgamated; and I think we are not asking too much when we ask that such restrictions should be imposed as will be in the interest of the people and of the country generally.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not understand, from what has fallen either from the hon. Minister of Customs or from the gentleman who moved these amendments, that any agreement has been arrived at between the parties in whose interest they are moved, and the company asking for this legislation. If it were established clearly that there was an agreement come to, and that the House was merely called upon to ratify that agreement, it would be a different matter. But we have been treated with a long statement regarding interviews and negotiations, which, as the hon. Minister himself admits, have absolutely failed. It is the case every day that parties meet together and attempt to arrange, but do not complete arrangements. In the present case, the negotiations came to nothing; therefore, the whole matter is before us, and I submit that we are called upon to deal with it as if there had been no negotiations whatever. I listened with very great interest to the discussion on this question when it was before the Railway Committee. It then came to my knowledge for the first time that a railway had been built by American capital for eighty miles into the back country, silently and unobtrusively, almost entirely unknown to the majority of the people of Ontario. I understand that it is the policy of the Government—and I endorse that policy—to attract foreign capital to this country from all sources. I understand that the great iron industries of the United States are interested in the extension of this railway; that they desire to obtain our iron ore for purposes of their own, and that they are not appealing to the Canadian people for assistance, but are building this road out of their own resources. Under these circumstances I doubt if there is a case on record which has appealed more forcibly than this does, for all the freedom which the Legislature can give to the enterprise in question. I am surprised, therefore, that the hon. Minister of Customs, even though trammelled as he must be by local interests, should, instead of meeting the issues squarely, go out of his way to try and defeat the Bill by a narrative of matters which, in my opinion, are wholly irrelevant to the issue. Has he addressed one argument to the real question between the Company and the House? We have nothing to do with these supposed agreements, which did not amount to anything. We have the question before us: Is it in the interest of Canada to grant this charter, and to allow this Company, with their own money, to build their line from its present terminus into our unknown wilds, in order to develop our resources at their own expense? Did the hon. Minister address one word of argument to that issue? I failed to hear one word. I might enquire: Did the hon Minister of Customs remember this issue, when a Bill of a very similar character unanimously passed this House a short time ago? That was a Bill dealing with a company called the North-West Coal and Navigation Company, limited—a company formed in England, having mining rights in the North-West, and which applied to Parliament to have railway powers attached to its mining powers. That Bill passed this House unanimously there not being one attempt made either in Committee or in the House to restrict the Company in its absolute freedom. The hon. Minister of Customs did attempt to intimate, not by argument, but by assertion, that the present Company would do wrong—that having a large amount of mining territory under its control, it would discriminate in its own favour, and against others having mining interests in the same district. Why did he not express the same fear with regard to the North-West Coal and Navigation Company? That company, I understand, possess extensive coal mines in the vicinity of Belly River. I suppose others have mining interests there also; but when we clothed that company with railway powers, we did not attempt to control its operations with regard to carrying the coal of others. We gave it a charter to develop that coal region, and no doubt the House felt that if that company did not perform that work, others would come forward to develop the coal mines, and do the carrying trade. So, if this Company is willing to bring money from abroad, and to spend it in developing our undeveloped treasure, I fail to see why we should hesitate for one moment to grant it the necessary powers. On the contrary, I think the hon. Minister of Customs has made a grave mistake in giving reason for it to be felt abroad that even one member of the Government could be found to throw an obstacle in the way of the development of this portion of our great natural wealth.

Mr. COLBY. I suppose my hon. friend, who happens to be a member of the Government, is also a representative of the county of Hastings, and has certain duties to discharge in relation to matters which concern his constituents; and I suppose he has not addressed this Company in his capacity as Minister of Customs, but rather as the representative of a constituency which is largely interested in the project now before the House. Like the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, I heard this matter discussed in another place, and it presented itself to my mind something in this wise: Some enterprising gentlemen from abroad—and I think the local community benefited have reason to be grateful to them—came to Canada with the view of developing the very valuable iron mines in the county of Hastings, where in the first instance a railway had been built largely by the contribu-

tions of the Ontario Government and of certain municipalities, running from Picton to Trenton, and purchased that railway at very much less than its original cost.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. COLBY. Having acquired that section they extended it, I believe, into the back country, by means of a very liberal charter from the Government of Ontario—a charter which was intended to help forward a laudable and commendable industry. Now, these gentlemen who have built their mining road for their own convenience largely, come to this Legislature and ask powers to extend their road to a point of connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to convert it from its original character, as a local and mining road, into a road of public concern. I think that we, as members of this Legislature, when asked to grant a charter of this character, connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway and crossing the Grand Trunk road, which is destined for large traffic, have a right to consider that charter with reference to the interests of the country at large and the interests of that section especially which it it destined to serve. I believe it was very generally admitted in another place where his subject was discussed that one railway will practically serve the necessities of the whole of that part of country; that although the Belleville road has powers to extend further northward, although Tamworth road has a Bill now before the House the giving it power to extend northward, yet, practically, one road is quite sufficient to serve all these localities; the people there desire but one road, and I am sure we ought not, unless compelled to do so, throw upon them the burden of constructing more than one road. It seems that from the Bay of Quinté, or the St. Lawrence, or both, three roads have been started running into this back country; one, the road referred to; another, the Belleville and North Hastings road; and the other, the Napanee and Tamworth road. There is a point about thirty-five or forty miles from the frontage where all these roads naturally converge. That point is Eldorado. The road now applying for a charter is built to and passes that point; the Belleville road is built to that point, and the Napanee and Tamworth road is built in that direction, twenty miles from it. This seems to be the natural central converging point for these roads starting from Trenton, Belleville and Napanee. What is the proposition before us? Hastings county has a direct interest in this matter in a double sense. It is to be largely affected by it and has besides already contributed for the construction of a road running into the back country. The county of Hastings has contributed $80,000, the township of Madoc $30,000, and Belleville $50,000, or a total of $160,000 contributed to reach this back country north of Hastings. Now, the proposition emanates from my hon. friend here in his capacity as member representing the constituency of Hastings, and from his colleague from the same county, and from the Mayor of Belleville, who was here the other day, before the Railway Committee, and other gentlemen representing these local interests, to this effect. They say: We want nothing unfair, we do not want to build a rival road running to the Canadian Pacific Railway; we do not want to embarrass these gentlemen in the slightest degree; we desire that they shall have their charter which shall be for the benefit of the whole country, but what we desire at the same time is simply this, that these roads radiating from Eldorado as a common point; that this road, the Belleville road, and the Napanee and Tamworth road shall, so far as regards freights passing from Eldorado northward on the Trunk line, be treated equally. That does not seem unfair; it does not seem unreasonable that this Company should not be permitted to make discriminating rates in favour of its own line against these other localities, which have invested their money in the other lines and are interested in reaching the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It cannot do it under the general law.

Mr. COLBY. I am coming to that. These gentlemen ask that the same rates from Eldorado down, and the rates given each of these three roads those freights may take—that freights brought over the Canadian Pacific Railway down to Eldorado and north part of Hastings shall be carried at the same rates. That proposition seems to be a reasonable one; it is one which has been assented to by the promoter of this Bill, the present president of the railway himself. He says it is a reasonable proposition; letters have been produced over his own signature in which he says he is prepared, when he gets his Bill, to make running arrangements on this basis, so that there will be no unfair discrimination. Now, the question we have to consider is, if this be a reasonable proposition, and it is admitted to be so, whether we should not put some clause in the Bill which shall make this proposition binding, so that it will be actually carried out in good faith whether the present president of the road continues to be the president or is replaced by some other man at some future day, or whether the railway be controlled by some other set of men who might have a different policy. The question is whether we ought not, by some such clause, place the condition of the people of Hastings on a sound, permanent, substantial basis, and not leave it subject to the caprice of future managers of the railway. I say it is right we should do so. There is strong justice in their claims, and no good reason, as far as I can see, has been advanced why this proposition should not be embodied in the Bill. A suggestion was made by an influential member of the Railway Committee, that this would be an artistic piece of legislation, and what struck me, at the time, as having considerable force was,—that if any provisions of that kind are to be incorporated, they should not be incorporated in a special Act but be made part of the general railway law. That was certainly a plausible argument and one that had considerable force, but on reflection, I do not think it altogether applicable, because I do not think you can have any general railway law that will meet all the conditions of companies; I do not think we can dispense with considering every Bill on its merits and trust wholly to a general railway law. It is impossible to construct such a law as will meet all possible contingencies. We have, for instance, a Joint Stock Company Act, which meets the conditions of most companies that desire powers, so far as powers can be given under that Act; but if persons come forward and ask a special charter, if they ask powers slightly different, perhaps, to those given under the Act, shall we say to them: Here is a Joint Stock Companies' Act, you must organize under that or not at all; we cannot consider any special case or any special conditions, so long as there is a Joint Stock Act for the organization of Joint Stock Companies, we cannot incorporate special companies. But we do not take that ground, and we incorporate special companies under that Act. By a parity of reasoning, we should adopt the same principle and follow the same course with regard to the General Railway Act. It should be so constructed as to meet the conditions of the large majority of cases, so that it will not be necessary to create special legislation in each particular case, but at the same time, there are special cases which cannot be covered by any General Act, whether a Joint Stock Company Act or a Railway Act. The present is of that class of cases, and what these gentlemen from Hastings, what the members representing that constituency, and the Mayor of Belleville, and the other gentlemen representing those local interests ask, is a reasonable request. They ask nothing that will

hamper the railway in the carrying out of its work; they ask nothing but what is conceded by the President of the Company to be a reasonable request, because he has pledged himself to carry it out, at some future time, as a reasonable arrangement; and I see, therefore, no reason why this Legislature should not be fairly asked to embody these amendments as a condition of the charter, and I believe myself, from my own knowledge of the condition, that it will have a permanently good effect, and I believe it will be better for the Company, although it is true they have the right to be the best judges of their own interest. It has been said that they propose to go in and build that road with their own money. We do not say in the charter that they shall build it with their own money. We give them the same bonding powers we give to other roads. They will appeal to the money markets and to capitalists wherever they can find them. They have a right to do so under that charter; and if they can go to capitalists and say that by this arrangement with the Belleville road and the Tamworth road, which are not onerous to them, they have headed off any attempt of those companies to extend their lines to the Canadian Pacific Railway, they will stand in a better position in regard to capitalists than they would if both those roads were in a position to ask for powers of extension, and competition of that kind might be dreaded in the near future. I believe then, under all these circumstances, the proposition being reasonable, the objections seeming to be almost wholly that it should be brought in as a modification of the General Railway Act instead of an insertion into a private Bill, but the real force of the argument of these gentlemen representing the locality being admitted by almost everybody, being admitted by the interested parties themselves, this Legislature may very fairly permit this reasonable proposition to be embodied and to be made a binding condition in this Bill, so that, when the liberal-minded president of the road, who is perfectly willing to carry out running arrangements, is superseded by somebody else less liberal, it will not be in the power of the Company to do away with the arrangement, which is in the interest of the whole country, and in the interest of existing railways, in which municipal moneys have been invested, and is not, as far as I can see, injurious to any person.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). In reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I have to say that, having looked through these clauses which are proposed to be added, I have no doubt whatever that passing them would place the Central Ontario Company so completely in the power of the Midland Railway in reference to the control of its own line, that the president of the Company feels that so strongly, having carefully considered the clauses since they have been in print, that he informs me he will be under the necessity, if this House should adopt them, of withdrawing his Bill, because he would be taking the power to extend the road beyond Bancroft at such a serious cost or injury to his own Company that it would be folly for him to take it. My hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) has said it would facilitate the obtaining of money to build this line, if he could show that fair terms were given to the Midland Company and the Napanee and Tamworth line. Instead of that, the people proposing to lend their money on the bonds of the Company for the purpose of making the extension would see that the line was so handicapped by these clauses that they would not put a dollar into it, and the president feels that so strongly that, if these clauses are added, he feels he must withdraw the Bill. The House should understand that the result of adding these clauses will be that the Bill will have to be withdrawn and the Central Ontario Company will have to wait until Parliament thinks fit, at some other time or in some other way,

to authorize the extension of this road. They have already built—and it is a point which has been lost sight of—from the point of junction with the Midland system south of Eldorado, 36 miles north with their own money, and it is proposed to put the traffic over those 36 miles which they have built with their own money on equal terms as to the Midland traffic and the Central Ontario traffic; and in fact these clauses are a cunningly devised mode of putting the road into the control of the Midland system, and through the Midland system into the control of the Grand Trunk. The best proof is that the clauses originally drawn by the solicitor of the Grand Trunk, which I have in my hand, provide for the Midland Railway having running powers over the whole of the Central Ontario Railway system. When those clauses were shown to my hon. friend from North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) even he, though not experienced in railway matters, saw at once that they were most unfair to the Central Ontario road. He then said so, and went to an hon. member of this House, who looked through the clauses and said they were quite unfair and one-sided, and I believe drew these altered clauses, not understanding the true position of the matter; but these altered clauses, although not so objectionable as those originally drawn by Mr. Bell, practically would have the same effect, and the Central Ontario Company will be compelled to withdraw the Bill *in toto* from the House if these clauses are passed. My hon. friend says that the Railway Act cannot provide for all cases. If it does not provide for an interchange of traffic on fair terms between two railways at the point of junction, it ought to do so. That is a point that applies to every two railways that cross or touch each other, and if the machinery of the Railway Act is insufficient for that purpose, the sooner it is amended the better. There are no special reasons why this Company should be put in a different position or under different restrictions to every other company that joins or touches every other line of railway; and if we are going to put these clauses into this Bill, we ought to put them into every railway Bill which comes to the House, because every railway touches some other railway somewhere, and the Railway Act says it shall interchange traffic on fair terms at the point of junction. If that were amended so as to impose some penalty on the company which refused to do that, or so as to provide, as I think it might, that a company complaining should have the right to go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in order to enforce that provision, then there is something that all companies might resort to; but there is nothing in the circumstances of this case to justify putting this Company in a different position from every other. As to the point that the Midland charter is still in existence, it seems very clear to me that the Statute my hon. friend read does not affect the question at all. I understand that Bancroft and the township of Faraday are in the free grant district. Am I right in that supposition?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. Then this Act of 1882 did not at all extend the powers of the former company, and did not remove the restriction or limitation as to time imposed by the original Bill. It simply had the effect of saying that, instead of going straight from Eldorado to a point in the free grant district, they could extend the road "from its present terminus in the township of Madoc to the village of Bancroft, in the Township of Faraday, to the iron mines situate at that place, and passing by way of the iron mines situate between said points." It allowed them to go in a devious way, touching at iron mines on each side. As there were two years of the original charter then to run, that two years' limitation still applied, and on the 24th March, 1884, the power to extend to Bancroft by the Midland Company, in my opinion, expired.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I would not have referred to the matter again if the hon. gentleman had not referred to this Bill. What is the fact? A company that he was a partner in, a company that he was connected with, a company that he gets profits from, agreed to build this road to Bancroft; agreed with the town of Belleville, which gave them $150,000; agreed with the county of Hastings, which gave them $80,000; agreed with the township of Madoc, which gave them $30,000; but, so soon as they got their road built by municipal and Government aid, then they sold the road to the Midland system of railways, and now he, as solicitor of the Company, as adviser of the Company, as part of the Company who got the people of Hastings to give their $80,000, and the people of Belleville to give their $150,000, and the people of Madoc to give their $30,000, with the promise that they should go back to Bancroft, after they have sold the road and got the money and divided the profits, wants to shunt the people of Hastings and the people of Belleville on one side. Now, what is the position of the people of Hastings? They are not in a position to give any more aid to the railway. What is the position of Belleville? It is not in a position to give any more aid to the railway. There are many of us in Hastings owning property who will have to pay taxes for the next twenty-five or thirty years to swell the profits of these gentlemen. I think the hon. member who is promoting this Bill ought to consider the position he has placed us in. He ought to consider that if he and his associates get $500,000 profit out of this road, those who are to contribute this profit deserve some consideration. Now, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was very eloquent over the assertion that this was American capital. Let me give him a little information. Half the capital of this road is borrowed from Canadian capitalists. There is a gentleman here in Ottawa who has loaned $500,000 towards building that road. Again, the hon. gentleman says that no proposition has been made. I contend that this proposal comes from the president of the road. He comes here authorized by the Company to push this matter. He came and solicited me to assist him, and I did so. He requested the Hon. Mr. Abbott to draw up the clauses, and he ordered the clauses to be printed. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that when he started this matter he ought to accept this proposition and support it. Now, let me just say that we are asking nothing unfair or nothing unreasonable; we are asking nothing but what we are willing to give. He will get the same privilege over 500 miles of railway of the Midland system, and he will get the same privilege over fifty or sixty miles of the Napanee and Tamworth Railway, as we are asking from this Company. That proposal came from himself; it should be carried out, and when an hon. gentleman says in this House that there has been nothing proposed, I say he is mistaken. I contend that if there is a gentleman in this House who ought to assist the parties who are trying to get an arrangement made with the Ontario Central Railway, it is the hon. member for North Victoria. He is the party who has made the money—he and his associates—that we have got to pay for the next 25 or 30 years. I contend that if this Company gets the road back to Callander—and the Napanee and Tamworth Railway will not push the road back—the Midland system will stop at Eldorado; for that will be in the interests of the Company, and will increase its revenue by getting the right of traffic, at any rate. I hope this Committee will adopt the resolutions placed in your hands.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can find no fault with the Minister of Customs for interfering in the matter which so closely interests the section of country of which he is a representative. But, it strikes me that all this talk about the money that Hastings and Belleville and other municipalities have given to these roads in the past, has nothing at all to do with this question. The whole question seems to be simply this: These people who have applied to this Parliament have a road now in operation for seventy-six miles, as I understand—for thirty-eight or forty miles beyond Eldorado, the common point to which the Hastings road is built; and the claim of the hon. gentleman who moves this amendment is, that they shall have a right to operate over that distance of road from the common point of junction, not only to the point already completed, but to the point on the Canadian Pacific Railway that this road has to join. Now, let me ask this House one question. Suppose an independent company had come to this House asking for a charter to build a road from the point where this road is chartered to connect, does any one here pretend to say that that independent company would be refused that road? Certainly not. For have we not given an enormous sum of money to connect the Ontario system of roads in the west with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Gravenhurst? And if these gentlemen come before this House now, having already built seventy-six miles of road with thirty-six or forty miles beyond the common point of junction, and are prepared and offer to go on and build at their own expense, without any public subsidy, a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, surely that is what Canada is looking for—it is men who will build roads giving a connection with our great system of railways without asking any subsidy, and I hope that we will permit that. But to say that because these men, who have eighty miles of this road already built and in operation, come here and ask to make that connection, we have a right to force on them a condition which this Parliament has no equitable right to demand, seems to me unreasonable, unjust, and unfair. This whole thing is in a nut-shell. I can quite understand that the terrorism the Grand Trunk Railway Company have exercised, not alone at Ottawa, but in the other Legislatures of the Dominion, both in Quebec and Ontario—I can quite understand their interfering and insisting that such conditions shall be attached as they see fit. But without considering whether they are responsible or not, the contention of the supporters of the Bill is this, that the General Railway Act provides for these traffic arrangements and gives the Company every protection and security they are entitled to have. If it does not give them this, then I say amend the General Railway Act. Take the same position that the advocates of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's Bill did in the Committee—that the Minister of Railways took when he said: "We will not put that condition in the Bill, because it will affect the raising of securities and the finances of the Company, but we will amend the General Railway Act." And if that Act to-day is not sufficient to cover the conditions required, as the Minister of Railways is going to bring in a measure for the purpose of amending the General Railway Act, let a clause be put to cover the present case. It will be very easy for the hon. Minister of Customs, representing, as he does, a constituency which will be affected by this measure, to introduce into the General Railway Act a clause which will meet and cover the full requirements. Sir, it does appear to me that this is legislation which, if I understand the matter aright, they have no right to ask for. We ought not to include in this Bill conditions and provisions which will have the effect of limiting the benefit and operations of a railway already constructed; but, as we have heard from the mover of this Bill that it will be withdrawn if it is so hampered, I think this Committee should hesitate when they find that without the cost of a dollar, without any bonus whatever, they can get that connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway pushed into the wilds of Ontario—I think, I say, they ought to hesitate before they thus hamper a Bill which may have the effect of preventing

that connection. Sir, I must say that I think this matter ought never to have come here. It was fully discussed in the Railway Committee, discussed in the most ample manner in that Committee, which three times decided upon it, and three times rejected the proposals which were considered unjust and unreasonable, as they were presented by the opponents of the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) referred to the fact that the promoters of this Bill would probably withdraw it if this clause were inserted. For one, I have no hesitation in saying, as a member of this House, that I decline to be bound or influenced by any suggestion of this kind. When gentlemen come to this House and ask that railway charters be passed, it is our business to deal with those charters as we think proper. Any suggestion that they will take only what they please, and that if Parliament inserts certain clauses they will withdraw the Bill and not bring money into the country, should not influence our action. The truth of the matter is, that people outside are too apt to think that the only business of Parliament is to grant railway charters out of which they can make money; it is a popular idea and should be abandoned, and the sooner promoters are made to abandon it by the action of Parliament the better it will be for all parties. I, therefore, think the threat to withdraw this Bill should have no influence with this House. Then the hon. member for North Victoria stated that the effect of the amendments would be to place this line, which is going to be extended, entirely under the control of the Midland system; and he told us, as proof of this, that there had been certain clauses prepared by the solicitor of the Grand Trunk, who happens to be Mr. Bell, who is interested as a Belleville man in this matter, with that object; but the hon. gentleman was careful not to tell the Committee that those clauses were not embodied in the Bill—that those clauses which were going to place this extended line under the control of the Midland system when they came to be submitted to the Minister of Customs as representing North Hastings, and, having an interest in this matter, were changed; and therefore the hon. member for North Victoria can hardly say those clauses are going to accomplish that object, when his only proof is that certain other clauses which were withdrawn and are not here, would have accomplished it if they had been in the Bill. So far, therefore, from these clauses tending to place the whole railway under the Midland system, according to the argument which the hon. member for North Victoria presented, the very opposite is the fact: the clauses which would have done that are not before us; they were withdrawn because they were unsatisfactory. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said the object of the amendment is unfair, because they proposed to allow the Midland to operate the railway and have running privileges over the road. I do not understand anything of this kind is contained in the amendment. There is no proposal to operate the road—to have running arrangements over it. There is simply this: At a certain point of junction, the Company shall take the traffic which comes to it from other railways, on equal terms, and run it over the railway. That is all that is proposed in the amendment. We are told this ought to be in the General Railway Act. Probably, it ought to be in the General Railway Act; although, I am bound to say, that from the discussion which occurred in another place, as well as the remarks that have fallen from the hon. gentleman, one would imagine that all the powers given here are in the General Railway Act. If all those arrangements by which they are compelled to give equal rates to traffic coming on the line are already in the General Railway Act, no injury can befall the Company from the powers being placed in this Bill. They cannot say, under those circumstances, that the charter is going to be ruined,

because it is proposed to place in this special Bill, special clauses, covering conditions which, according to the statements of some hon. members, are to be found in the General Railway Act. I believe it is desirable to have uniform legislation as far as possible, but I do not believe that, because certain powers are not conferred in the General Railway Act, we should be prevented from dealing with every Bill as it comes up. This particular Bill happens to be in a peculiar position. There are three prongs, as it were, running to one long handle, and the proposal is simply, by such arrangements as are proposed, to secure this Company in the extension of its line from the probability, almost from the possibility, of competition in their extension, by simply providing that they shall give equal facilities to the three lines for the purpose of carrying traffic which may come to them from either one or other of the three lines. When we are told that this simple provision, which everyone must admit is in the interests of the country, is going to be so injurious that the Company will withdraw their Bill if it is granted, then I am bound to say that we are entitled to view with considerable suspicion, at all events, their professions of willingness to make any running arrangements which may be necessary hereafter. When they come to us, as they have done in this case, with clauses agreed to by themselves, not under the influence of the legislative terrorism of the Grand Trunk, but which the president of the Company first suggested to the solicitor of the Grand Trunk, and in accordance with statements made to persons interested in that district of country, that he would make reasonable traffic arrangements—when the president made this proposition, and the clauses were drawn under his instructions, he is hardly in a position to come here and say that if the House inserts those clauses in the Bill he will withdraw it. When any company comes before Parliament and threatens to withdraw a Bill because certain clauses are inserted or others are omitted, I am quite prepared to assert the independence of this House. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) suggests what is quite right, that the president of the Company promises hereafter to make traffic arrangements. That is all that is proposed by the Bill, and we should have clauses inserted in it to carry out the arrangement made by the president of the Company and Mr. Bell, at the suggestion and request of the former

Mr. PLATT. The afternoon has been spent in discussing amendments to carry out negotiations which have taken place between the president of the railway company and some hon. gentlemen opposite. So far as regards the arguments advanced, they go to show that there is no necessity whatever for inserting the amendment, and the willingness on the part of the president to act fairly and honourably with other companies. This road has been described by the last speaker as one running from the frontier north to the common point, Eldorado, with three prongs and one long handle. Has he considered the effect of placing restrictions on this one road and not placing them on the other roads? I hold in my hand the Bill which has passed this House to grant a charter to the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway. That is a charter without any restrictions; it gives the company power to run in almost any direction from Eldorado to Callander. We desire the Company whose Bill is under discussion to be placed in the same position as other companies chartered this Session. Is there any wonder that the promoter of this Bill or the proprietor of this railway should fail to see why amendments should be accepted, when Bills giving charters to rival companies have passed this House without restrictions being inserted therein? This is an attempt to impose exceptional restrictions on this particular Company. I wish the Committee to notice, moreover, that it is proposed to impose these restrictions, not on a mere paper railway, but on a railway already built and upon which traffic is already

running. I do not think any such legislation has been proposed before during my parliamentary career. Then, so far as the southern part of the county of Hastings is concerned, and especially the city of Belleville, I can assure this hon. Committee that the promoters of this Bill have no antipathy to that city and wish to place no obstacle in the way of her advancement. We have admired her enterprise for years; we have rejoiced at her successes, which have been many; we have regretted her failures, which have been few; but we are not prepared to admit that the vast wealth of our northern country shall remain undeveloped, as it has for centuries, simply because the abundant and valuable minerals of that region cannot find their way to market by way of Belleville. The promoters of this Bill have opened up a more direct route to market by way of Weller's Bay, where, at enormous expense, they have established one of the best shipping harbours in Canada. They have, already, by their own means, without a cent of public aid, constructed a railway through a difficult portion of the country, to within a few miles of the mines, and we now ask power from this Parliament to extend the line still further northward, in order to still further develop the resources of that almost unknown region; and if they, the promoters of this Bill, think that the better, and cheaper, and shorter route to the markets of the world is by way of Trenton, I do not think the city of Belleville has any right, nor do I think that city has any desire, to throw obstacles in their way.

Mr. BOWELL. We make no such claim.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the large amount of money expended by Belleville and the county of Hastings in unsuccessful efforts to bring the iron ore to the frontier at that city. Well, is that any reason why they should seek to recoup themselves for losses entailed by their dealings with others by imposing restrictions upon those who have never received and have never asked anything from them. I do not think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) made any threat when he spoke of withdrawing the Bill if the proposed amendments be attached to it. He merely expressed his opinions that with these restrictions the charter would be worthless. Such is my opinion, but I do not say the Bill will be withdrawn in consequence of such restrictions; but I do say, that I fear the imposition of those restrictions will have a tendency to leave the northern part of Hastings without those facilities for reaching the frontier markets, for which the city of Belleville, as well as the representatives of Hastings, have zealously laboured for years. I believe that if hon. gentlemen opposite thought that by their opposition to this Bill they were impeding the construction of the road they would be slow to take the steps they are taking to-day. I can readily understand their position, however, and having made a strong show of opposition, ostensibly in the interests of their constituents, I hope they will yield this point—that the trade of the country should not languish in order that certain localities, without geographical facilities, may live in the vain hope that fortune will some day favour them to the disadvantage of the country at large. I sincerely hope the House will reject the proposed amendments and leave the Company free to pursue their work untrammelled by unusual and unjust restrictions.

Mr. BOWELL. Allow me a word or two of explanation with reference to the remarks which fell from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). He said that in all my statements I had not shown that any arrangement had been made. I took it for granted that in all the negotiations with the president of the Company we should take his word, as a gentleman, and that I had done so; and I say more it is not a position we should take, either as the representatives of the people—a legislative body—or as individuals, when we solemnly agree to certain amendments to a Bill, that certain arrangements should be carried out, that we should not keep faith one with the other. At least, if one party to an agreement thinks, in the interest of the Company he represents, he should withdraw from an agreement solemnly entered into, he should at least inform those with whom he is negotiating that he withdraws from the arrangements he has been making and not leave them in ignorance, and the Committee and the House without any knowledge of the repudiation which has taken place. I desire to say also, that neither I nor the hon. member for East Hastings, desired to take any step which might, unfortunately, be construed as an attempt to prevent the construction of a railway into that country. We have long advocated the extension of that road, and the best evidence of our interest in it is what we have voluntarily put into these enterpises, without expectation of receiving any reward therefor. I desire to say, that if these amendments, which were drawn up with a view of giving the same rates to the Central Ontario as to the other roads, do not carry out that agreement, I pledge my word that such alterations shall be made in the amendment, upon the third reading, as shall give fair and reciprocal rates to these companies. Further, I say to the hon. gentleman for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), on the authority of Mr. Rathbun, a gentleman whose word I am quite prepared to take—one who, I am satisfied, will never repudiate what he states—that he is prepared to enter into precisely the same arrangements with regard to his own road, the moment it touches the other system, for giving the same rates over his road as he asks from theirs.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Why did not you put that in the Napanee and Tamworth Bill? You take Mr. Rathbun's word, but you do not take Mr. Ritchie's.

Mr. BOWELL. We have no reason to take the word of the latter gentleman; and judging from what has taken place within the last fortnight, I do not think even the hon. gentleman would say that we should put in black and white what he agreed to, in order that that agreement may be carried out. I repeat that if there is the slightest privilege given to the Belleville and North Hastings which is not given also to the Central Ontario, I will agree—as I am sure the hon. gentleman behind me will agree—that the amendment shall be reconstructed at the third reading, in order to meet the view of my hon. friend from North Victoria, or the promoter of the Bill. A good deal has been said about the question of whose money this road is being built with. I know the parties connected with the road in the north are receiving great advantages from the Ontario Government, not given to others. I am glad to see that the Government of Ontario have extended aid in that way, that they have taken the position of extending these railways, more particularly into the back portions of Ontario, by which the resources of the country may be extended. I find, by a return brought down on the last day of the Session of the Ontario Legislature, that one gentleman connected with this road—not holding any stock in it, but who holds mines in that district, and is connected more or less, not only by the land company, but in the interests of the railway company—I mean Mr. Coe—has obtained 54,000 acres of land in the mineral regions of that country, at, as I am informed, 25 cents per acre less than it could be obtained by anybody else, with the additional privilege of utilizing all the wood upon it, less the pine; while any other gentleman here would have to pay 25 cents more per acre for it, reserving all the merchantable timber on the land. He has also the privilege of buying 46,000 acres more, and this is all in connection with railway enterprise. I am not at all finding fault with this, if it is given to place this Company on as good a financial basis as possible, and I hope it may succeed; but I ask for the county with which I am connected, that the agreement made by these gentlemen should be carried out in good faith. I cannot understand how the financial negotiations should be interfer-

ed with by traffic arrangements—not running arrangements, because we do not ask them; not operating arrangements, because we ask nothing of that kind, but traffic arrangements—that they shall receive the traffic from Deseronto *via* Napanee through that road, and by the Belleville and North Hastings, not at a ruinous rate, but at the rate at which they carry their own freight. These arrangements are all we certainly require, and notwithstanding my legal friend's interpretation of this law, my view is that of legal gentlemen whom I have consulted, and I think it is the common sense view, that the charter is still in existence. The charter incorporating the Belleville and North Hastings Railway gives power to extend the line to some point in the free grant territory. That power extended for only ten years. If it has expired, there would be an end to that privilege, but the Act making the Belleville and North Hastings Railway a part of the Midland system does not say that the powers and restrictions contained in that Act shall be continued in this Act; it gives absolute power under the clause I have read, to extend the railway to a point not mentioned in the former Act at all. The original Act says to some point in the free grant territory: that would mean from the northern boundary of the township of Madoc northward to the Ottawa River. But the amalgamation Act gives distinct power to extend the road from the present terminus to Bancroft, in the township of Faraday.

Amendment negatived, and Bill reported.

Mr. PLATT moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. I object to the third reading now. We proposed to move the amendments we proposed in Committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Move now.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is in order for the Bill to be now read the third time.

Mr. WHITE moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee, with instructions to insert the clauses which he had moved in Committee.

Amendment negatived on the following division :—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Daly,	McMullen,
Baker (Victoria),	Dawson,	McNeill,
Bell,	Dugas,	Massue,
Benoit,	Dundas,	Moffat,
Bergin,	Dupont,	O'Brien,
Bossé,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Paint,
Bowell,	Ferguson (Welland),	Patterson (Essex),
Brecken,	Gault,	Pinsonneault,
Bryson,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Hesson,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Smyth,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Taylor,
Carling,	Kranz,	Tilley,
Caron,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Chapleau,	Macdonald (King),	Wallace (York),
Cimon,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Cardwell),
Cochrane,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Coby,	McDougald,	White (Renfrew),
Costigan,	McGreevy,	Wigle,
Cuthbert,	McLelan,	Woodworth.—69.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Allison (Hants),	Foster,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox),	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Amyot,	Gigault,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Montplaisir,
Auger,	Girouard,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Guilbault,	Orton,
Beaty,	Guna,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Hall,	Platt,
Billy,	Harley,	Ray,
Blake,	Hay,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Hilliard,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Houde,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burpee (St. John),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper (Pictou),
Catudal,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vail,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Vanasse,
Cockburn,	Lesage,	Watson,
Davies,	Lister,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	Wells,
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wheler,
Dodd,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Fisher,	McCraney,	Yeo—91.
Fleming,		

Bill read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed :—

Bill (No. 66) to reduce the Capital Stock of the Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, and to make other provisions respecting the said Bank.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

WAREHOUSING LICENSE, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. WELDON enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a general Inland Revenue Warehouse in St. John, N.B., to enable merchants not having a special warehouse to place in bond tobacco brought by them from Montreal or elsewhere ex-warehouse? Or whether arrangements will be made to enable merchants in St. John, N.B., to pay the excise duties on tobacco ex-warehouse from Montreal, at St. John, and not at Monreal?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under present regulations, any merchant or owner of a warehouse may apply for and obtain a warehousing license under which other merchants may warehouse tobacco in bond. The inspector is informed of this, and should such license be taken out, the Excise duties would, of course, be paid in St. John instead of Montreal.

NEWFOUNDLAND PROHIBITIVE DUTY.

Mr. DESJARDINS enquired, Whether the Government has received information relating to a recent Resolution enacted by the Legislature of Newfoundland, to the following effect: "There shall be a duty of one hundred per cent. imposed upon all packages containing merchandise imported into this colony, provided that this duty shall not be levied until proclamation by the Governor in Council shall first issue, and shall then be made to apply to importations from countries to be mentioned therein, which shall levy a tax on packages from this colony or in which inspection of merchandise from this colony is made compulsory;" and whether it is the intention of the Government to take any action in the matter, so far as Canadian trade might be affected by it?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Communications have been received from the Board of Trade and Corn Exchange of Montreal within the last two days, and the Government are now giving the matter their best consideration.

ONTARIO LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Mr. HESSON enquired, What balance (if any) is now due to the Province of Ontario on account of the Land Improvement Fund? Does the Government still allow and pay interest on said fund at the rate of 5 per cent.? Have the Dominion Government at any time refused to make provision for the payment of principal or interest on account of said fund when requested so to do? Have the Ontario Government now made a demand upon this Government for payment in full of said indebtedness? If so, will a sum be included in the Supplementary Estimates for payment of same?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. By the fifth clause of the award of the arbitration appointed to adjust the debts of the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, it was declared (page 3) that the Upper Canada Improvement Fund, amongst other special or trust funds, should be the property of and belong to the Province of Ontario. By the seventh clause of the award (page 6), it was declared that from the Common School Fund, as held on the 30th June, 1867, the sum of $124,685.18 should be taken and deducted, and placed to the credit of the Upper Canada Improvement Fund, that sum being one fourth part of the moneys received by the late Province of Canada, between the 6th March, 1861, and the 1st July, 1867. In the accounts recently rendered to the two Provinces, the said sum of $124,685.18 was credited to the Province of Ontario as on the 30th June, 1867. Correspondence is now taking place, and has been going on since October last, between the Ontario Government and the Finance Department respecting the several accounts, and enquiries are being made as to the circumstances connected with the origin and distribution of the fund in question; and it is expected that during the recess a settlement will be arrived at of all the accounts between the Provinces and the Dominion. We stated in October or November last that the Government were prepared to dispose of these accounts, but it has not yet been convenient. I do not know that there was any distinct demand made.

LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. GAULT enquired, When does the contract call for the completion of the two new basins on the Lachine Canal, and what will be the probable cost of those works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract calls for the completion of the two new basins on the Lachine Canal in September, 1884, and the probable cost of these works is $150,000.

DOMINION EXHIBITION.

Mr. GAULT enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to have the Dominion Exhibition held in Montreal this year, and to make the usual grant for that purpose?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has not been decided where the exhibition will be held, as far as the Government are concerned.

SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Tuesday next, to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that in the accounts between the Dominion and the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the amounts by which the respective debts of the said Provinces were increased by the Act 36 Vic., cap. 30 (as explained as to Nova Scotia by the Act 37 Vic., cap. 3) shall be calculated and allowed to the Provinces aforesaid, as if the said Act 36 Vic., cap. 30 had directed that the increased amounts should be allowed from the date of the coming into force of the British North America Act, 1867, and the amounts of such increases respectively from the last mentioned date to the 1st of July, 1873, shall be deemed capital owing to the said Provinces respectively, and shall bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent. as part of their respective subsidies; and further, that as respects the Provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island, the amounts hitherto calculated and allowed as the debts of these Provinces respectively, shall be increased by such amounts as shall make the total amounts thereof respectively bear the same proportion to the respective populations of the said Provinces as ascertained by the Census of 1881, as the total amount calculated and allowed as the respective debts of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, as provided hereby, shall bear to the respective populations of the last named Provinces, as ascertained by the said Census of 1881, and the amount of such increases to the said Provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island, shall be deemed capital owing to the said Provinces respectively, and shall bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent. as part of their respective subsidies.

He said: This is changed from the original notice. In looking over the matter as it stood, I found that it would not be doing justice to the Provinces which came in later. Take this by way of illustration: If the amount to be placed at the credit of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should average $1.50 a head of the whole population, then, by the amended Resolution, the Provinces of Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and Manitoba will receive that $1.50 a head upon their population of 1881. If upon the population of 1881, collectively, of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, it amounts to $1.50, it will be added to the other Provinces in proportion. As Prince Edward Island only came into the Union in 1873, it would receive nothing under the Resolution as it stood before.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite clear that the original Resolution was quite indefensible.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; because it did not carry out what the intention of the Government was on the subject.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient that a sum of $600 be appropriated for the payment of the salary of a clerk to assist the Civil Service Board of Examiners; and to provide for the salaries of the Assistant Post Office Inspectors at the sum of $1,200 on their appointment, with an annual increase of $50, to a maximum of $1,600; also for the salaries of Superintendents of Letter Carriers at $600, with an annual increase of $40, to a maximum of $800; Mail Transfer Agents $400, with an annual increase of $40, to a maximum of $600; also to provide for a salary of $360, instead of $300, for letter carriers, messengers, box collectors and packers.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ANALYSTS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may cause such remuneration as he deems proper to be paid to the Analysts appointed under the Bill now before the House for the prevention of adulteration of food and drugs, and such remuneration, whether by fees or salary, or in part by both, may be paid to them out of any sums voted by Parliament for the purposes of the said Bill.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. WILSON. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter which, although somewhat personal to myself, is also one of public importance—I refer to the repeated applications I have made requesting that a return be brought down of the petitions and

charges against Judge Hughes, of the county of Elgin, asking for an investigation into those charges. Repeated enquiries have been made up to this date, and no satisfaction has been given me by the Government. Why the Government should feel a desire to withhold this information I am at a loss at present to understand, unless they desire to shield the Judge and thereby prevent the people in that county from being freed from the injustice under which they have been labouring for a long time. It is well known, I think, to every hon. member here, that in the year 1862 there were charges preferred against Judge Hughes; that these charges were tried before a competent court, and after a long and thorough investigation was made into them he was found guilty and impeached; and I may say, that if the law had been vindicated, if the decision arrived at by that court had been carried out by the Government of the day, Judge Hughes, on account of the offence committed at that time, would have been no longer competent to hold the position which he has held from that time to the present. Now, Sir, having as I thought, a perfect right to present to this House an Address, I asked that returns might be brought down in order that I might have an opportunity early in the Session, of seeing whether those charges were of such a nature as justified the people of that county in demanding redress at the hands of the Government. I moved early, and it is now nearly the close of the Session, and yet I am without those papers; I have had no opportunity of seeing those papers, although I have asked for them so frequently as, doubtless, to weary the House. This is my last attempt, as I know full well that even if the papers were all brought down at this time of the Session, I would have no opportunity of bringing the matter up. Now, Sir, I would not, perhaps, have adopted this course had it not been for a statement made by the First Minister in, reference to this matter, when he used these words:

"THE COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Notices of Motions are called, I would beg to state that the hon. member for Elgin has moved several times for papers connected with the petitions for the removal of Judge Hughes. I ascertain from the House that one of the objects of the return was to get copies of papers under the impeachment. The papers were dated as far back as 1862 and diligent search has been made in the Department of Justice and in the Secretary of State's Office, every where, but they cannot be found.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. Look in the Minister of Interior's pigeon hole.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Secretary of State has written to Toronto to try and get copies of the papers connected with that impeachment. In the *Globe* of the 18th March, it was stated that the Dominion Government has shown signs of intending to do nothing in the matter of the petition for the removal of Judge Hughes; that the petition has been returned with several small objections, the return being an insult to the people of Elgin; that Judge Hughes is a man after Sir John's own heart, who wants the matter to be allowed to drop. The small objections against the petition amounts to this: that there was a paper sent down professing to be a petition, but no signature was attached to it, and it was sent back for the purpose of getting one man at least in Elgin to sign it. It was sent back with the request, first, to get the signatures of the petitioners; secondly, to get the dates when the acts complained of were done; and thirdly and generally, for a more orderly arrangement of the ground, which spread over twenty-five years.

"Mr. WILSON. I might ask the hon. First Minister when this supposed petition was returned to Mr. Stanton.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The petition was received in the Department on the 21st January, and the Address was moved on the 28th January, so the hon. gentelman had full notice that petition was coming down, and he moved immediately after he heard it was sent down. The petition was unsigned, and complained of acts happening a great many years ago. I cannot exactly tell the hon. gentleman, because I do not know; the information was not supplied to me, but I will ascertain, when the letter was written back from the Department of Justice asking that a petition might be sent, if it was to be sent."

Now, Sir, although perhaps my hon. friend might have imagined that there were no petitions—and he distinctly stated that there were none sent down, that there was merely a paper with no signatures to it, I would like to call his attention to a petition that was sent down a year ago last March and still remains in the Department, and is in the possession, I suppose, or it ought to be, of the Minister of Justice. Has he made any effort to ascertain whether that petition was there or not? Was he correctly or properly informed in reference to their being any petition or not? I hold in my hand evidence showing that that petition was sent down a year ago, with a number of signatures. He certainly should have ascertained whether that petition was lying in the Department, and he certainly ought to have made a return of the paper that was in the possession of the Government. I think, therefore, I have just cause of complaint that there was apparently a desire on the part of the Government to prevent my obtaining those returns in time to ascertain whether any action should be taken or not, and therefore the statement made by the *Globe* is to a certain extent borne out by subsequent events. It so happens that at the time the petition was prepared, it was resolved to petition not only the Dominion Government but also the Ontario Government, the petitioners not knowing definitely which Government had the right to investigate charges into the conduct of a country Judge. Two petitions were prepared; the signatures placed upon each were identical; one was to be sent to the Dominion Government and the other to the Ontario Government. The petitioners did not send the petition to the Ontario Government, and I have the document in my hand. The other one was forwarded to the Governor in Council, and is, I suppose, still in the hands of the Minister of Justice notwithstanding the First Minister's statement to the contrary. If there is any doubt as to the genuineness of that petition, any doubt as to the signatures attached to it, I can show the First Minister this petition, which is a *fac simile* of the other one, and he will find among the names a number of the leading men of St. Thomas, including several lawyers. The petitioners asked for an investigation into the charges preferred against Judge Hughes, calling the attention of the Government to the fact that that Judge had been impeached so long ago as 1862. As regards the assertion made by the First Minister, that I was notified in regard to there being a petition brought down against Judge Hughes, I may say that I had no knowledge, either directly or indirectly, until I saw the statement in the public press; that I had no communication, either directly or indirectly, with the parties who were presenting these charges. As there might be a question with respect to the petition having been sent, I will read a portion of it. This one is addressed to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario, and is, as I have before said, a *fac simile* of the one sent to the Minister of Justice. The petition says:

"That David John Hughes, Esq., has been for many years past and is now Judge of the County Court of the County of Elgin, and holds other official positions which by law are entrusted to him as such County Judge.

"That many years ago a public investigation into the official conduct of the said David John Hughes was held before the Court of Impeachment at the City of Toronto, whereat the said David John Hughes was found guilty by the unanimous verdict of the said Court of Impeachment of making a personal profit out of his patronage of the appointment of a Clerk of the Division Court in St. Thomas, a verdict which makes him legally and morally incompetent to hold his present position."

Then the petition goes on to refer to other charges which it is not necessary to read. If the First Minister desires to see the petition and the names attached, I will allow him to do so. The petition is signed by William Coyne, merchant; H. Lindop, builder and contractor; Elijah Moore, J.P.; Henry H. Waddell, merchant; James Stanton, barrister; W. F. Ellis, barrister; John H. Robinson, barrister; in all, eleven or twelve leading citizens. In order to show that the Department of Justice did receive the petition, and that the First Minister was incorrect in his statement that the petition was not in the Department, I will read the following correspondence. The Deputy Minister of Justice wrote as follows, under date of 27th March, 1883:—

'Copy.

"OTTAWA, 27th March, 1883.

"SIR,—Having reference to your letter of the 3rd instant, transmitting a petition of certain inhabitants of St. Thomas, praying for an enquiry into the grievances they labour under so long as His Honour Judge Hughes is permitted to occupy the position of County Judge for the county of Elgin, I have the honour to say, in regard to your reference to a public investigation had many years ago, that this is not now a matter for investigation.

"The other statements in the petition are of too general a nature and character to justify an investigation.

"You should state specifically the time and the place at which and the case in which, by reason of what you allege, he has brought himself within the terms of the Act of 1882.

"I am, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,

"GEO. W. BURBIDGE,
"*Deputy Minister of Justice.*

'JAMES STANTON, Esq.,
"St. Thomas."

The County Crown Attorney, who is charged with the duty of seeing that the law is properly administered, forwarded these charges. He received the following letter from the Deputy Minister of Justice:

"Copy.

"OTTAWA, 3rd March, 1884.

"SIR,—With further reference to your letter of 21st ultimo, I have the honour to call your attention to the fact that the petition accompanying your letter, which you stated to be the specification of the charges, and of the grounds on which the petitioner's complaint is based, is not signed by any person.

"I have also to call your attention to the fact that in a number of cases, no time is stated at which the matters complained of took place.

"It would be convenient, in stating the charges and grounds on which the complaint is based, to state them in the order of time in which they occurred.

"The petition is therefore returned to you for signature, and for amendment in the particulars indicated.

"I am, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,

"GEO. W. BURBIDGE,
"*Deputy Minister of Justice.*

"JAMES STANTON, Esq.,
"St. Thomas."

It will be observed that the suggestion or statement was made that the petition was returned. Immediately the First Minister made the announcement that no petition or charges were in the possession of the Government, I wrote to Mr. Stanton. He immediately had the charges signed by the former petitioners, or as many of them as he could find. He had the petition signed, and he, acting for petitioners, forwarded the document to the Department. That document was mailed in St. Thomas on the 24th. A letter of the same date was written and mailed to me. I received the letter on the morning of the 25th, and on the afternoon of the 26th I had a notice on the Paper enquiring of the Government if they had up to to that time received any such document. When the question was asked of the Government the Minister of Public Works, in the absence of the First Minister, stated that no petitions were in the possession of the Government; and when I further asked whether the Government intended to take any further action in the matter, the reply was that they could take no action, as there was nothing before them. Now, I do not accuse the First Minister—I do not say he is to blame in the matter—but what I do say is, that there should have been better supervision over the Department of Justice, so that when an Address is passed here, and when we are entitled to receive the papers covered by that Address, the Deputies of the Departments should furnish the Ministers with correct and reliable information. The Government are in possession of the petition, and they are asked to investigate the matter. It is their bounden duty either to act upon that petition or else to give a positive refusal and say that the charges are not ample and sufficient for investigation. They have certainly a right to say that the impeachment and the suspense of judgment which took place in 1852 should not now be revived. We all know perfectly well that a Judge is not entitled to hold his position a day after he has been found guilty of using his public position in any way to better his private circumstances. This was proven after full and fair enquiry. Now, I have done my duty in regard to these charges. Some may say that I have brought this matter up on personal pique. I have taken no direct or indirect part in the matter, and I should not have referred to it at all had it not, to a certain extent, been the impression that I was trying to get information out of the Government that the Government was not in possession of. How it is that these petitions have been lying in the Department of Justice, and that, though I have time and again asked for them, which an Address of the House called for, and yet that information has been withheld, is something which I cannot account for. However, if the Government choose to take that course, upon them be the responsability and not upon me. Having placed the matter before the House so as to exonerate myself from any censure in connection, with the matter I leave it in the hands of the Government, hoping they may see their way clear to give some definite information, so that I may be able to say to the people of the county whether or not the Government intend to enquire into these charges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am rather sorry that the hon. gentleman did not tell me that he was going to bring this matter up, for this reason, that only yesterday I had a letter from Mr. Stanton, whom I know very well, stating that I must have been under a misapprehension when I stated that there was no petition signed. Upon that I communicated with the Department of Justice, and I suppose there will be an answer to-morrow. At present I have nothing more to say than I stated before. Immediately on the appearance of the enquiry of the hon. gentleman on the Order Paper, that question being:

"Whether the Government have taken any steps to enquire into the charges preferred against the official conduct of D. J. Hughes, Judge of the County Court of Elgin; and if not, whether it is their intention to do so, and when?"

I immediately called the attention of the Department of Justice and the Deputy Minister sent me this memorandum:

"An unsigned petition, asking the investigation of certain charges against the Judge, was received. A copy of this petition was sent to Mr. Hughes, and the original returned to the person who forwarded it in order that the signatures of the petitioners might be supplied, and also the dates (where not given) of acts complained of."

There is the further statement by the Deputy Minister:

"That petition was received in the Department on the 21st January, and the Address was moved on the 28th; the petition was unsigned and complained of acts happening a great many years ago, as well as recently, and also of acts the dates of which were not given. It was returned for the following purposes: First, for the signatures of the petitioners; secondly, for the dates when the acts complained of were done; and thirdly and generally, for a more orderly arranged statement of the grounds. At all events, it was manifestly unfair to make these charges public before the Judge had an opportunity of answering them. Although the petition was unsigned, we asked the Secretary of State's Department to send a copy of it to Judge Hughes, which was done."

It was upon the authority of those papers that I made the statement to the hon. gentleman with respect to the impeachment which took place so long ago as 1862, and I think the House will agree that it is far too late to enter on the discussion of charges against a Judge which were made more than twenty years ago, he having gone on as Judge ever since, and I suppose he has given satisfaction, so far as I know, at least. The papers in reference to that impeachment are not to be found in the Department. The last known of them, they were in the hands of Mr. (now Chief

Justice) Wilson, who was then Solicitor-General, and there is no memorandum in the Department about them to show where they are now, whether they have been mislaid or destroyed. It is quite clear it would be highly improper, however, to go into a matter of more than twenty years standing. I have not Mr. Stanton's letter by me, in which he simply stated that I must be under some misapprehension, and that he had sent a petition signed. After hearing the hon. gentleman's statement, I fancy it must have been in this way: that Mr. Stanton enclosed a paper signed by some persons, and it was upon that document that the Minister of Justice thought he could found no investigation. But he wrote for another petition which would state the facts and dates and the suspicious circumstances to warrant an investigation. I dare say the hon. gentleman can quite understand that a process against a Judge is a very serious matter, and that the charges must be made with great particularity—must be charges of specific offences, must be so specific that there may be no difficulty in making enquiry into them. That paper, which was presumed to be a petition, setting forth specific charges, was unsigned, and has been sent back to be signed, and has not yet been received.

Mr. WILSON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that it is not yet received?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know. I only say that I received Mr. Stanton's letter on Saturday, and I sent it at once to the Department of Justice. I think the hon. gentleman was good enough to mention that he would bring up the matter to-day; but I will make more enquiries to-morrow, and on going into Supply, I shall be able to make a more specific reply than I have made now. At all events, I have given all the information I have myself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the same Bill.

SUPPLY.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

PUBLIC WORKS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, NOVA SCOTIA.

111	Cow Bay	$3,000 00
	Benecadie Pond—To complete work	1,500 00
	Cheverie	2,500 00
	Port Hood—To complete	8,000 00
	Coffin's Island—To complete	1,000 00
	Port Lorne—To complete	500 00
	Three Fathom Harbour—To complete	600 00
	Great Village River—Locality furnishing $1,000	3,250 00
	Chipman's Brook—Repairs	1,000 00
	Harborville—Repairs	1,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Cow Bay vote is a revote. The work will be proceeded with by the Department. There has been a good deal of damage done to that pier by storms.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apparently every year Cow Bay comes for a new grant. I think I remember it figuring in the Estimates at least a dozen times.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose it is in a very exposed place. Up to 1878 the amount expended on it was $90,000, and the amount expended since is $11,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was bought from the proprietors in 1875.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any chance of the expenditure coming to a final close?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so. As long as storms exist, I am afraid we shall have to repair the damage done by them. The hon. gentleman also knows that the worms do a great deal of damage to the timber there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The worm that did most damage in that quarter was a Senator. I would like to know if any one is authorized to expend any money there without geting a vote from Parliament.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nobody but the Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. One of the first things that the hon. gentleman did after he came back to power, was to pay some $5,000 or $6,000 to a private person, who said he had expended it on this work. I hope that process will not be continued.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All I can say is, that so far as I can recollect, the only money paid has been for work done by the Department. The vote for Benecadie Pond is a revote of $1,500, which is required to complete the opening of a passage from the pond to the lake, and building the sides of the same with crib work. It is in Cape Breton. Cheverie is in the county of Hants. This sum includes a revote of $1,500. The work is under contract, and this sum is required to complete it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will any of this cover extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it is not an extra, the amount of the tender which was the lowest was larger than the vote of last year, and of course we have to supplement it by this sum. There is a contract there also. This is to pay for the balance of the contract. The contractor is Mr. J. McGee. His contract was for $11,400, and the $8,000 here asked for will complete it. The $1,000 for Coffin's Island will complete the work; also the $600 for Three Fathom Harbour. Great Village River is in the county of Colchester, and this amount of $3,250 will complete the work. There is a contract there for $12,000, of which this is the balance required. The $1,000 for Chipman's Brook repairs is required in addition to the $1,500 for the repairs to the old wall on the west side, as shown by an examination of the wharf. With reference to the $1,000 for Harbourville, the Chief Engineer states this is required to complete the repairs now being carried out on the east and west piers, as shown by an examination lately made of these harbour works. This is in King's, Nova Scotia.

Mr. McISAAC. $5,000 were voted last year for McNair's Cove. Has that money been expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it has been, or will be before the 1st of July.

Mr. McISAAC. Was the work done by contract or by day work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It must be by day work; it was a small vote and most likely expended in that way.

Mr. McISAAC. I expected to see this vote not only repeated but doubled this Session, in order to make the repairs which have been allowed to become necessary. This work was commenced and finished in the early years of Confederation, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and it cost over $30,000, from first to last, exclusive of last year's vote. In 1879 or 1880, in consequence of the storms that generally occur in the fall, a certain amount of damage was inflicted on this work. This damage I brought to the notice of the Minister at the time; and the people of the locality also, by a petition, brought it to his notice,

and urged the necessity of immediate repairs being made, on the principle that a stitch in time was profitable economy, particularly in a case such as this. The hon. Minister, however, heeded neither information nor representation, but allowed $30,000 to disappear almost altogether. He seemed to pay particular attention to this senatorial Cow Bay, where as often as there is a storm there is some damage, and as often as there is damage there is a vote in the Estimates. I fail to see why he does not give the same attention to this particular work at McNair's Cove, because I maintain that for want of such attention, $30,000 or $40,000 value of work has been completely lost. The hon. gentleman commenced repairs last year by a vote of $5,000, when, in fact, there was nothing left to be repaired. The wharf had been swept away, and no trace of it left for any useful purpose; whereas, if he had paid attention when the matter was first brought to his notice, less than $5,000—$1,000 in 1880 or 1879 would have saved between $30,000 and $40,000. What has been expended is worth nothing at all. Where large vessels sheltered before the wharf was carried away, now, even after the expenditure of $5,000, the smallest fishing boats cannot get any shelter. I do not think such neglect on the part of the hon. Minister to make timely repairs will add to the reputation his Department has for efficiency and economy. I am far from saying that his Department is not entitled to a reputation for efficient administration; but, as far as the saving or preserving of costly structures like this is concerned, its reputation has actually yet to be earned. This is not the only case I have to complain of. There is another breakwater in the same county which cost $8,000, and that has nearly gone also—the breakwater at Tracadie. I had the honour to present a petition to the Department early in the Session, and have brought the matter to the hon. Minister's notice every Session for the last few years, and I now assure him that unless some provision be made this Session, the $8,000 expended on this breakwater will follow the $30,000 he allowed to be wasted at Cape George. If the breakwater was worth commencing, it is worth preserving. It is far better, in the public interest, not to commence these works at all, if they are to be allowed to disappear in so short a time. There is another work, also in the same county, and the hon. Minister knows all about it—that is the breakwater at Bayfield. Last Session the hon. gentleman was good enough to promise that he would give it his attention this Session and make the necessary provision. I hope he will not forget that promise; $5,000 was expended in 1878, commencing the work, and unless it is now looked after immediately, that $5,000 will be gone also. The hon. Minister of Railways knows all about these works. In 1882 he did us the honour, in my county, to pay us a visit, and he gave us a very eloquent address, during which he enumerated these public works—St. George, Tracadie and Bayfield—described their delapidated condition, and said the only thing he needed to make the required provision for these public works was the assistance of the representative of the county to vote the money. I can assure him I am ready to assist him to vote all the money required, and I think that I can assure him the assistance of hon. gentlemen on this side to carry out that side of the bargain.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not sure I will agree to assist in any corrupt bargain.

Mr. McISAAC. I am not disposed to call it corrupt; it is only a delayed duty on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways, and I must ask and insist, if my insistance will be of any avail on the hon. Minister of Public Works, that he should save at least what is left of the money that he and others have expended on these public works. He commenced these works himself, and I say again he should not have commenced these structures if he thought they would not be worth preserving. I trust when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, the necessary provisions will be found in them to make these absolutely necessary repairs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon friend has put the matter a little too broadly. I do not think I stated quite in those very distinct terms the case as he has put it, but I must say that the gentleman whose interests I was advocating at the time, the gentleman whom I was supporting in that county at that time, as a candidate for this House, has since been elected by a very large majority in that county as a successor to the present Judge Thompson, who now graces the Bench of Nova Scotia; and I might tell my hon. friend that it would be impossible for his advocacy to be stronger or more pressing on the Minister of Public Works in regard to these works than the pressure that is constantly brought to bear upon him by the hon. gentleman's colleague for that county in the Local Legislature. I am in hopes that between them they will be able to induce my hon. friend here to take such measures as will prevent any further injury to these works and make them as useful as possible.

Mr. McISAAC. Does the hon. gentleman say that the only merit the works possess is the fact of their being advocated by a gentleman who represents the county in the Local Legislature?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I do not. I do not see what the hon. gentleman means. He does not mean to say that the only merit the works have is the fact that he is advocating them in this House?

Mr. McISAAC. I am asking whether the only value which he attaches to these works is the fact that aid is asked for them by a gentleman in the Local House?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I, say no. I say the works themselves are important, very important, but the hon. gentleman is very well aware that there are a great many very important works in this country that it is not possible to grapple with at the same time; but I have said before, and I express again the hope that the strong appeal the hon. gentleman has made, and the still stronger appeals that have been continuously made by his colleague in the local branch of the Legislature, will succeed in duly impressing my hon. friend here, and I can assure him that my advocacy and support will not be wanting in anything that can be done to promote the advancement and the security and the extension of those important works.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Minister of Railways forgot to tell us exactly what he did promise during the election. We would like to know that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it would not be edifying for us all to give our experience and fight our battles over again, and restate what we have said in the course of a parliamentary campaign. I am afraid, although I think my memory is tolerably accurate, I could hardly rely on it for minute details in a matter of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will take it confidentially.

Mr. MILLS. It is rather a novel statement that the Minister of Railways makes that the importance of these works is being pressed on the Government by a gentleman who has been elected to another Legislature for the performance of other duties. Why does the hon. gentleman take such pains to inform the House that that gentleman, besides discharging the duties he is elected to discharge by the electors, has undertaken to discharge the duties which devolve on the gentleman who is elected for that purpose in this House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. member (Mr. McIsaac) did not notify me that he would bring

up the question this evening of these works for which we are asking no money this year; because, I would have been prepared to give him a distinct answer. I hope, if he has other matters of the kind, he will give me till next day, at all events, and then I will be prepared to give him the information.

Mr. McISAAC. I will take the information on Concurrence. I have no desire to press the hon. Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is impossible that I should be prepared on every work for which a supply is not asked. As to McNair's Cove, I would like him to be a little more precise in his dates. He said the work was carried away in 1881, or in 1880, or in 1879. It might be 1878. I would like to know exactly what year it was, so that I might be able to answer him. If the work is all carried away——

Mr. McISAAC. Not quite all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The fact that I asked $5,000 last year shows that we were informed differently, and that I was taking care of the work. Perhaps that $5,000 was not enough and we might have asked more this year, but my attention was not called to it.

Mr. McISAAC. Less than $5,000 would have been sufficient, if expended in 1880, when the damage was first done, but it is the neglect to apply the money in time that has made it worse.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Let the hon. gentleman not speak of neglect. Let us wait until Concurrence, and we will fight it out then.

Mr. McISAAC. There will be no fight about it. The money will settle it.

Mr. KIRK. I have looked to see if there was a revote proposed for certain breakwaters for which a vote was taken in 1882, in the county of Guysboro'. Last year I brought the matter to the notice of the Minister, and when the Estimates were under discussion he promised that he would carry out a suggestion of mine, that an engineer should be sent down to examine those harbours to see what it would cost to erect breakwaters to meet the wants of the fishermen. I asked the question here this winter, whether the promise on that occasion had been carried out, and he answered me by saying he thought I had made a mistake, and intimated that no such promise had been made. In answer to me, he quoted from his answer given last year, which was:

"When the time came to use the vote of $3,000 appropriated by Parliament, enquiries were instituted as to the total amount required to make it a really useful work. It was found that the amount was so large the Government were not prepared at that time to proceed with the work."

That was his answer, when I asked if it was the intention of the Government to expend this money in erecting those breakwaters; but, when the question came up on a vote in the Estimates, I explained to the Minister that I did think he was justified in withholding the expenditure of the money, the $3,000, from the fact that the Engineer, in 1874, had reported that it would cost $53,000 to build a breakwater, and I thought it was hardly reasonable to expect him to expend $3,000 on the building of a breakwater when it would cost $53,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What harbour is that?

Mr. KIRK. New Harbour, in the county of Guysboro'. I suggested that in order to ascertain what it would really cost to build a breakwater for the necessities of the fishermen there, he should send an Engineer during the recess to examine it, and he promised me to carry out that suggestion. I said:

"I am not finding fault with the hon. Minister for acting as he has done. The fact that the Engineer of the Department reported that this work would cost $53,000 was, I think, a sufficient reason for refusing to undertake it with 3 000. But this report was given while the policy of the Government was not to undertake any work of a local nature. This policy, however, has been changed by the Government, they having decided to build smaller breakwaters for the benefit of the fishermen. What I should suggest is, that the Government send their Engineer there again to see what a breakwater would cost that would be serviceable for the fishermen."

"Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a proper suggestion, and I will do that."

Now, you see it was the Minister himself who made the mistake as to his not having made that promise, and not I. I was expecting that an Engineer would be sent down, and that the Minister would be prepared during this Session to propose an additional vote or a revote of the $3,000, with perhaps an addition for the breakwater at New Harbour, but on looking over the Estimates I do not find there is any revote of $3,000 or any other sum; and I therefore hope he will place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates this year and carry out the suggestion made last year that an Engineer in the meantime, during the recess, before the money is expended, will examine the harbour and report what it will cost. If it is found that a breakwater suitable to the fishermen will cost $53,000, I will not ask him to expend a dollar, because I do not think so large a sum should be expended on such a work for local purposes. My impression, however, is that a work sufficient for all purposes can be erected for $5,000 or $6,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year we had no vote of money for this work, and, therefore, as there was no vote, there could not be a revote. The hon. gentleman says I promised there would be an examination made. Does he say there has been no examination made?

Mr. KIRK. Not since the promise was made, that I know of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If I made a promise, I have no doubt the Engineer has fulfilled my promise. It is impossible for me to say, at the present moment, whether an Engineer was sent there or not. When a promise is made, I give the order. I am not in a position to say whether there will be a vote or not, but there is no revote, because there was no vote last year. In the meantime, I will see what the report has been about this case, and if it is possible to submit an item to my colleagues before coming down here with the Supplementary Estimates, I will do so.

Mr. KIRK. The Minister will remember that although there was no vote in the Estimates last year, he explained to the House that it was not necessary to revote the money of 1882, because it could be expended any time before, I think he said, the 1st of November; and there was no need to vote it again; that in the meantime he would send the Engineer, and if he found the money could be usefully expended he would have it expended before the time expired.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, P.E.I.

112. South River, Murray Harbour $1,250 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose the report was not favourable. There is $1,250 to complete Murray Harbour, South River. This is a revote. It is for the purpose of improving the channel so as to provide for a comparatively straight channel, and make it both wider and deeper.

Mr. McINTYRE. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the harbour of St. Peter's Bay, for which I see no vote in the Estimates. In 1882 the sum of $6,000 was voted to complete the breakwater there on the east side, the part on the west side being completed during the Mackenzie Administration. There was a contract entered into with a man named Sinnott, and last year, I believe, he performed a certain portion of that work, but last fall a storm carried away the larger portion of it. Now, I may state to the hon. Minister that, personally, I am not aware of the facts, but

I will give them to him as they have been stated to me by those who are in a position to give information on the subject. I have had several letters from that section of the country, complaining of the manner in which this work has been carried out. The first complaint is that the contract should have been finished in September last and the second complaint is, as I have heard it, that no security was required for the completion of the contract; and third, that no preparations have been made to continue the contract. The harbour, last fall, I am told, was in a state of complete dilapidation. Since my attention was drawn to this condition of affairs, I placed on the Order Paper a notice calling for correspondence and documents, but it has become so late in the Session that it could not be reached, and of course it had to go like the others, last Friday. But the complaint is very strong, that no preparations have been made to continue the contract and that the work seems likely not to proceed any further. I may say that this conviction is strengthened by the circumstance that nothing has been done during the past winter with a view of going on with the work next summer. No timber, or stone, or material of any kind have been procured for the purpose of going on with the work in the spring. Of course, in that section of the country, as in most other parts of Canada, the winter is the proper time to prepare for the work of the summer. Now, it is very desirable that this work should be looked after and that this gentleman should be compelled to continue his contract, otherwise the harbour, if allowed to continue in its present condition, will be completely destroyed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was ready the other day to give the information if the hon. gentleman had had an opportunity of making his motion. I will answer the hon. gentleman now by saying that John Sinnott made a contract with the Department on the 10th of February, 1883, for the construction of a breakwater on the eastern side of St. Peter's Bay, for the sum of $3,930, agreeing to complete the same on the 29th September the same year. Early in September he asked for an extension of time, stating it would be impossible to finish the work during 1883. He was informed that no extension would be granted, but that he must finish the work; and on the 6th of October he was informed by the Engineer in charge that he would be held responsible for the work in its unfinished state, and liable for all damages which might befall the work by its being left unfinished. The amount paid Mr. Sinnott for this work is $1,500, and is paid in proportion to the work done. The hon. gentleman said that he understood there were no sureties given. He says he only heard so, and I must say he made a fair statement. There were not any sureties for the contract, because it is not the custom of the Department to require any, for the reason that we withhold the sum of 5 per cent., which, in this case, amounted to $196.50, as security for the completion of the contract.

Mr. McINTYRE. Do I understand from the Minister that the work will be proceeded with in the spring.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister in what manner the vote for Victoria Breakwater last year was expended. Was a contract let, or was the work done by day's work? Has the whole amount been spent? And can he tell me in what position that breakwater stands now? Is it his intention to let any contract for the completion of it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Supplementary Estimates, I think, will contain the vote for that work. Wood Island is in the same position. The amount of money was too small, therefore we did not proceed with the work.

Mr. DAVIES. Would the hon. gentleman tell me whether that work was done by contract or by day's work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think by days' work. So far as I can recollect, $2,000 was expended.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman intend to take any vote to complete the breakwater?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think a small vote will appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman, of course, understands that a very large amount of money has already been expended, which will be absolutely useless unless the work is completed.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, NEW BRUNSWICK.

113	St. John Harbour—Breakwater at Negro Point—To complete	$40,000 00
	River Tobique and River St. John, above Grand Falls	3,000 00
	River St. John—River des Chutes to Bear Island	2,000 00
	Madawaska River	1,000 00
	Anderson's Hollow—Addition to Pier	2,000 00
	Mispec Breakwater	3,000 00
	Hopewell Cape—Ballast Wharf, &c.—To complete	4,000 00
	Buctouche	1,000 00
	For extended Railway wharf accommodation at Carleton, St. John, N.B	10,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to the breakwater at Negro Point, it will be remembered that about one-third of the work was destroyed by gales in 1879. We expended, in 1882, $55,000; in 1883, $30,000; in 1884, $31,000. We now ask for a revote of $40,000, which is required to carry on the work during the next fiscal year. I understand the work is being restored, with good prospect of it being a permanent one, and much stronger than it was in the first instance, experience having taught us what is required to resist storms there. With respect to Mispec breakwater, $3,000 is asked. This is for the construction of a breakwater 200 feet long by 25 feet wide. The probable cost will be $10,000. The amount of $4,000 is asked for a ballast wharf at Hopewell Cape. This vote is required to construct a further length of 200 feet by 20 feet. As regards the item for Buctouche, the $1,000 is a revote to complete the work, the total cost of which will be $4,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where is this wharf accommodation—at Carleton, St. John, N.B.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been no expenditure there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why then ask a vote? It is on the wrong side of the harbour altogether. There is no railway there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly there is; it runs down to Carleton on the wharf.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not a Government road, and why build a wharf for it? What company is it?

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). This is the Carleton Branch, I presume; part belongs to the county and part to the city. It is an extension of the New Brunswick Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It does not belong to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All the railway wharves and harbour accommodation belong to the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The Government does not own an inch of the harbour of St. John. I should think that this vote ought to be taken out now, and put in again four years hence, when it will be required afresh.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I expected that the Minister of Finance would be here to explain this vote, as I have not the information; therefore, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the vote to pass, and take the explanation on Concurrence.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think that the vote should go on at all, as there must be some mistake. I do not wish to delay the Committee, but I think that vote should be struck out.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am certain there is no mistake, as the vote was taken last year, and repeated this, after consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But really there is no explanation possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman should not allow himself to prejudge the case. There may be a very good explanation, as I have no doubt there is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that when he was Minister of Public Works he constantly aided railways which were not Government railways. He gave them infinitely greater facilities than this small amount to a railway company to extend their wharf accommodation. As the hon. gentleman set the example over and over again, of giving public money for the assistance of railways, I do not think that he should say that this is starting a new principle, or that it is not a right and proper expenditure. I take it for granted that this railway company required assistance, and instead of giving it, as the hon. gentleman did, to place rails on the road, it is given to assist in extending their wharf accommodation. This is a perfectly right and proper thing, and is entirely in conformity with the policy which the hon. gentleman himself pursued, and for which he asked and obtained the support of this House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I never aided any railway by vote. The giving of rails to existing branches was a different thing, and I took a vote of the House for it, but this is for an extension of a wharf. It is assumed by the vote that it is a Government work, whereas the Government have no railway on that side of the harbour at all. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is so much in love with the company that he should build a wharf for them without telling them that he intended to do it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This vote is for the purpose of encouraging and probably purchasing from that company the property they have there, and to give facilities for a winter port. It is part of the arrangement in connection with the western railways on that side of the harbour.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then it should be worded differently, and called wharves and wharf accommodation. This looks as if the Government owned the wharf already.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Carleton Branch Railway Company own the wharf, which is 1,600 feet in length, and capable of extension, so as to make it the finest wharf accommodation in America. It is required for the purpose of affording facilities for loading and unloading freight.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the Government buy the land?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is proposed to buy the land and afford accommodation there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What accommodation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For the railways coming there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Which railways?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Those coming through from Montreal. One is by crossing the bridge on the eastern side and this is on the western side.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is the Grand Southern and the Canada New Brunswick, which is to have the wharf presented to them?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the arrangements are made which are contemplated, to have a through line from Montreal to St. John, then the New Brunswick Railway Company have leased the road from the boundary of Maine to St. John, including the Carleton Branch, and the Carleton Branch Railway owns this railway and the 1,600 feet frontage on the western side of the harbour; and this is for the purpose of affording facilities there for the discharge of cargoes and for the erection of elevators or anything else that may be necessary for the handling of freight.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When was this project gone into?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Last year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was Parliament asked last year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government were asked to afford the facilities, and the Government complied with the request.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They do not appear to have spent any money.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; because a satisfactory arrangement could not be made, and therefore it is asked to allow the matter to stand over until next year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Government have no Bill before Parliament authorizing them to engage in such a work.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will find, before the House rises, that there will be Bills before the House which will enlighten him on this subject.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps there will. I know that when I pointed out similar acts in the past, Bills have been introduced, and perhaps this will be done again. But there has been no sanction of Parliament given to this connection. The hon. gentleman is not able to tell which of the railroads is to obtain this money, or if it is to be paid to them and on what terms. I am very sorry the whole Government are not able to give us some explanation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much money will be wanted?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is just possible, if the business which is hoped for is obtained, that an additional sum may be required, but this is all at present.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the Minister of Public Works bring down any correspondence or Order in Council in respect to this? Of course I cannot move for them at this period of the Session.

Mr. GILLMOR. Will the Grand Southern Railway have a right to use that wharf, in the event of the Government purchasing it?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Of course, the Government will be very glad to afford facilities to all lines to connect with it.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC.

	New Carlisle—Municipality having voted $1,000	$ 4,000 00
	Trois Pistoles—To complete	750 00
	Rivière du Loup (*en bas*)—To complete	14,000 00
	River Saguenay—Improvement of channel below Chicoutimi—To complete	4,500 00
	Baie St. Paul—Local authorities furnishing $3,000—To complete	5,000 00
	River St. Lawrence—Removal of chains, anchors, boulders, &c	5,000 00
	River Nicolet—Harbour of Refuge	9,000 00
	River Yamaska	15,000 00
	St. Zotique—To complete	1,250 00
	River du Lièvre	6,000 00
	Etang du Nord—To continue work	6,000 00
	St. François, Island of Orleans	4,000 00
115	Quebec—Marine Hospital Wharves—To complete	1,500 00
	Berthier (*en bas*)	4,500 00
	River St. Louis	5,000 00
	Lanoraie—The locality furnishing $1,500	4,000 00
	Percé	5,000 00

Queen's Wharf, Quebec—Improvement to Wharf and Building	4,000 00
Bic Pier	2 500 00
St. Jean d'Orleans—To protect Lighthouse	3,000 00
Port Daniel	6,000 00
Point aux Orignaux (Rivière Ouelle)—To complete	1,500 00
Barachois de Malbaie, and mouth of Newport River—For removal of obstructions	1,000 00
Ile aux Grues	5,000 00
General Repairs and Improvements—Harbours and Rivers, Quebec	10,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The New Carlisle vote is for a long pier. We shall probably require $8,000 or $9,000 more. The vote of $750 for Trois Pistoles is a mistake; it should be $1,750, so that in the Supplementary Estimates we shall have to ask for $1,000 additional. The vote for Rivière du Loup is for the purpose of building a cross wharf at the end of the pier, to afford additional protection. At times the wind is so strong at the end of the wharf that vessels cannot remain there. This will give them shelter inside.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the depth of water?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sixteen feet. But there is more than that at the lower end of the pier.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would not be sufficient for ocean steamers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the ocean steamers do not go there. We have been three years at the work of improving the channel of the Saguenay below Chicoutimi, and it will probably require as much more as we are asking this year to complete it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you do with the chains and anchors which are removed from the St. Lawrence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are sold, and the proceeds are put in the public Treasury. This year the work of removing the chains and anchors will be done in the channel of the harbour of Quebec. There are still nests of chains and anchors there. The vote for the harbour of refuge on the river Nicolet does not complete the work. The work has proceeded rather slowly, and we encouraged rather than discouraged the slowness of the work, because we found that instead of making a long pier, we could, by bridging, avoid that, at the depth of water required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth of water does the hon. gentleman get in the harbour?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say exactly the depth, but it must be considerable, as it begins at the mouth of the River St. Lawrence. River Yamaska, there should be in the first column a revote of $10,000; it is a misprint. St. Zotique is a revote also, and placed in the wrong column by a misprint. Etang du Nord, $6,000, is printed as a revote, but there should be no revote. St. François, Island of Orleans—that is a revote. Quebec Marine Hospital Wharves, $1,500, to complete the wharves commenced two years ago. Berthier, $4,500, to complete the pier at this place, in accordance with the Estimates; there is a contract for this, and this is to complete it. Rivière St. Louis, $5,000; this is the end of that work. Lanoraie, $4,000, that is a revote; the contract was given the other day. Percé, $5,000, is a revote; we did not proceed with that work because we wanted to have the wood contracted for during the winter. We would not be justified in undertaking a breakwater there, as it will be an expensive and very costly work, and we thought it could be postponed. Queen's Wharf, Quebec—we will require to expend $8,000 during the year on that Government wharf. St. Jean d'Orleans, $3,000, which will complete it. Port Daniel, $6,000, not expended last year; the localities furnish the timber, and the work will be proceeded with during the year.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the sum of $2,000 placed last year in the Estimates for the removal of bars at Portage du Fort and Bristol. The bar at Portage du Fort was removed but not that at Bristol; no dredging has been done at the latter place at all. Has the amount of $2,000 been expended in removing the bar at Portage du Fort, and will an amount be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the removal of the bar at Bristol?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have expended a portion of the money, and there will be something to cheer the hon. gentleman in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There will be an amazing lot of cheerfulness in the Supplementary Estimates, from the statements made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Barachois de Malbaie and mouth of Newport River, $1,000, for removal of obstructions; that is a revote. Ile aux Grues, $5,000; there is a contract there; this will not complete it, we will require probably $1,500 more.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, ONTARIO.

116	Cobourg Harbour, Lake Ontario	$14,000 00
	Port Hope Harbour, L O	7,500 00
	Toronto Harbour, L.O.—To complete	65,000 00
	Rondeau Harbour, Lake Erie	4,000 00
	Port Elgin, L.H.—To complete	5,000 00
	Collingwood Harbour, L.H	19,000 00
	Kingston Harbour	7,000 00
	Little Current, L.H.—To complete	10,000 00
	Kingsville, Lake Erie	20,000 00
	Morpeth, Lake Erie—The locality to provide $4,000	12,000 00
	L'Orignal—Repairs to wharf, the local authorities furnishing $1,000—To complete	2,000 00
	Southampton, Lake Huron	7,500 00
	Midland Harbour	10,000 00
	General repairs and improvements, Harbours and Rivers, Ontario	8,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Cobourg Harbour, Lake Ontario. This is a revote of $10,000 and an additional vote of $4,000. This work has been delayed by the failure of the previous contractor. Tenders were called for, and the new contractor is Mr. J. W. Dinwoodie, for $42,750. About $9,000 will be required next year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will that complete it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid not, as there will be some work required on the east pier. Up to 1878, $73,000 were expended, and since that $31,000 more have been expended, making a total of $104,000. With these $4,000 and the $9,000 additional required, we will have a total of $117,000, which is, as far as I am informed, the amount required. Port Hope Harbour, $7,500 is a revote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has there been any dredging or extension of the piers there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is dredging, and there is some pier work being constructed. This will be—for pier work $3,000, dredging about $3,500, and about $1,000 for the engineer and for the superintendence. The $65,000 for Toronto Harbour is to complete the work. The works undertaken at Toronto have been most successful. The hon. gentleman will remember that we employed Capt. Eads, a very eminent engineer in the United States, in connection with the Mississippi and so on, and we paid him, I think, $5,000. At the time it was considered a large fee, but I must say that his report, with the modifications that were required afterwards, was not a dear report even at that amount, and the work is a most successful one. Small piers have been built out from the island towards the lake, and thus new land has been formed there, and the island is increasing instead of being washed away as before. The whole work is very perfect, and, when completed, I think

it will be a credit to this House, which has given us the money, as well as to the Government, and a great benefit to Toronto. This is to complete the work. Of course, there are other works in the interior of the harbour, which are more of a local nature.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the two channels left?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; two channels have been left open. Capt. Eads thought that the new channel should have been closed, but experience in Toronto of mariners and others, as well as the desire of the Chief Engineer of my Department, not to close that, has had for its result that the western channel remains as it is and the new channel is there still, and it is found that it does not work detrimentally to the harbour. Of course, if it were found not to succeed, it would be very easy to close it entirely and complete the work that Capt. Eads thought should be undertaken there, but it was thought better that the channel should be left open.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Has anything been done in the west channel?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think there has been some dredging done there and it is still going on.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The year before, the dredging was made in the wrong place there. I would like to know how it is continued.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know about that. They have found the right place now, and are going on with it.

Mr. MILLS. Where is this sum of $1,000 for Rondeau Harbour being expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for the entrance to the harbour, the pier work that is damaged, for repairing the piers at the entrance to the harbour and the beach to the west of the lighthouse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know whether steps are taken to protect the timber in the neighbourhood of the Rondeau—the growing timber that exists or did exist on a portion of the land which forms the harbour?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not aware. There has been no complaint made to my Department about this.

Mr. MILLS. The point to which the hon. gentleman refers is owned by the Local Government—I think some 4,000 acres. I know on some old maps the extreme point is marked as a military reserve, but there is no timber growing on that; it is simply a sand bar which extends some distance east of the harbour, and there never has been timber growing there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask if the hon. gentleman's attention has been called to the condition of the works constructed at Bayfield Harbour. I think I moved or asked a question on the subject in the early part of the Session, and he intimated to me then that he would make enquiry about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; I have enquired and I think I have made a report to Council on the subject—a report which is now there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state whether the damage which was done by recent storms will be repaired this season? It ought to be if the work is to be preserved at all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think what I communicated to Council covers the whole ground. I cannot say whether this is to come up in the Estimates or not. But I will take a note of it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There has been a considerable sum of public money spent there, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not overlook it. Considerable damage was done there last fall, and it may require some money—not a very large sum—to repair the injury which has been done. There is another harbour in which I know the hon. gentleman takes a lively interest—the harbour west of Goderich, Port Albert. I drew his attention to it last year, and I think he gave a sort of promise that he would be disposed to deal with it this year. I believe representations have been made to the Department of the hon. gentleman that some work requires to be done there. I hope that, while dealing with other harbours on the lakes, he will not overlook that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have a faint recollection that Port Albert came under my notice recently, and I suppose we will hear a little more about that before the end of the Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is being done at Collingwood?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of this amount of $19,000, $14,000 will go to the completion of the breakwater, and $5,000 for dredging in the inner harbour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth of water does that give?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sixteen feet. The amount of $7,000 for Kingston Harbour is for the continuation of the work of deepening it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Removing the shoal, I suppose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The amount of $10,000 for Little Current will complete the work, I understand. The works undertaken and performed there, I am informed by my Chief Engineer, are very successful. The amount of $20,000 for Kingsville is a revote. That is in South Essex. The work is proceeding there under contract.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman promised to give me some particulars as to the harbour of Morpeth; who is the contractor, and the probable total amount that would be spent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract price was $17,400 for the excavation of rocks and dredging for foundation for a pier. The pier will be 500 feet in length and 10 feet in depth, but the shore end will be 25 feet in width. The whole cost will be about $25,000.

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. gentleman has arranged to have this pier so constructed as to be capable of extension at any future day, because all that could be done with $20,000 would not provide a really good harbour. It is a step in the right direction, but I hope it will be so let as to be capable of extension hereafter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We wish to make this a complete work by itself; but the plan may always be extended. We will be in a better position to judge of the wants of that locality when this is completed.

Mr. CASEY. It is an important and growing little place, and I think in the near future it will require a much more extensive harbour. It should not be built on a contracted plan.

Mr. MILLS. In reference to Rondeau Point, I would like to call the Minister's attention to some circumstances connected with it. It extends out westward a long distance in the lake, so that while there is considerable shelter afforded on the east side of Rondeau Point for vessels, if the wind shifts to the east they are frequently driven on the shore. It was supposed when this wharf was built out a certain distance that by turning it to the westward it would protect

that portion of the water against east storms, which was already sufficiently protected by the Rondeau Point against west storms. But, if the hon. gentleman extends it out only 500 feet it will not afford protection to vessels drawing a very great depth of water. It would require to be extended 200 feet further, and therefore it is very desirable that the hon. gentleman should leave it in a condition that it could be continued at some future time, and also be turned to the westward so as to afford complete protection to vessels seeking shelter there. I observe that the hon. gentleman has not taken any further vote for the improvements in the River Sydenham. I would like to ask him whether the vote of last year for dredging in the north branch of the Sydenham has all been expended, and whether the amount taken was sufficient to remove obstructions to navigation up as far as Wilkesport, the head of navigation on that river. I would like to call his attention to a matter about which I spoke to him privately a little while ago, with reference to building a wall for the protection of the road along the west side of the township of Sombra. I had a communication from the municipality a few days ago, in which I was informed that the Government had promised to build a stone wall, with a view of protecting the road against the encroachment of the river, upon condition that the Municipal Council would fill in the vacancies where the water has already made considerable encroachment on the road. I have in my hand a copy on the Resolution passed by the Council which, I think, the hon. gentleman told me he had received; and I would like to ask him at this point, seeing that there is no appropriation in these Estimates, whether there is to be an appropriation and whether the Government is considering this subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As for the River Sydenham I cannot say exactly whether the whole amount has been expended, but if it has not, it will be expended before the 1st of July.

Mr. MILLS. Is the appropriation, $5,000, sufficient to remove all the obstructions up to Wilkesport?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say just now, but when we come to Concurrence I will take an opportunity of answering the different questions on those votes that are not asked for this year, in addition to the explanation that I can give him now. As regards Sombra, I directed this work to be noted in the Supplementary Estimates to be laid before my colleagues.

Mr. CASEY. I desire to ascertain who were the other tenderers. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state whether Mr. Askwith, who obtained the contract, was the lowest tenderer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt he was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. WILSON. Representations have been made to the Minister with respect to works at Port Stanley and Port Burwell. I see no amount in the Estimates for these ports. When the railway company obtained charge of Port Stanley, in 1880, an agreement was entered into between the Government and the company, by which the company were to make an annual return of the dues collected. I find no such return has been made. I desire to ask the Minister whether we may hope that an amount will be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for works at those two ports.

Mr. CASEY. Great interest is felt in Port Stanley, as is evidenced by representations made to the Minister. That part of the Lake Erie shore is much exposed to certain winds, and disasters are of frequent occurrence. A strong case has been made out in favour of doing something at Port Stanley. A strong case has also been made out for Port Burwell.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The respresentations made to me in respect to those two harbours have been made quite recently, and therefore it is quite impossible that amounts should appear in the Estimates. These representations, after they have been investigated, will be laid before Council, and Council will decide whether a vote shall be placed in the Supplementary Estimates or not.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to the return to be made by the railway company, the hon. gentleman will remember that the harbour was given in trust to the Port Stanley Railway and transferred to the Great Western and subsequently to the Grand Trunk. One of the conditions was, that all tolls collected should be expended on repairs; and although the railway company has been of late years pretty liberal on the question of repairs, it would be more satisfactory to have a proper statement brought down yearly. The harbour is in a very bad condition. Large accumulations of mud are brought down by the stream and deposited where the vessels usually lie. Great inconvenience thus arises every year, because vessels are almost unable to swing round in the stream. If the Minister will consult his engineers, he will find they have reported to that effect.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to Midland Harbour, nothing has been done there, because the railway company and the Government are to do their respective shares of the work, and we are now in communication with the company in regard to the work.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire to enquire whether the amount appropriated last year, $3,000, for the removal of boulders, &c., at the Narrows, above Pembroke, has been expended. Is it the intention of the Government to continue dredging?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand the amount was expended. I think an amout has been placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the object referred to.

Mr. ALLISON (Lennox). Will the hon. gentleman state whether an amount will be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of dredging Napanee River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is being looked into; the Government are not forgetting that river.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the Minister will furnish me with a detailed statement which he promised with regard to the River Thames.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have a statement from the Chief Engineer to the following effect: The survey made last summer commenced at Middlemiss, about fifty-five miles by the river, and thirty-five miles by rail, below London, and traversed the most favourable line of country to Fort Talbot on Lake Erie, a distance of twelve miles. The fall between these points is fifty-seven feet, being at the rate of four and a-half feet per mile, the gradient of a cutting over the whole distance. The average depth of cut would be 68¾ feet; the greatest depth 169 feet. Total quantity of excavation 22,500,000 cubic yards, requiring at least 600 acres of land. The construction of a bridge 140 feet in height to carry the Canada Southern Railway, and 13 highway bridges of from 50 to 100 feet in height, and as farms would be severed, the owners might demand large amounts for damages or the construction of bridges. The object in the minds of the promoters is to provide means for carrying off surplus water from the River Thames during the period of high water, freshets, &c., and within the limits of a reasonable expenditure the scheme may be classed as impracticable.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does this item of new dredging plant cover the expense in connection with the new dredges which are to be constructed in the United States?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; it covers a portion of it.

Mr. CAMERON. Is there no establishment in Canada where they could be constructed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; we could not have them constructed in Canada. I am glad to say, however, that I have lately been informed that a large establishment in Kingston is now trying to procure the necessary models to perform work of this kind, and that in future we will most likely be able to have this work done in Canada.

Mr. CAMERON. I am told that they construct these dredges at Port Dalhousie, and I think the hon. gentleman had that in his mind last year, for according to the report of his remarks in *Hansard*, he intimated that they would be constructed in Canada.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; we tried and failed.

Mr. CAMERON. My information is that there are two places in Canada where they can be constructed. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman whether or not tenders were called for, or whether the contract was given to the Lockport firm without any tenders being called for.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The information I have on that point from the Chief Engineer of the Department is to the effect that these dredges are not constructed in Canada.

Mr. COCKBURN. I believe several dredges were got up in this country for the Ontario Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They may be smaller dredges. These are very powerful dredges, and if the hon. gentleman will enquire again, I think he will find that they cannot be built here.

Mr. COCKBURN. We can build as powerful dredges here as are built in any other country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The statement of the Chief Engineer is as follows :—

"The manufacture of dredging machinery as a specialty is not carried on in Canada, and the machinery required for the new dredges is being constructed by the Pound Manufacturing Company, of Lockport, N.Y., which, for many years, has been engaged entirely in the construction of dredging plant and excavating appliances.

"Canadian contractors, as a rule, have had their machinery constructed at Lockport.

"Last year, Larkin, Conolly & Co., of St. Catharines, contractors for the harbour works at Quebec, had their new dredge constructed in Chicago, and this winter are building a second—even obtaining the iron to be used in the machinery truss work from the United States.

"With respect to the hulls, plans and specifications were submitted in December last to Messrs. Cantin, Montreal, who declined; R. Davis, Kingston, who would construct only two scows for $5,400; W. Power, Kingston, no reply; Calvin & Son, Kingston, declined; S. Mickhena, St. Catharines, declined; Muir & Bros., St. Catharines, declined; Morgan & Sutton, Lockport, N.Y., two scows, $3,950; dredge hull, $7,500; tug hull, $5,500. The tender of this firm was accepted for dredge for Ontario, and it may be stated here that this firm make a specialty of the construction of dredge hulls and tugs, and therefore keep in stock the quality and dimensions of timber required in their construction.

"With respect to their offer for the construction of two scows for $3,950, the following statement of tenders received nine months previously for the construction of two scows for Quebec dredging plant, is given, for the sake of comparison :

F. Lachance, Quebec, two scows		$7,800 00
A. Miller, Hull	do	4,690 00
J. Samson, Quebec	do	5,850 00
A. Cantin, Montreal	do	4,746 00
W. Power, Kingston	do	5,120 00

"These scows were not constructed, price being deemed too high.

"Owing to the peculiar construction of a dredge hull, timber of certain sizes and lengths and quality are required.

"The following firms were asked to supply the oak and pine required for a construction of a new hull for the *Queen*, and all stated they could not furnish what was required :—Perley & Pattee, Mason & Co., Ottawa; E. B. Eddy, Hull; McLaren & Co., Captain Young, Bronson & Weston, Baldwin & Bros., Ottawa; Caldwell & Bros., McLaren & Co., Carleton Place; McLaughlin & Bros., Arnprior; Anglin & Bros., Collier's Bay Lumber Co., Davis & Co., Calvin & Son, Kingston; Rathbun & Co., Desoronto; S. Mickhens, St. Catharines; Muir & Bros., Port Dalhousie.

"With reference to the Manitoba dredge, it may be stated that though the North-West Transportation Company had offered the timber they had on hand for the construction of a barge, which by the way came from the State of Minnesota, for the construction of a dredge hull at Winnipeg, it was found not to be at all suitable, either as regards size or character of wood, and the dredge hull was therefore obtained from Morgan & Sutton, who have constructed it in the same manner that they have constructed a very large number for the Panama Canal, and it is now on its way to Winnipeg, where it will be erected and ready for service on or before 15th April next.

"In no other way could this dredging plant have been obtained so cheaply."

TELEGRAPH LINES.

123	Lower Rivers and Gulf of St. Lawrence and Maritime Provinces :—	
	Extension of land line on north shore of St. Lawrence, from River Pentecost towards Mingan	$12,000 00
	Telegraph line, Chatham to Escuminac—To complete	2,000 00
	Telegraph Lines, Manitoba and the North-West Territories	14,000 00
	Telegraph Line, Battleford to Edmonton	8,000 00
	Extension from Edmonton to Saskatchewan, the poles being furnished to the Government free of cost	1,350 00
	Extension from Edmonton to St. Albert, the poles being furnished to the Government free of cost	675 00
	Telegraph lines, British Columbia :—	
	Land line between Australian Ranche and Barkerville	1,500 00
	Land line between Victoria and Nanaimo	2,250 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first vote is to continue the extension of the short line towards Mingan for a distance of about seventy or seventy-five miles. The whole distance is 155 miles, which, at $150 per mile, will cost $23,250. The vote for the line from Battleford to Edmonton is required to put the line in order. The posts are all rotten, and the wire is in a very bad condition. Edmonton to Saskatchewan, $1,350; this is an extension towards the North-West. The same from Edmonton to St. Albert, $675, the poles being furnished to the Government free of cost. Telegraph lines British Columbia, land line between Australian Ranche and Barkerville, $1,500; the lines require to be put in order and the poles are all rotten. Land line between Victoria and Nanaimo, the same for this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the arrangements that require us to construct this line?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under the Union Act with British Columbia, we are required to keep up these lines. The revenue is steadily increasing and we have reduced the estimates to a minimum.

MISCELLANEOUS.

124	Miscellaneous Works, not otherwise provided for.	$10,000 00
	Surveys and Inspections	25,000 00
	Arbitrations and Awards	5,000 00
	To provide for the cost of a Monument to the memory of the late Sir George Etienne Cartier, Bart	2,000 00
	National Art Gallery	1,500 00
	Monument to Joseph Brant	5,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Miscellaneous Works not otherwise provided for, $10,000, ordinary vote; the same for the next item; Arbitration and Awards, also ordinary vote. Monument to the memory of the late Sir George E. Cartier, $2,000; this monument we expect will be completed for the 1st of July and inaugurated then; it will be erected on this square. The statue is to be in bronze and the pedestal in granite. National Art Gallery, $1,500, the same as last year. Monument to Joseph Brant, $5,000; this is a revote. I sent on behalf of the Government the Chief Architect of my Department to Brantford, to look at the models, and the parties there representing the Government and the parties representing the local authorities came to an understanding that three of the models should be selected

and then submitted to the local authorities as well as to the Government. Of these three, one is from Paris; the second is from London, by Mr. Perry Woods, son of the late Marshall Woods, who was one of his aides for a long time; and the third is Mr. Hebert, of Montreal, who is the fortunate tenderer for a monument to Sir George Cartier. These models will be most likely exhibited to the Council, and we will have to select the best.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

142 Maintenance and repairs of Government steamers $140,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. The steamer *Newfield* requires a new boiler, and during the portion of the year the Government will engage another steamer.

Mr. DAVIES. Is any portion of that amount to be appropriated for the *Northern Light?* Last spring she was ordered by the Government Inspector to go upon the slip of Pictou for repairs, and she went there, but she was ordered back again by the Department, and the agent reprimanded for allowing her to go. The Government Inspectors have not given her a certificate yet, and the hon. Minister knows she is engaged in a most dangerous and arduous work.

Mr. McLELAN. The *Northern Light* was put upon the slip and repaired in the spring, under the directions of one of the inspectors, Capt. McElhinney, and was then taken to Charlottetown, where she remained during the summer. Another inspector, not knowing that she had been put upon the slip in the spring, and had been seen by the Government Inspector, directed Mr. Lord to send her to be placed again on the slip. This sum asked now will be sufficient to cover any repairs necessary to be made on the *Northern Light* and also on the steamer *Newfield;* there has always been a large amount expended on the *Northern Light.*

Mr. DAVIES. The papers brought down show that no inspection was made of that steamer. I was not aware Capt. McElhinney was a Government Inspector. The Inspector of Hulls for the Maritime Provinces is, I think, Mr. Pope, the only one appointed under the Inspection Act.

Mr. McLELAN. Capt. McElhinney is Inspector General of the Dominion, in the employ of the Department, and is sent wherever necessity calls him. He is an inspector under the Act, without any particular location.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. Minister will remember that the agent reported that the steamboat had a very serious strain near the sternpost, and that he could not repair it in Charlottetown. It would be necessary for it to go on the slip. If I had known that these Estimates were coming up to-night, I would have had the papers here. The agent thought that, when the vessel was in motion, they could keep the water down very well, but that when she was lying by the side of the wharf with the usual amount of freight on board, she took in a great deal of water. I was very much surprised at the statement, and I did not understand from the papers that that defect had been properly remedied, and if she is running now with that defect, it is very serious.

Mr. McLELAN. That defect is not from a strain at the sternpost. He supposes that some bolt hole has been unstopped.

Mr. DAVIES. But it could not be remedied without going on the slip?

Mr. McLELAN. No, it could not be found; but it was from some small hole left. It is a very common thing in the launching of ships that some bolt hole is left unfilled. They know the amount of the leakage and it is not at all serious.

Mr. DAVIES. The amount of leakage was pretty serious.

Mr. McLELAN. I think not very serious.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. Minister will remember that the agent could only give a supposition as to what was the cause of that leakage. Whether it was that the sternpost was started, or that a bolt had come out, or whatever the cause was he could not tell, and he supposed it might be the absence of a bolt or something of that kind. I would like to know whether it is the intention—pardon my being so persistent in this matter, because I have to cross in that boat in a few days, and take my life in my hands, and I want to know if it is safe—to put the boat on the slip early this spring and to have her thoroughly examined.

Mr. McLELAN. Certainly; she is to go on the slip and undergo very extensive repairs—more extensive, I think, than in any season yet, judging from her condition now. It will require very serious and heavy work to get the track broken open this spring, and the vessel will be put on the slip at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Has part of this increased amount for maintenance and repairs of Government steamers been caused by an amount of expenditure upon the steamer *Sir James Douglas?* Is part of that $15,000 required to cover an expenditure not originally contemplated by the Department, the return for which I have called for?

Mr. McLELAN. No; that is the expenditure ending 30th June, 1884.

143 For the providing of a steamer to replace the *Glendon* $35,000 00

Mr. WELDON. Is that amount calculated to furnish the steamer?

Mr. McLELAN. The boilers and machinery are already provided and paid for, and some materials were saved from the wreck of the other vessel. This sum will be sufficient to equip her.

Mr. WELDON. What materials were saved? I should not think there could be much, from the place where she was wrecked.

Mr. McLELAN. It is reported by the officers that from $3,000 to $5,000 worth has been saved.

Mr. WELDON. From the wreck?

Mr. McLELAN. From the wreck; and the hon. gentleman will bear in mind that the machinery and boilers were not placed on board the other vessel.

Mr. WELDON. I have not the returns here, but, if my memory serves me right, the return brought down shows an expenditure of nearly $40,000 on the vessel. I think Mr. Brown was paid nearly $39,000.

Mr. McLELAN. No; the return included the boilers and the machinery, which brought it up to about $45,000 altogether.

Mr. WELDON. I speak subject to correction, but I fancy not. The tender for the hull was $29,900. I think there were some items for machinery, but I think the expenditure on this side was nearly $40,000.

Mr. McLELAN. No; the hon. gentleman will find that $29,000 about covers the expenditure on the hull and the equipment of the hull, exclusive of the machinery and boilers.

Mr. WELDON. The tender was only $29,000, and surely that vessel was not completely finished, hull and spars, or she was different from any vessel that is launched, and the amount of the tender was paid up to $900.

Mr. McLELAN. The inspector reported that she was completed according to the specification, which was very full, in hull, and spars, and rigging and sails. The inspector's report was that she was all finished, with the exception of about $300 of expenditure.

Mr. WELDON. Who is the inspector who reported?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Coker, I think.

Mr. WELDON. I do not recollect seeing any return from Mr. Coker brought down.

Mr. McLELAN. If it has not been brought down, if the different reports from the inspectors at different stages have not been brought down, I will see that they are brought down.

Mr. WELDON. I moved for the payments to Mr. O'Brien and the certificates on which they were paid. I do not think that has been brought down.

Mr. McLELAN. I will see that it is brought down. That is the condition of the matter. The inspector reports that the vessel was completed, except about $300; the contract was for $29,000, and $29,000 was paid. The expenditure on the machinery and boilers makes it up to about $45,000.

Mr. WELDON. I observe that in the tenders and specifications, and in the contract, there was no place mentioned for the delivery of the vessel. I have understood from persons who tendered that they were under the impression that they had to deliver her in Halifax. It made a serious difference in the tenders, as anyone can see by looking at them. They range from $64,000 down to $29,000—I exclude Clarke's tender, which was $25,000. Some of the tenderers were men whom I know to be perfectly qualified as to the building of a vessel, but the amount was small and a man could hardly build a vessel for that amount, and some were under the impression that they were bound to deliver the vessel in Halifax.

Mr. McLELAN. I think not—the wharf at St. John. You refer to the first contract?

Mr. WELDON. Yes.

Mr. McLELAN. That was at St. John.

Mr. WELDON. That made a vast difference, because it was a comparatively easy task to bring the vessel down to St. John, and a safe one; but it was very different to take her to Halifax at that season of the year, and if the contractor had to insure her, he would have had to pay an enormous premium. It seems to me it was a very great risk going around to Halifax, and it was a most extraordinary proceeding, when the tug *Hercules* went for the boat that she was not towed to St. John and put in order. The Minister stated before that he was guided by Captain Guildford and Mr. Brown. I do not think either of them was acquainted with the Bay of Fundy, not as well as the hon. gentleman himself, because Captain Guildford was employed between Halifax and St. Pierre Miquelon; Brown was an officer in the Navy, and neither of them had the slightest experience, nor, may I say, had there ever been a Bay of Fundy pilot on board the *Newfield*.

Mr. DAVIES. What is to be the intended draft of the vessel that is going to assist the *Northern Light* in keeping communication open to the Island?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot give the draft at present; she will have much less draft than the *Northern Light*.

Mr. McLELAN.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings, P.E.I.) With regard to this vessel that is to replace the *Princess Louise* that is lost, I understand she is to be much less draft than the *Northern Light*. I think it will be a mistake for the Government to build a vessel of much less draft than the *Northern Light* for ice purposes, because the screw will be so near the surface as to render the vessel unfit for forcing her way through the ice. The great merit of the *Northern Light* consists in her great draft enabling her to carry the screw so far below the surface that it does not come into contact with the ice. I am glad the Minister is going to put the *Northern Light* in a good state of repair for the coming season; and I hope they will give her a thorough good overhauling and make her as strong as she was at first, perhaps—at least make her fit for the service that she has been fairly well carrying out until the present time. In connection with that point, I may suggest to the hon. Minister that he should take some steps with respect to assisting the crossing at the Capes by providing a strong tug to be placed there during the winter to enable the crossing to be done more satisfactorily and regularly. I have had a little experience of that sort of thing myself this winter in coming here to Parliament, when I was detained eight days waiting for a crossing, and if there had been a steam tug it could have made the connection with the mainland almost every day. The trouble is the open water that intervenes between the ice and the board, and a small boat cannot make the connection between the board and the running ice. If a small tug was placed there, it is my opinion it would very materially assist communication at those points. It would not cost the Government very much to put on an ice boat as an experiment for one season, and if they found the idea a good one, they could supplement her service by placing a boat on each side, which would certainly accomplish a much desired object. I trust that when the Supplementary Estimates come down, the Government may see fit to provide for getting a boat for this purpose. She can be very safely taken care of at Cape Progress, where a wharf is now being constructed, and can be worked out to the edge of the board ice as it forms, and can be safely docked at the edge of the board ice, where she can be at all times utilized and connected with the running ice in the Straits. In that way I believe there would be more good done in facilitating our winter communication than in any other way.

Mr. PAINT. I wish to correct one statement made by the hon. member for St. John in connection with Captain Guildford. I understood the hon. member to say that he had not the slightest experience of the Bay of Fundy when he was appointed to tow that vessel round. Now, Sir, we have not got a better sea captain in the Dominion.

Mr. WELDON. I said he had no experience in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. PAINT. His reputation dates back to 1860, when he was employed as pilot on the *Great Eastern*, from New York to Halifax, and he has been sailing round our shores ever since. Besides that, he was engaged to lay cables in the Bay of Fundy, and within the now last past three or four years, so he could not be a novice in that bay since that time. His reputation and character as a seaman are of the highest standing, and cannot be impeached in any sense.

Mr. WELDON. I said with regard to the Bay of Fundy, and I say so still. A man may be a good seaman enough to cross the Atlantic or to run between Halifax and southern ports, but I think he requires a good knowledge of the tides and currents of the Bay of Fundy channel, in order to navigate it safely, and an experience which only persons accustomed to navigate it at regular periods can acquire.

Mr. PAINT. That opinion does not apply in this case, inasmuch as the ship was in deep water when the steel hawser or towing cable parted.

Mr. WELDON. What is intended to be done with the new vessel? Will she be sent home to receive machinery, or will she be brought out?

Mr. McLELAN. She will be brought out.

Mr. DAVIES. The question came up last year about steam tugs on the route between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, and I understood the Minister of Railways, who then spoke on behalf of the Government, that it was their intention to consider that question, and an early answer would be given. Now that the question has been repeated by the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., (Mr. Macdonald), I would like to know whether the matter has been considered by the Government, and whether there is any probability of these steam tugs being placed on the route? Last year it was complained that the boats were too small, that we ought to have larger boats and well manned, not only for the ice but for the openings. I know the man who had charge of the service on the Island boat had a water-boat ready, and all he was waiting for was to get a promise that he would be paid. This question of the steam tugs was raised last year. It has been raised again by the hon. member for King's, and I should like to have the answer of the Government on the point.

Mr. BRECKEN. I fully concur in what my colleague has said. There are many men on the Island who advocate the trial of steam launches across the Straits. It is but right that a trial should be made. Whether it will be successful or not, it is not for me to say.

Mr. McLELAN. The matter has not yet been decided. I have had several communications and consultations with heads of the Departments of Post Office and Railways. Very much will depend on the condition of the railway conveniences and the position of the wharves on each side of the Straits. If the wharves were constructed, a tug could be placed on the service at once.

144. To provide for the examination of Masters and Mates..... $6,000 00

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). For what is the additional $1,000 required? Last year I particularly asked that the agent at Victoria should not be appointed on the Examining Board. I find, however, he was appointed. That officer and the officer in command of the steamer *Sir James Douglas* are still at loggerheads; and the consequence is, the examinations must be very nicely conducted. I ask that the first named gentleman should be removed from the Board and another gentleman appointed.

Mr. McLELAN. Steps are being taken to carry out that idea. The increase of $1,000 is to meet expenses caused by the examination for certificates for coasters on inland waters.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are all persons engaged in managing vessels carrying passengers and freight obliged to pass examinations?

Mr. McLELAN. Officers on vessels carrying passengers require to have masters' and mates' certificates; but these are not required on freight vessels, if the freight is less than 100 tons.

145. For purchase of life-boats, stations and life-preservers; maintenance of crews and rewards for saving lives..... $8,000 00

Mr. DAVIES. I understand the Minister received a petition from the inhabitants on the north side of Prince Edward Island, asking that a life-boat be purchased and stationed in that locality. Has the petition received favourable consideration or not? I understand that my colleague presented it to the Department, and he is aware as to the necessity of the prayer of the petition being granted. The north side of the Island is very much frequented by shipping, not only by small fishing schooners but by large vessels, and the bight of the Island is an awkward place to be caught in during stormy weather. There is no place where a life-boat, is more needed than in the harbour of New London. I desire, therefore, to enquire whether the petition has been received, and whether its prayer is likely to receive favourable consideration?

Mr. BRECKEN. The hon. gentleman is quite right. I had a memorial entrusted to me, asking for a life-boat to be placed at New London and another life-boat at Rustico. I presented the petition and used my influence to secure life-boats for both places. I am aware that in New London a life-boat is very necessary, and at Rustico it is equally so, and I trust the Minister will see the necessity of providing life-boats at both places. At Rustico, where the lighthouse is on the beach and stands on a frame, it has been represented that if the Department would grant a life-boat, it could be placed under the lighthouse and the service of a crew obtained gratuitously. Rustico is a bar harbour, which is very much frequented by fishing vessels. Several lives have been lost there, and in the cause of humanity the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could not expend money more profitably than in providing a life boat for that harbour. I believe a life-boat is equally necessary at New London. I do not think we have a life-boat on any part of our coast; but if there is any part of the Island which requires such appliances, it is that of Rustico, and also that of New London.

Mr. McLELAN. I think it is altogether probable that there is more than one point on the Island where a life-boat is necessary. I cannot promise to undertake all the work necessary to be done in this field. It is probable, however, that I will get at least one boat for the Island. There are very many points all over the Dominion, both on the sea-coast and inland waters, where it is necessary to place life-boats. I have had designs drawn and specifications prepared for the most approved life-boats, and these specifications are now in the hands of the officials. We will call tenders for a number of these boats and locate them at different points, with captains and crews duly selected, organized and put into practice. It is found that life-boats have heretofore been stationed at very many points; but no person practically had charge of them, and when occasions arose for their use, they were generally found unserviceable. I have adopted the plan of appointing a captain, giving him a small sum, and allowing him to select the crew; and we pay him so much for every time his crew practices, and they must practice once or twice during the season.

Mr. DAVIES. What will be the cost of the construction and equipment of a life-saving boat?

Mr. McLELAN. From $300 to $500.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask whether the Minister has taken into consideration the representations of Captain Pollock, to furnish a life-boat if a company should be formed at once to take charge of it without additional expense, and if it is intended to have a life-boat located there.

Mr McLELAN. I have considered his case, with others, but we have not decided upon the points on the lakes at which they shall be located. They will all be fully considered before the boats can be got ready.

Mr. DAWSON. The establishment of life-saving stations on the upper lakes was spoken of last year, but I suppose nothing has so far been done. It was promised that there should be life-saving apparatus provided at certain stations on these lakes, and that boats should be placed at them, for

they are undoubtedly very much needed. We have had wrecks, and there has been a great loss of life, and I think it is quite as necessary that we should have some provision of this kind for the upper lakes as well as for the sea-coast. Of course, we cannot expect it all at once, and I have no doubt the Department has been considering the matter, and that in the proper time the upper lakes will receive a fair share of attention in that regard.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman say that he expects to obtain life-boats of a suitable description for from $300 to $500?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak from memory, but it strikes me that the life-boats on the English coast cost a great deal more than that. I think they cannot obtain first-class life-boats, such as they use on the English Channel, for less than £200 or £300 sterling.

Mr. PAINT. £400 sterling.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHL. That is more than I expected, but I can hardly think that for ocean service the amount named by the Minister will suffice.

Mr. McLELAN. It is found that a much lighter boat is more serviceable than the heavy and cumbrous boats which are used in England, where there is a longer coast, and the lighter boats can be constructed, I believe, for the sum I have named, with all the latest improvements of the United States service, which is very efficient.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many life-saving stations are being maintained by the Government in all parts of the Dominion, and how many on the lakes?

Mr. McLELAN. There are only five which are paid; but there are a number of life-boats located at different points—a number on the lakes, others on the River St. Lawrence, and others on the sea-coast. I cannot remember the exact number at present.

Mr. PLATT. I am glad to notice the increased interest which is being taken in this branch of the service, and I hope the Minister will take it upon himself to conduct this branch of the service with a degree of activity which has been unknown in the past, and that the service will be conducted on a scale of efficiency such as we have not hitherto witnessed. My hon. friends are asking that life-boat stations should be established at different points on the River St. Lawrence, the lakes and the sea-coasts; but unless they prove more efficient than those which have been in operation, little good will come of them. I am not aware that any efforts have been made by the Government to educate mariners on the inland lakes, as to the points at which the boats now constructed are located. I think it is a great defect of the system that there are no means of keeping mariners thoroughly informed as to the exact location of these stations. A few weeks ago reference was made to an unfortunate wreck which took place on Lake Erie, which in all probability, had the crew of the unfortunate vessel been aware of the existence of a life-boat in the vicinity, they might have remained on the vessel until rescued instead of going down in their own yawl boat. I think that, as in other countries, the mariners upon every vessel sailing on the lakes, should have a chart or list showing the location of all these boats connected with the life-saving stations. Another point to which I would call attention is, that we know very little of where the money expended on life-saving stations has gone. I find no mention of it in the Minister's Report, and no mention of the number of the boats is given. I would like also to ask the Minister to explain to the Committee whether or not any instructions have been issued from the Department, as to the manner of controlling these stations; whether there is any signal service in this country to afford communication between the life-saving service and the wreck; whether there is any system of patrol along the coast, or of constantly keeping watch during storms; whether there is any system of enlistment, or whether the crews are expected to attend the stations during dangerous seasons of the year. So far as the life-boats in my county are concerned, there is a material defect in this respect, and although we are supposed to have a life-boat, neither captain nor crew could be found when their services were needed. Last fall a man's life was imperilled within sight of the station, and he would have lost his life but for the energetic and adventurous conduct of some fishermen on the shore, who risked their own lives by venturing out to save this man's life, at the point where the life-boat was landed. At this very time the captain of that life-boat was some six or eight miles away, and if he had been required he would have needed a life-boat better than the one we have to reach and rouse the crew on that occasion. The other life-boat in that county has not, I believe, been called upon to rescue any imperilled mariners. If it had been I believe the result would have been the same. These things occur because we have no proper system. Up to the present time, so far as I can learn, neither captain nor crew have received any remuneration for the services they were expected to perform, which fortunately they were not called on to perform. I think the hon. Minister ought to take into his earnest consideration these various defects in the system, and instead of spending money in enlarging it, he should perfect what he has. A very great difference of opinion exists as to the proper location of stations on the coasts of the county I represent. I may state here what I stated last Session, that one of these life-boats, as at present stationed, is of no possible value. I am aware that the hon. Minister took a great deal of pains to enquire as to the best locality; but my own impression is, that if he solicits the opinion of the sailors accustomed to that part of the lake, he will find very few indeed to endorse the placing of the life-boat at the village of Wellington. I have enquired of the oldest inhabitants and the mariners at that place, and I find that, during the experience of the oldest inhabitant, there has not been a single life lost within ten miles of that port by drowning from a wrecked vessel. I suppose the hon. Minister has been shown reports which state that there have been wrecks there; but these have taken place at the docks, as the place is on the open coast, and they go into the report as wrecks, although no lives have been lost Now, I have before me some information that was obtained, in reply to enquiries made by the Department of Marine, as to the best locality for the establishment of a life-saving station on the coast of Prince Edward; and I propose showing, by brief extracts from those reports, that the opinion of several of the principal mariners of that county coincides with the opinion I have expressed in favour of Salmon Point. The first is the opinion of Captain O'Hegan to Captain McElhinny, dated on the 15th of December, 1882:

"In answer to your question with reference to the establishing of life-saving stations on our Prince Edward coasts, in my opinion the most suitable places for two of them is, one at Wellers' Beach, and another at West Point, or between that and Wellington, on the beach."

This would bring the life-boats nearer to the dangerous coast I speak of—Salmon Point. On the same date, a letter was written by Captain McCullough, of the village of Wellington, in which he recommends Wellington. Then Captain Nelson Hudgins, a master mariner of twenty-five years' experience, says:

"I would be in favour of three stations—Salmon Point, Presqu'Ile and Long Point. If only two are given, one at Salmon Point and one at Long Point. * * I think that Salmon Point is the most dangerous part of the coast of Prince Edward. * * * The greatest loss of life, in my opinion, has occurred at Salmon Point."

John Abercrombie, Athol: "Have lived twenty-nine years near Salmon Point, and can testify that there has been more loss of life and

property in the vicinity of Salmon Point than all the rest of the north cost of Lake Ontario, and think it is high time that something was done by the Government to save life. A good crew could easily be had."

Peter Huff—"Lived on the Point forty-five years; think Salmon Point the best place."

Capt. Hiram Welchea, Master Mariner: "In my opinion, Salmon Point is the place to locate the first life saving station, because there has been more loss of life in that vicinity than anywhere along the coast in my recollection."

Capt. John Heniman, South Marysburgh: "I have had a good deal of experience along the coast of Prince Edward. I don't think there has been so much loss on Salmon Point since the light was placed there, but I think it one of the best places to locate a life-saving station."

Capt. Hargrave, Master Mariner, South Marysburgh: "If two stations are to be located, Salmon Point should be the first (the road runs right along the shore, so that the boat would be available for a long distance along the beach.)"

Capt. Lobb, Master Mariner, Milford: "I have had a good deal of experience on the coast for fifteen years, and in trading about the Points now in question. I believe Salmon Point would be the proper place to locate a life-saving station."

Peter Ryckman: "I believe Salmon Point to be the worst point on this coast for wrecks, and that is the most desirable place for a life-saving station."

Now, Sir, I think the Government should take into their earnest consideration the advisability of protecting this dangerous point. I know they will point at once to the report of Captain McElhinny, who does say in one part of his report that Wellington is the best place for a station; but his best argument is that a crew could easily be obtained at that place. I may say that Salmon Point can furnish as good a crew as any part of Ontario. But Captain McElhinny makes this observation in his report:

"Salmon Point must be of very sharp, rocky formation, as shown in the case of the bodies of those saved from the wrecked schooner *Folger*, being very much mutilated in coming that short distance to the shore, and a vessel must go to pieces very quickly."

He says further, referring to Captain McCullough's recommendation:

"Captain Hugh McCullough, a person of a good deal of experience, gives in a letter his opinion, and recommends very strongly Wellington Beach for a life-saving station——"

Wellington Beach is a very different place from the village of Wellington. But Captain McElhinny goes on to say:

"It being central between Huyk's Point and Salmon Point. This, considering the distance between these points by the shore, would make the life-boat of very little use to Salmon Point, as no boat can go in the trough of the sea, and would have to be wheeled the whole length of the shore round the light."

So that, after all, Captain McElhinny gives us this statement that Salmon Point, the most dangerous part of the coast, is still unprotected. I may refer to the difficulty which seems to arise at South Bay Station, or Long Point as it is called, and I would like the hon. Minister to state whether the exact location of the life-boat built for that place has yet been agreed upon. Some say it should be on the lake coast, others on the bay coast. It might as well be in one of the mill-ponds as on the bay shore, for it would be utterly useless there. There are some other matters which I would like to have had the opportunity of bringing to the attention of the House. I have asked for papers, which I trust will be brought down. I would like to know if any report has been received from the captains or crews of these boats, in various parts of the Dominion, so that we may know if they have been of any service whatever to the country. We know that many wrecks have occurred and many lives lost, and it is high time to consider the amount of money that has been expended in this service, the length of time since its inauguration and what return it has rendered. There is one other point to which I wish to refer, not to effect any particular purpose, but merely to show that the anxiety of the Government to secure a suitable location for the life-boats has existed for some length of time. It is somewhat strange that the life-boats destined for Prince Edwards did not arrive for five or six months after they were reported to this House as finished and ready for shipment; as long ago as 1882, the Government made strenous efforts to secure a proper place for the location of the life-boat, especially strenuous just before the elections. A year after that, Capt. McElhinny was sent to Prince Edward to make enquiries about the coast, but the Department had made up its mind beforehand that Salmon Point was to be the locality. I do not know the object for writing the following letter, but the date is suspicious, the 12th of June, 1882, the day before the election; and Mr. Young, to whom the letter was addressed, happened to be a former supporter of this Government, though for good and sufficient reasons he did not see fit to attach himself to the party supporting the Government. So Mr. Young was written to, the day before the election, in these words:

"DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES,
"OTTAWA, 12th June, 1882.

SIR,—The Department has had under consideration the question of establishing a life-boat station along the lake coast nearest Salmon Point. I understand that you are the owner of the land, and from your experience I presume you are able to give a reliable opinion as to the best and most convenient place to station a life-boat. I have to request, therefore, that you will inform the Department as to the best place for the station, in your opinion, and also as to the price at which you would be willing to sell, say one acre, in the event of its being determined to place a station on your land.

"I am, Sir,
"Your most obedient servant,
"WILLIAM SMITH,
"*Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.*"

The answer came after a considerable time, as follows:—

"SALMON POINT, 24th June, 1882.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your important questions, bearing date 12th June, I beg to say that the Dominion elections—it being near polling day—was the cause of my laziness in replying, as I felt great interest in trying to sustain the present Government, &c., &c."

Such was the effect produced by this letter, and I will allow hon. gentlemen to draw their own inferences.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Young voted all right.

Mr. PLATT. I think he did. If this was the first letter, there might not be so much cause for complaint; but this is not an insolated case. Another letter has come to my hand, written almost on the same day to a gentleman who had a little difference with the Government but who formerly supported them; and the letter sent to him was couched almost in the same language as that to Mr. Young, but it had not the same effect. This Mr. Young is a man of experience, who has written voluminous letters to the Department, but so far as I can learn none of his recommendations have been accepted by the Government. He expresses himself most strongly of the opinion that Salmon Point should be the location for the first and best life-boat. I shall not read the other letter which was written on this occasion, but I have it in my hand and can read it if necessary. I do not wish to make any capital out of this, but I hope the Government, in the conduct of this service in the future, will try to keep politics out of the question. On the other side of the line, our American friends keep politics out of it, and they seem to take a great deal of pride in the fact that, although at a change of Administration most of the other offices are changed, the life-saving service is kept intact. I trust this Government will copy in a great many respects, so far as the administration of our life service is concerned, the life-saving service of the United States.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman's opponents say that the Government elected him a member for this House by advertising for the Welland Canal to go by Presqu'Isle Harbour. If they wrote letters to keep him out of the House, through the life-saving station, they did more to keep him in it by the Murray Canal.

Mr. PLATT. I am not responsible for what my opponents do. However, the Government made a great mistake in the

location of the canal as well, as far as the result to the public is concerned, though they may have benefitted, indirectly the county I have the honour to represent, by causing it to change its representative.

Mr. CASEY. I want to allude to a matter in which I think no politics are concerned. I am aware that a deputation has had an interview either with the Minister or his Deputy in regard to the placing a life-boat at Port Stanley. A life-boat is not only of use at the place where located, but also for a considerable distance up and down the coast, and here the coast is dangerous and the necessity for a life-boat pressing. I understand free storage is promised to the boat in a building belonging to the Grand Trunk Railway, and a captain of long experience has undertaken to take charge of the crew, so that everything is favourable for the establishment of a life-boat at that point, at the least expense to the Government.

Mr. PAINT. In reference to the selection of the points where these life-boats are to be established, it must be borne in mind that one of the most difficult things to be accomplished is the proper selection of a site, inasmuch as a wreck will take place on the lee shore just where the gale or squall strikes the ship and carries away her masts and sails, and then she will go ashore, perhaps, at the most safe and smooth part of the coast, and the life-boat may be in quite another position, where it might be supposed a wreck would occur. So, with a steamer, wherever the machinery ceases to work, there the wreck will occur.

Mr. McLELAN. There was a great diversity of opinion in the county as to where the boat should be placed, and after consideration of the different points, these were selected. For six or seven years one of the old life-boats was stationed at Salmon Point, and during all the time she was there her services were never called into requisition.

Mr. PLATT. Will these crews be paid anything for their services—the services of the past year?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

146. To provide for investigation into Wrecks and Casualities and collection of information relating to disasters of shipping	$1,500 00
147. Expenses in connection with Canadian Registration of Shipping	500 00
148. Montreal and Quebec Water and River Police	38,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the force the same?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

149. Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers	$2,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the hon. gentleman very often does not use this at all.

Mr. McLELAN. There has been very little expenditure. I have ascertained that there are a number of wrecks it is important to have removed, and we propose to take steps to remove all those.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the sum. I merely note that a year ago nothing at all was done.

Mr. PAINT. As to the triennial list of shipping, it has been brought to my notice frequently that we should have the list of shipping every year, and it was so issued some seven or eight years ago, but this $1,500 has been voted separately to enable us to have the list only every three years. Is there any objection to having it every year?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think the necessity would warrant our having it every year. It is a very expensive thing to have it yearly.

Mr. PLATT.

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE.

150. Salaries and allowances, &c., of Light-house Keepers.....	$167,048 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the detail of this vote to be found? In former years it used to form part of the Estimates. The detail ought to be given somewhere —where is it?

Mr. McLELAN. You mean the names?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not the names, but the various points at which they are employed, with the salaries, and also the number of new appointments that have been made.

Mr. McLELAN. That is published in the report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this $3,023 increase for?

Mr. McLELAN. For the additional lights we may put in operation during the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many?

Mr. McLELAN. From eighteen to twenty-two.

Mr. PLATT. Does the hon. Minister recollect whether there is any change to be made in the salary of the light-house keeper at South Bay Point? It was stated last year that it was only $150 per annum, and it is not in keeping with the salaries paid at other places.

Mr. McLELAN. I think a small increase has been given to that gentleman, making the salary $200.

151. Agencies, Rents and Contingencies.....	$18,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This a new form, rather, of putting it in. What does this refer to?

Mr. McLELAN. The agencies in the different Provinces for the lighthouse services at Halifax, St. John, Charlottetown, Quebec and British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want the hon. gentleman to revert back to the old fashion under which we had a dozen pages and more devoted to details of the light-house service that were probably as well out; but if he will look back to the old Estimates, he will find, I think, that very much more full details were given, and might conveniently be given, with respect to some of these large items, such as the item which immediately follows, of nearly $300,000, of which not the faintest detail is given, I perceive, in these Estimates. Now, in other Estimates, such as the Estimates of the year 1878, and so forth, the hon. gentleman will find that a reasonable amount of detail was given, occupying about half a page, and although I do not want to detain the hon. gentleman too much now, I would suggest that next year, so far as that goes, some further detail might be given. It is not convenient to be called upon to vote nearly $300,000 without further information than is given here. If the hon. gentleman will look back to the older Estimates, he will find that a very reasonable amount is given. For instance, "Maintenance and Repairs" are divided into three or four sections—below Quebec, above Montreal, and so forth—and in these some reasonable amount of information is given as to what is required. I think it would be more satisfactory to the House if, in future, a little more detail were given of this large vote.

Mr. McLELAN. I will read to the hon. gentleman, if it is necessary to detain the Committee, the sub-division of the salaries of the lighthouse-keepers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall not ask him to do that on this occasion. I suppose I will find some tolerable information about that in the Return he has laid on the Table, but it is not proper to be asked to vote $300,000 or $400,000, without having before you in the book you are

discussing some little more detail than we have here. What I want is something like this: In the last Estimates I myself brought down for 1878-79, the Department provided very tolerably full information about these, dividing them, as I see, into the several heads, and, although it is not necessary to cumber up the Estimates with a dozen pages giving the details of the number of lighthouse-keepers and so forth, I think that the one page was useful which contained something like the details the hon. gentleman proposes to give: for instance, how much was required for buoys and beacons, how much for repairing, maintaining and arranging lights and light-ships, how much for boats, how much for oil and so forth. I think that might be judiciously restored. It was the custom in former times to give all that information, and it is much more convenient to have it in a page in the Estimates than to have to look it up.

Mr. McLELAN. Difficulties may arise from dividing the estimates in that way. There may be an accident to a lighthouse, a fire or an undermining by the sea—that is an expense upon maintenance and repairs, and this may largely increase one of the sub-divisions and largely increase your appropriation for that, while in other points it may be less than you estimate for, and when you take a lump sum in this way, you are not tied down to any particular expenditure for any particular service, and it is unwise to do so, in view of the liability to accidents in matters of this kind. The sub-division we have is:

Chimneys, burners, reflectors, &c.	$11,000 00
Oil	32,000 00
Coal, wood, water and freight	37,000 00
Oil tanks, tinware	3,000 00
Repairs, lumber, stone, cement, machinery, &c.	78,360 00
Lanterns, lamps, &c.	8,000 00
Powder	9,000 00
Signal stations	3,500 00
Repairs to dwellings, boat houses, wharves and sheds	34,000 00
Buoy service	36,000 00
Humane establishments	10,000 00
Paint, oil, glass, white lead, &c.	10,000 00
Hardware, rope, rubber packing, &c.	6,000 00
Baize, chamois, flannel, polishing powder, &c.	4,500 00
Sundries	6,500 00
Total	$288,860 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But those are just the items that may be advantageously put in as in former years. I did not ask for the extreme sub-division that prevailed before when they were divided in that fashion in half a dozen sub-heads. But even if the hon. gentleman requires to take a pretty large allowance for contingencies, which can be easily put in, still it is desirable to have some more information than we have here.

Mr. McLELAN. We will take that into consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not desirable that so large a vote as this should be taken and left entirely at the disposal of the Department in the way the hon. gentleman suggests.

152. Maintenance and repairs to lights, fog whistles, buoys and beacons, humane establishments and provisional depots.... $288,860 00

Mr. McLELAN. This sum covers all the lighthouses and the increased buoy service. Buoys are found necessary at additional points, and several new fog whistles have been added during the past year which are of expensive maintenance. The humane establishments are hospitals at the different points where we establish life-saving institutions.

Mr. WELDON. There ought to be a better fog alarm at the harbour of St. John. The bell-buoy is not at all sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. McLELAN. Considerable repairs were made to that bell-buoy last season, and I understand it is now in a better condition.

Mr. PLATT. In the early part of the Session I asked the Government for information regarding a change in the direction of the range lights at Weller's Bay, and I was told it was not the intention to make any change. Since then I believe a petition has been received by the Department asking for a change in that harbour, and also asking that spar buoys be placed at the entrance in order to remedy the failure of the light to be in range with the channel.

Mr. McLELAN. That will all be enquired into as soon as possible by the proper officer of the Department. No decision is made in the office upon petitions or applications without enquiry by some competent officer of the Department. Whenever we receive a petition signed by so respectable a body of men as are the constituents of the hon. gentleman, it will be attended to.

153. Cape Race Light $1,300 00
154. Completion and Construction of Lighthouse and Fog Alarms $40,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. This is for building one or two fog alarms. I will give a complete list of items before Concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to have it now when we are asked to vote the money in Supply, because this is the proper time for discussion. Although it has been once or twice done as the hon. gentleman now proposes to do, it was done under protest by reason of some accidental failure in obtaining the information. We are asked for $40,000, and the hon. gentleman does not state any details or places where he is going to spend it. We are not anxious to delay him, still we have a right to know how this money is being spent.

Mr. McLELAN. The sheet is not yet from the printers, but will be here before Concurrence, and will be distributed to the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) With this large vote of $40,000, I think the Government ought to erect a fog alarm at East Point, in the Lower St. Lawrence, in answer to a numerously signed petition from the leading shipping merchants of Quebec, Halifax, Prince Edward Island, and other maritime ports. This is one of the most important places in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, and more shipping passes this point to Prince Edward Island than at almost any other point on the Lower St. Lawrence. The importance of the situation would warrant the Government in giving due attention to this matter at an early date, and I trust they will take steps in that direction at once.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will find on the sheet when it comes before the House that provision is made for that.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) The hon. member for King's asks for a fog whistle at East Point—I suppose he means in Prince Edward Island. But there is another East Point in British Columbia, and representations have been made to the effect that one is very necessary there. Will the sum provide for the erection of a lighthouse on East Point?

Mr. McLELAN. There is some appropriation made for some new lights in the hon. gentleman's Province; I am not able to state just now where it is.

Mr. BAKER. We shall be informed on Concurrence, I suppose. That seems to be an excuse for almost everything—in fact I regard this Concurrence as a snare and delusion.

Mr. McLELAN. It is a very difficult matter in a multitude of applications that come in for lights, buoys and fog whistles, to make a selection and keep within the sum that you have reasonably asked Parliament to grant in any one year. This paper is in the hands of the printer, but it has not yet been completed. I will bring it down on Wednesday, and full discussion can take place on Concurrence.

Mr. BAKER. I can fully understand the difficulty experienced in discriminating between the various claims made. I would, however, be failing in my duty if I failed to bring before the Minister the fact that in the opinion of the whole Maritime population of British Columbia a lighthouse is required on the eastern point of Saturna Island. I trust when the Minister arranges for the distribution of the $40,000 he will give this matter every consideration.

Mr. DAVIES. Does this amount cover land expropriated for lighthouses?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to draw the Minister's attention to a case of hardship which occurred in Prince Edward Island. A piece of land having a frontage of 11½ chains was taken from the farm of Rodger Campbell for lighthouse purposes, he being induced to give it for a nominal sum on the representation being made to him that he was eligible for recommendation to the appointment of lighthouse keeper. When his name was forwarded to Ottawa, it was found that he was beyond the age, and the Minister had no option but to refuse his request. Then Campbell sought to have his offer withdrawn, or to be paid the real value of his land. He has made a number of applications, simply asking to have the value of the site assessed by any respectable man whom the Minister chooses to appoint. Campbell is a most respectable man.

155.	Construction of Lighthouse at Colchester Reef, Lake Erie	$5,000 00
156.	Signal Stations	$7,600 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many signal stations are in operation, and how is the service conducted?

Mr. McLELAN. The signal service has been used during the past season: first, for reporting the condition of the ice in spring, which information is telegraphed to points of call and is cabled to Liverpool; and second, to report vessels inward and outward as they pass the Gulf.

Mr. McNEILL. No doubt the signal service has been a great benefit to the country. It is most important that we should have a signal station established at Manitowaning, the gateway between Georgian Bay and Lake Huron.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister would state the number of stations.

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot give the exact number, but almost all the lighthouse keepers along the gulf and coast are engaged in this work and receive an allowance yearly. Then there is a superintendent at Quebec who receives these reports, and sends them to the points where they are desired. There must be about one hundred officers engaged in this service.

FISHERIES.

SALARIES AND DISBURSEMENTS OF FISHERY OVERSEERS AND WARDENS.

157.	Ontario	$13,500 00
	Quebec	16,000 00
	Nova Scotia	16,500 00
	New Brunswick	13,000 00
	Prince Edward Island	3,500 00
	British Columbia	4,000 00
	Manitoba, Keewatin and North-West Territories	2,000 00
	Fish-breeding and building of Fishways	35,000 00
	To provide for legal and incidental expenses connected with the Fisheries, advertising, &c	2,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that there is a considerable increase in connection with the fish hatcheries, and perhaps the hon. gentleman would state what he finds, generally, is the result of this very considerable expenditure. I know that there was some doubt on the part of those who profess to be experienced in these matters whether the expenditure of this large sum was productive of much good, and whether more good would not be got in the way of developing our fisheries, in seeing that fish were not destroyed during the spawning season, and that the close season was generally observed, than by the sum devoted to fish-breeding. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state his opinion on the subject.

Mr. McLELAN. My own opinion is that fish breeding is capable of being made a great success. I have been giving attention to the returns of salmon fishing, from the lower Provinces more particularly, and I find this result: That in all the rivers in which we have been placing young fry the supply of fish has either been maintained or increased, whilst in the rivers in which we have placed no fry, and more particularly on the northern coasts of the St. Lawrence there has been a great decrease in the catch of salmon. The increase last year in the Restigouche, where we had placed these fry, was particularly marked. Hon gentlemen will bear in mind that with the increase in population, and with the increase of appliances for destroying fish, it is very difficult in any river or lake to keep it supplied with fish, and that considering all the destructive appliances that are used, if we are able to maintain the supply we are doing a good deal, because we find where the fishermen are left to themselves they soon clear out a river or lake.

Mr. HACKETT. The question of the preservation of the fisheries for the people of Canada is one of great importance. I would say that I have no objection to the remarks of the Minister so far as the inland rivers and lake fisheries are concerned; but I think the coast fisheries are being rapidly depleted by the use of the apparatus or machine called a trap, which is set round the coast for the purpose of capturing fish. On the coast of Prince Edward Island we have had small experience in that regard. But we have had some of these traps, and the experience thus far has shown that if continued they will ultimately result in the destruction of these fisheries. I think some steps should be taken to prevent those traps being used, unless on headlands or outside the spawning grounds of the fish. Gentlemen who are acquinted with the habits of the fish know that they come around capes, and bays, and estuaries, of the coast, and deposit their eggs, and that these traps are set on those spawning grounds, and the result will be that in a few years they will be destroyed, and the fishermen will not be able to follow the occupation which they have had for many years. I hope the hon. gentleman will take steps to prevent the use of these traps, because I believe the result of their general use will be as I have stated. We find that in the United States, where they have had larger experience than they have in Canada, the result has been that the coast fisheries have almost been totally destroyed, and the people of the United States have been at great expense for the purpose of restoring those fisheries. So far, the means resorted to have been found inadequate to restore the coast fisheries of the United States. With regard to Prince Edward Island, it will result detrimentally to the interests of the people of the Island if these fish traps, which are the worst kind of apparatus for capturing fish, are to be continued, and I hope some steps will be taken by which this mode of fishing will not be increased but curtailed in the future.

Mr. McISAAC. I quite agree with the hon. member who has spoken, that the proper protection of rivers, and the removal of obstructions, such as dams, are the best means for preserving and propagating our fisheries. Very

little good, I believe, results from hatcheries. In that respect I have to differ from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In doing so, I may refer to a discussion which took place in the other Chamber some weeks ago, when an hon. gentleman, who represents there the county of Lunenburg—a county more remarkable for its fisheries than any other county in the whole Dominion—contradicted entirely the statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries just now. He did not condemn the hatcheries on principle, but the manner in which they are conducted; and he declared that he could prove that they are an entire failure. Last year I had occasion to complain to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that a large portion of the expenditure on fisheries, and in paying the salaries of officers, was money thrown away. As a case in point, I referred to a fish-way and dam on the St. Mary's River—that branch of the river which runs out of Lochabar. The Minister was kind enough to refer the complaint to Mr. Rogers, the inspector, who communicated it to the overseer of the district. The overseer visited the place and made his report, and I have no hesitation in saying that his report is absolutely false. I do not blame the authorities at Ottawa, for they are misled by many of their subordinates, and that is one of the reasons why the protection of our fisheries is in so many cases a farce. I will read the report of the overseer, which is addressed to Mr. Rogers:

"SHERBROOKE, 3rd July, 1883.

"DEAR SIR,—I was on the ground this spring, the very first day the alewives made their appearance, and can testify that I saw them ascend the fishway to the very top in quantities; and there are men at Lochabar who caught barrels of them. For salmon, Lochabar has never been a resort, and I do not believe that any try to go up. They can if they wish.

"I am, yours truly,

"ALLAN McQUARRIE, *Overseer.*

"W. H ROGERS, Esq., Fishery Inspector."

Mr. Rogers publishes this letter in the Halifax *Herald*, introducing it by a letter of his own, endorsing every word of it. Shortly after its appearance, I was spoken to by persons living in the locality about it; and since my arrival here I have taken the trouble to write to the owner of the mill that is operated by this dam; and if any person would have an interest in suppressing the truth with regard to the fishway, it would be the mill owner. Yet he was frank enough, though not to his own interest to make this statement, which is dated the 5th March, in reply to my enquiry whether he remembered the day the overseer examined the ladder:

"I did not hear that any fish were caught above the fishway the time McQuarrie was here. I doubt if he saw any going up, for the flood in the spring partly broke the fishway, and it was not repaired until a few days after he was here."

The fishway was out of repair, and was not repaired until some days after McQuarrie left; and yet he says in his report to Rogers that he himself saw the fish ascend the ladder. Now this state of things should not be allowed to exist any longer, and I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to send some reliable person there as soon as possible to make a correct report, because neither McQuarrie nor Rogers is to be relied upon. This Mr. Rogers has a hobby of his own, a ladder, which he is always putting forward. This will be seen in the letter which he sent to the Halifax *Herald* on the 5th of July, 1883, in introducing McQuarries' report. It is as follows:—

"To the Editor of the *Herald*:

"SIR,—The following from the Overseer of Fisheries at Sherbrooke, as to the workable qualities of a ladder of the old pattern built by myself some years ago below the dam, will be of interest just now Isaac Galtz, overseer, informs me about the same is the case with a ladder of the same sort on the dam at Sheet Harbour, in east Halifax. The difficulty with most people is, they do not know that fish only ascends fishways at certain times of the day, and they visit the ladders at improper times, see no fish, and report accordingly. This Lochaber fishway has been condemned over and over again by the knowing ones."

It is well known that Mr. Rogers is an inventor of ladders. The first ladder to which he refers here he claims to be perfect; if it is, there is no reason for improvement; yet in his letter he says: "This has been condemned over and over again by the knowing ones." This, I think, is simply a rebuke to those who venture to condemn his ladder. Therefore, I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, again, as the season is approaching when the fish will ascend the river, to send some reliable person down to examine the place. Mr. Rogers gets $1,400 for travelling expenses, and what does he show for it? Everybody knows that there is no river more celebrated in Nova Scotia than the river St. Mary's for its fisheries, and particularly its salmon fisheries, and since the erection of this dam the salmon and other fish have deserted altogether the portion above the dam. A few alewives make the exception. Every statement in this letter of Mr. McQuarrie is false. That is bold language to use, but it is the truth, and every resident along the river for 20 or 30 miles will corroborate what I say.

Mr. McLELAN. Will the hon. gentleman send me a copy of the letter; it is a serious matter if an officer has made a false return. There must be some convenience, a ladder of some kind to enable the fish to pass over the dam.

Mr. McISAAC. There is a kind of a ladder.

Mr. McLELAN. Of all the ladders I have seen, Mr. Roger's is the best and on the right principle, and if the ladder in question is one of Rogers' and is properly constructed, it ought to be able to effect the purpose. I have instructed Mr. Roberts to see that the fish have facilities to ascend to their breeding grounds. The hon. gentleman referred to the remarks of the hon. member for Lunenburg. Lunenburg is one of the greatest fishing counties in the Dominion, and we have placed fry in some of the rivers of that county. There is no hatchery yet on that coast, but some fry has been taken there, and the overseer reports that during last year there was a considerable increase in the catch of salmon.

Mr. McIAAC. The request is made in this letter that a warden be appointed near this dam. There is one within five or six miles of the mill who is a relative of the mill owners, and naturally does not take the same interest in looking after the fisheries as he otherwise would, and it is necessary to appoint a warden who is not a relative of the mill owner.

Mr. McLELAN. If he were too near the mill, he might get his grist there.

Mr. McISAAC. I do not recommend any one in particular, so that I have no personal interest in the matter in any special appointee.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) I want to take this occasion to advocate, as I did last year, the payment of an adequate salary to the Inspector of Fisheries in British Columbia. Mr. Alex. Caulfield Anderson, the inspector, receives but $1,200 a year, and why he should receive less than any other Provincial Inspector of Fisheries I cannot imagine. I must do the hon. Minister of Marine the justice to state that last year he did increase Mr. Anderson's salary, but still it is not equal to that of the Inspectors of Fisheries in the other Provinces. Of course, when one is advocating an increase in expenditure, or anything which entails the expenditure of public money, the question is asked: Will it pay? What is the return? If a Custom House or Post Office is asked for, the Government will ask, what are the receipts? Is there sufficient revenue to yield a sufficient return for the money expended? Possibly hon. gentlemen in this House are not fully alive to the value of the fishery interests of British Columbia; but, perhaps, I can enlighten them on that subject. I have a memorandum, showing that for the year

1883, up to the 31st December, the total value of exported fish, fish oils, &c., including the consumption by the European population throughout the Province, was $1,60[illegible],145.42, and the consumption by the Indian population throughout the Province, by computation previously made and published, $4,885,000; making a total of no less than $6,488,145.42. There is sufficient in that to show that there must be as much work devolving on the Inspector of Fisheries in British Columbia as on the inspectors in any of the other Provinces. I do not wish to detract from any other Province, but I do think that the inspector in British Columbia should receive, not only as much as the inspectors of the other Provinces, but should receive a larger amount, in view of the increased cost of living in that country. The comparative value of the yield of the years 1882 and 1883, exclusive of computed Indian consumption, was: in 1883, $1,603,145.42, and in 1882, $1,842,675.05—which shows a deficiency in the year 1883, of $239,529.63, arising from shortness of salmon pack and deficient fur seal hunt. The pack of canned salmon in 1883 from Fraser river amounted to 12 canneries 105,701 cases, and from the northern rivers and inlets, to 11 canneries 90,501 cases, or a total of 196,292 cases. The pack of 1882 was 265,610, which shows a deficiency of 1883, compared with 1882, of 58,769 cases. The value of vessels employed, together with boats, nets and ordinary equipment, was $253,245.00, and the computed value of stationary plant $515,000, or a total value of $768,245.00. The number of men employed during the season was 70 sailors, 2,934 fishermen and seal hunters, and 2,136 shoremen, making a total of 5,070 persons engaged in the trade. These statistics give a very fair idea of the importance of our fishing industry, and show the necessity of increasing the inspector's salary. Mr. Anderson is a gentleman of very high culture, a man of intelligence and ability, and I think the Department would be very sorry indeed to lose his services. If the Department desires to retain him in his position, it is necessary he should be paid commensurate with his services; and I hope the hon. gentleman will give the attention to this case which it is fairly entitled to.

Mr. PAINT. I wish to say one word in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Prince County, Prince Edward Island. He protested against the use of fish traps, and I wish to say a word on behalf of the fishermen of Nova Scotia. He objects to fish traps; I protest against the use of purse or tuck-seines. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, referred to the sixty-three American vessels that were in the Gulf of St. Lawrence last year; but he did not say that they had loaded with the aid of seines. The vessels throw the bait overboard, and the fish rise to the surface, and they run the seines round the shoal of mackerel and load their vessels this way, destroying immense numbers, the small ones being thrown away. In dealing with a Reciprocity Treaty or anything like that, care should be taken to treat with the Americans in regard to the destruction by them of the fish in our waters. Our Nova Scotia vessels have not yet taken that method of catching fish, but the Americans have done so, and they loaded twice last year; this is a more destructive method than the trap.

Mr. DAWSON. The constituency which I represent extends for 600 miles along the great lakes, and fishing is very extensively carried on there. I will not detain the House more than a few minutes, but I desire to refer to a matter which I think of very great importance to the country at large. I suppose that fish traps on the sea coast correspond with our pound nets on the great lakes, and there is no doubt that those pound nets are most destructive to the fish. They are set all over the lakes now, and are coming more and more into use every day, and some restrictions should be put upon their use. The pound nets are very unfair to a large class of the population up there, the Indian population. In some places the fish are actually swept out of the lake. The Minister has very well said that these nets would clean out a lake, however large or small it was, and there is no doubt that they have cleaned out the Georgian Bay a great deal. I think there should be some restrictions upon them. I must say, with regard to the fish hatcheries, that, so far as I have observed and heard, and the general opinion as far as I have heard it expressed is, that they are eminently successful. There can be no doubt that, but for these fish hatcheries, the fish would be very soon exterminated in some parts of the Great Lakes. They have been successful on Lake Ontario, and at Detroit, on the American side, they have been exceedingly successful, and wherever they have been tried. It is contrary to reason to suppose that, if you throw millions of fry into the water, perfectly alive and well, it will not increase the quantity of fish. It is absurd to imagine that it would not, and it has been proved that these hatcheries have been eminently successful.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member who has just sat down expresses a strong opinion which, if it were correct, would justify the voting of this money or a larger amount; but I am not satisfied that his opinion is a correct one. I would not give my opinion as strongly as he has done his, but I would recall to his recollection and to that of hon. members that the gentleman who was for twenty years the head of the Fishery Department, Commissioner of Fisheries, published an open letter which I read in the newspaper last year, in which he stated that, notwithstanding the enormous sums we had expended in this Dominion for the last twenty years, ranging up to I do not know how many thousand dollars, in his mind the system was a failure. It seemed to me that this would have been an appropriate time for the hon. Minister, if that letter or the conclusions which Mr. Whitcher submitted to the public as his conclusions after twenty years experience were incorrect, or if the data upon which he formed them were incorrect, to explain to the House and the country, who are called upon to vote $30,000 or $40,000 for this purpose, wherein he was incorrect—was it in his data, or in his conclusions, or in his reasoning? Certainly the country have a right to suppose that a gentleman occupying the position he did for so long, a gentleman supposed to know so much and credited with knowing so much, would, in giving such an opinion, do so with more than ordinary knowledge and with a right to be believed and to have his statements accepted. Perhaps he may have overdrawn it, or he may not; but I think the Minister should have given us not a simple opinion as he did to-night, but some reasons for it. As to the question of protecting the fisheries with the overseers; I am inclined to think, and there is no disguising the fact, that, to a very large extent, these men do not do their duty, that the rivers are not protected as they ought to be, that the wardens are afraid to discharge their duty in some instances, and in other instances do not discharge it from other causes, but, as a matter of fact, they do not do it. I would refer the Minister to the fact that, in Prince Edward Island, last year, one man, while discharging his duty, who caught three or four parties *in flagrante delicto* and tried to arrest them, was so brutally maltreated that he has been a cripple ever since. I believe he has put in some sort of claim to the Minister, and I hope that in order to show the wardens throughout the country that they will be protected in the performance of their duty, his case will be considered. In regard to the hatcheries, my opinion has been very much shaken by Mr. Whitcher's statement, and before Concurrence I would like the Minister to give us some further information upon this subject. Another year, at all events, I will not let the vote go by without making a thorough personal investigation into the

question. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) says, because you put so many fish in the river, they must naturally breed. It does not follow at all. In the hatcheries they are fed by hand up to a certain period, and, when they are thrown into the river, they no longer find their food provided for them, and the instinct which nature provides for young fish to seek their own food is to a large extent deadened or lost by the habit incurred in the hatcheries of having their food provided for them, and it is very generally believed that millions of them die because they have lost the instinct of looking for their food.

Mr. DALY. I am a practical fisherman. I enjoy the sport of salmon fishing every spring, and visit most of the rivers in Nova Scotia. I have visited Gold river, East river, Salmon river, and the rivers of Halifax county and Lunenburg county. I can bring personal evidence to bear to show that in those rivers where fry are sent from the Bedford Hatchery, the salmon have increased, or have at least held their own. I believe, if the hatchery at Bedford had never been established, the rivers I allude to would have been in a much worse state than they are, and each season shows that those fish that have been put in as fry for three or four years preceding come back to the river and have done good. I quite concur, from my own observation and from fishing in those rivers, in the statement that good has been done by the hatcheries, though not perhaps to the extent we anticipated, but I would be very sorry to see that item left out. The Minister's returns will show that those rivers to which fry have been sent from the hatchery have improved or held their own.

Mr. DAVIES. The returns do not show it.

Mr. SPROULE. In reference to fish hatching I am aware that some years ago Mr. Wilmot deposited a number of young fish in some of the rivers there of a kind that had not been before found in that part of the country. Our experience has been that they have grown and done well. With reference to the Inspectors of Fisheries, it appears to me important either that some more stringent rules were adopted and the inspectors required to carry them out, or else that the system should be entirely abolished. From year to year they draw their salary and give little or no return for it, especially the inspectors of inland fisheries. We have a law forbidding sawdust to be thrown into streams and forbidding dams from being built across streams to prevent the fish from going up or down; notwithstanding this law and these inspectors, in my part of the country at least, the law is everywhere violated. These men come up once or twice a year and stick up in some public place a copy of the law relating to the catching of fish out of season and that is all you see of them; but when the time comes to draw their pay they are always on hand. Complaints have been made to me by fishermen on the Georgian Bay, that at least one of the inspectors there permits a relative of his directly to infringe the fishery regulations, whereas others have not the same privilege. The fishermen also complain of a system that appears to be in vogue of giving leases to men for certain districts. They say that parties who, for some reason or other, possess a little influence, get leases to fish in certain districts and keep all others out of that district. Another question is in reference to the size of the mesh. I will say nothing about that now, because I believe the rule of the Minister of Marine is in the right direction. So long as the fishermen were allowed constantly to decrease the size of the mesh there, it would soon have resulted in the total destruction of the fisheries. However, the only points upon which I would urge the attention of the Minister are those in reference to the appointment of inspectors, that they should not be related to men who are directly interested in the business; in giving out licenses, that they should be general licenses, allowing a man to go anywhere he likes to fish; and lastly, as to the inspectors, that they should either be compelled to discharge their duty, or that the whole system should be abolished.

Mr. KAULBACH. I quite agree with my hon. friend who has taken his seat, that we should encourage fish hatcheries, as they are a great aid in re-stocking our rivers. And while encouraging this branch of the fishing industry, we should not be unmindful of the streams themselves, and see that access is had for the fish, and that obstructions such as exists in some of the rivers in my Province, do not prevail from the want of an inspector willing and ready to attend to his duty. I regret being compelled to make this statement; but it is nevertheless true, and simply the sentiments of other members besides myself. In my own county there are grievances, and I have heard the same in other counties as well. The Lahave, in the county I have the honour to represent, has been obstructed for years by mill dams which prevent the passage of fish, and by sawdust, which not only destroyed the fish, but impeding the navigation of that beautiful river; and although the inspector has been informed of this crying evil, he will not adopt the proper means of overcoming it. I have referred to this on a previous occasion, and I hope the hon. Minister will realize the position, and either compel the inspector—whom I view as a public obstructionist to the river fisheries, a statement I think I am correct in, for at all events, he has characterized himself as such on the Lahave—to do his duty, which hitherto he, as an inspector, has been either too incompetent or unwilling to perform, or perhaps both, or failing that, he be removed altogether, and thereby make room for a better man.

Mr. MOFFAT. The salmon hatchery has been transferred to the river Restigouche for the purpose of re-stocking the rivers, and it is quite right that it should be there. But the greater portion of the fry that is hatched in the hatchery in the Restigouche river is put into that river and at a season of the year when the fry can only be good for trouting; and I can safely say that the treatment the fish frequently receive is cruel to the fish and painful to the observer. You see dead salmon from which spawn have been taken lying on the ground, and the pigs going out and eating them. It may be from the incompetency of the officer, or it may be from the treatment they receive, but I am safe in saying that for the re-stocking of rivers, hatcheries may be necessary, but I do not think it is fair and right that such a valuable fish should be destroyed for the purpose of putting them in there to feed the smaller ones.

Mr. HACKETT. With regard to the question of fish-breeding, a good deal has been said here to-night to the effect that it cannot be successfully carried on. Well, whatever may be said on that point, we know that in the United States this question has engaged a great deal of attention, and public men there have arrived at the conclusion that something should be done, not only toward re-stocking the valuable inland fisheries of that country, but also the deep sea fisheries. In 1871, a gentleman of great experience in this matter, Professor Spencer Baird, was appointed by the United States Government to investigate the whole question of the re-stocking of the inland coast and deep sea fisheries of the United States. He undertook that great work, and he finds not only that he could, by scientific means, re-stock the inland fisheries of the country, but he also undertook with great success to re-stock all the depleted coast and deep sea fisheries of that country. Professor Baird is of the opinion that not only can he successfully stock the inland waters of the United States, but he is also enabled, with proper care and the best appliances, to fill the deep sea fisheries with fish of all kinds. I think this is quite sufficient to show—I do not care what

Mr. Whitcher or others may write on the question—that it is of the greatest importance that we should not only re-stock the depleted fisheries of the inland waters, but that some measures should be adopted for the purpose of improving the coast fisheries of the country. Most of the American fishing is carried on outside of the three-mile limit, and the United States fishermen, under the Treaty of 1818, have the right to fish outside of that limit. If, therefore, the strongest measures were adopted towards the purse seine fishermen, they would still come and seine in the Gulf. The most destructive mode of fishing in the Maritime Provinces is that known as trap fishing. I want to make this distinction: The people round the coast resort to brush weir fishing. They construct weirs along the coast, and these are altogether different from traps, which are machines constructed to gather in and destroy fish, and they are only used at times when the fish resort to the coast to spawn. When you prevent the fish coming to the coast to deposit their eggs, you at once destroy the fisheries. These fisheries have for a number of years given employment to our people and afforded subsistence to our fishermen and their families. Now, however, these men who resort to legitimate modes of fishing, the gill net and the hook and line, find that capitalists who are able to purchase trap nets are destroying their very means of subsistence. In the very next item of these Estimates, we are asked to grant a subsidy of $150,000 as a bounty to our fishermen. What for? To provide them with boats and gill nets for the purpose of prosecuting the fisheries outside of the coast and round the coast; and while you grant that money as a means of encouraging them, you at the same time allow capitalists from abroad, and especially from the United States, to set trap nets and destroy the valuable fisheries which you vote a subsidy to encourage our people to prosecute. Such course of action is inconsistent. If we wish that our people be encouraged to prosecute the fisheries, which led our people first to settle by the sea, which led Champlain to cross the ocean to this country, we must prevent the prosecution of trap fishing around the coasts of the Dominion. I feel strongly on this point. I know how it is in regard to Prince Edward Island. The Acadian French, who were the first settlers and who have prosecuted the fisheries for 100 years, found that when they made their valuable fisheries known, United States capitalists came in and set nets round the coast in the coves and bays which are the spawning grounds and are thus depriving the people of the means of prosecuting the fisheries by which they have provided for themselves during 100 years. I represent these people, and if it is the desire of the Government, and I know it is their desire, to preserve these fisheries for the people to whom they legitimately and properly belong, they will prevent such apparatus from coming into competition with gill nets and hand line fishing. One of the hon. members for British Columbia (Mr. Baker) has said that the inspector of that Province only received $1,200 a year. I have a complaint to make. We have in Prince Edward Island one of the most able fish inspectors in this country, a gentleman who is not only thoroughly qualified practically, but is also well read in the matter theoretically. This gentleman receives a salary of $800. I think I have a perfect right to make complaint that the Island inspector only receives $800, especially when the hon. gentleman from British Columbia declared that the inspector of that Province received the smallest salary of any inspector in the Dominion. The hon. gentleman made a great mistake. I trust the Minister will see that the inspector of Prince Edward Island is paid a fair salary in compensation for the services he so very ably performs.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). This is a very important question, and I am very glad indeed, the hon. gentleman has spoken so strongly and warmly on the subject. The protection of the river fisheries is a very important duty which the Government should look carefully after. In the county which I represent there happens to exist the best river fishery in our Province. I was exceedingly astonished that the hon. member for Halifax, who is a sportsman, did not refer to the Margaree. He should know that the Margaree is an excellent fishing river, particularly for salmon, and excels any other river in Nova Scotia; and I regret to say that river is hardly as well protected as it should be. It is not only necessary to protect the rivers, but it is also necessary to re-stock them, and I believe the fish-breeding establishment in Nova Scotia has done good service. But besides the inland fisheries, there is another important fishery which requires protection—that is the deep sea fishery. The trap nets, to which the hon member for Prince Edward Island has referred, are very destructive to fish, and I hope that some means will be employed by which the destruction of the fish will be lessened. The fish rise to the surface and are trapped. The fishermen use only a portion of them, and allow the rest to be thrown overboard and thus poison the fishing grounds. There is another unfortunate method which should be discontinued, and that is trawling along the coast. There is one section of my own county in which the people take the law into their own hands. The district of Cheticamp never allowed either their own fishermen or foreign fishermen to set trawls in that section of the country, and the result is that the fisheries there are more productive than in any other part of the Province of Nova Scotia. Wherever they use trawls, or trap nets, or other infernal machines, it is noticed that the fish are going to destruction fast. I have no hesitation in saying that means should be used to protect the fisheries against these appliances.

Mr. McLELAN. I wish to say a few words in reply to remarks which have been made by hon. gentlemen. I am glad to hear the hon. member for Prince County bear testimony to the efficiency of the fish inspector there, and I am equally sorry to hear the hon. member for Lunenburg speak of the inspector for Nova Scotia, and I would suggest that if he has a complaint to make he should make specific charges, and a complete investigation will be made. The hon. member for Restigouche speaks of the manner in which the parent salmon are treated. There may have been such cases from the want of skill on the part of the person manipulating them, but I think that injury done in that way must be exceptional. I know of cases in which the fish of some of the hatcheries have been marked, and the same fish have been taken there for three or four years, so that little injury must have been done. The hon. member from Queen's, Prince Edward Island, referred to a late officer of the Department, Mr. Whitcher, and to his opinions respecting the results of fish culture. I believe there is not a man in the Dominion of Canada who is a firmer believer in the advantages and benefits of fish culture than Mr. Whitcher. He was for a long time an officer of the Department, and faithfully served the Government. I do not want to enter into the particulars of the reasons why he published the letter which he did publish, or for what purpose it was published. But as an evidence upon which I found my views as to his opinions of fish culture, I may say that almost the first paper which came to me, after my return from the Fishery Exhibition, was an elaborate report from Mr. Whitcher, urging the purchase of a fish hatchery, which was in the hands of a private gentleman named Mr. Price, since deceased. I shall not say anything more about his motives, which were acknowledged to me at the time.

Mr. McINTYRE. I wish to say a few words with regard to the distribution of the fishery bounty. There has been a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed by those re-

ceiving the bounty, at the manner in which it has been distributed; I speak more especially of my own county. I am well aware that the bounty which was granted in 1882 was only distributed last fall, and that a large portion has not yet been distributed. I was approached by several fishermen shortly before I left home, who declared to me that they had sent in applications, and had never received any bounty whatever, and they said that several others who had made application had received their bounty. I think there is something wrong in regard to the distribution. I may state that it has not been the same even in all the counties of Prince Edward Island. Although the distribution only took place last fall, in King's County, in Prince county it tookplace last spring. At that time there was an election going on for the Local Legislature, and immediately before the election took place a distribution took place for that county. I think it is wrong that the fishery bounty which was to have been used for the benefit of the fishermen should have been used to make votes either one way or the other. Another point to which I direct the attention of the Minister is that when these fishermen make application for the bounty there are no forms to be had. I remember last summer and fall that the fishermen came to the sub-collector in the village where I live, and the usual reply was made that he had run out of forms. Another point is that the sub-collector in my village carries on a mercantile business; and I understand that accecording to the regulations of the Customs Department he should not do so. I do not bring this to the attention of the Minister from any personal feeling, but this gentleman who is in every way capable of acting as sub-collector is in the habit of selling goods, and the first thing which is kept out of the fisherman's bounty are the bills which they owe to this gentleman. I do not think that should be the case.

Mr. McLELAN. What is his name?

Mr. McINTYRE. Michael Foley.

Mr. BOWELL. That is at Souris?

Mr. McINTYRE. Yes. By Order-in-Council last fall the fishermen were directed to send in their claims before the end of 1883. The fishermen complied with that direction, as far as they possibly could; but when they applied for forms, the same objection was made as before—there were no forms; and up to this time there are dozens of fishermen in that section of the country who have not received blank forms, although the time for receiving them has expired. There ought to be a more simple method, it appears to me, of distributing this bounty than the method now pursued. It places too much power in the hands of sub-collectors. A man who has taken the proper amount of fish required, may claim the bounty, and he is to be put off on one pretext or another. I understand there are instances of some cases of men having been induced to send in claims in order to get the bounty when they had really no right to receive it, not having taken the full quantity of fish required. So far as I could learn, I know of only one case in my section of the country, of a fisherman not having taken a sufficient quantity of fish to entitle him to the bounty and who nevertheless received it. Another matter that bears very heavily on the fishermen of Prince Edward Island is the regulation in regard to the length of the boat which declares that the length must not be less than fourteen feet keel. This a very great hardship to our fishermen. There is a large section of our coast along which there is no harbor, and the fishermen are consequently obliged to haul their boats every night and every morning, so that they find the boats under fourteen feet keel the most convenient. It appears to me that the essential ground for this bounty is the quantity of fish caught; it does not matter whether they are taken on a raft or in a basket, so long as the required quantity is taken. It would be a great misfortune to our fishermen if they were obliged to use boats so large and bulky that they could not handle them. There are not many regular fishermen on that coast; most of them till the soil as well as fish. There is another point to which I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—a point which affects many other counties as well as my own. Certificates have been rejected sometimes for no other reason that I know of except some informality in filling them. I know of several instances of hardship which have resulted from errors of this kind. I know of one case in which two men were fishing in a boat which was supposed to return 25 cwt. of fish, and they put that quantity down for the boat, when it was really the quantity caught by each. I believe several cases of this kind have occurred. I think it would be an act of generosity on the part of the Minister to inquire into the cases of these people, as most of them are poor, and, if possible, to grant the bounty to those who, from ignorance or the want of some formality in filling up the forms, have forfeited it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings, P. E. I.) I do not altogether agree with my hon. colleague that there should be a simpler method of granting this bounty. On the contrary, I think we ought to restrict the method, because I believe instances have occurred in which people secured the bounty by going to their next neighbour, who might be a justice of the peace, and getting him to give them a certificate. I think every fisherman should be obliged to go to some sub-collector or officer under his jurisdiction, and make a proper affirmation before he gets the bounty. If that were done, it would prevent a great deal of the fraud which now takes place. It is proper that the fishermen who fish should get the bounty. But it should be seen that those who are not entitled to it should not get it. With respect to the length of boat, I agree to some extent with what the hon. gentleman has said. Our fishermen pursue their work on a coast where there are few harbours, and they have to haul their boats night and morning. Although their boats are small, they carry on deep sea-fishing. I know of several cases of hardship in which fishermen have been shut off from the bounty because their boats were only twelve or thirteen feet keel. An hon. member has referred to the sub-collector of Souris; but I venture to say that the Minister of Customs has not a more efficient or faithful officer in his service in any of the Provinces; and if the sub-collector has a small business besides, it is a legitimate one, and does not interfere with his duties as collector. I am satisfied that any returns made under him have been properly carried out, and that he has seen that men making returns for fishery bounties have made a proper affirmation. Now, I wish to impress upon the Minister the absolute necessity of more strictness in regard to the granting of these bounties. I would suggest that some person in each locality—either the Collector of Customs or some one else—should receive a small fee for seeing that the regulations are properly carried out. If that were done, it would prevent much of the fraud that takes place. I have never heard any complaints of blanks running out, and if they did, the sub-collector could easily write forms suitable for the purpose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must say this discussion is entirely out of order as there is no question before the Committee on which a general question can arise. I allowed the hon. gentlemen to proceed because I did not wish to draw the rule too strictly, but I cannot allow the discussion to proceed further.

MARINE HOSPITALS AND SICK AND DISTRESSED SEAMEN.

160	Marine and Immigrant Hospital, Quebec.....	$20,000 00
	St. Catharines Hospital, Ont.....	500 00
	Kingston do	500 00
	Hospitals, &c, in the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia.	35,000 00
161	Expenses for Shipwrecked and Disabled Seamen.....	6,000 00

Resolutions to be reported, Committee to sit again.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. BOWELL presented a Message from his Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the services of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1884; and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 31st March, 1884.

Ordered that the Message and Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am informed that these Estimates have been, before being laid on the Table, communicated to certain members of the press. I do not think that is respectful to the House. The members ought to have these Estimates first; they ought not to be given to special favourites of the press. I am sure the hon. Minister of Public Works had no hand or part in this, but I desire to protest in the name of the House against the practice which, I think, is very improper.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not aware they have been communicated to any one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will enquire, I think he will find that what I have stated is the case.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:30 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE *DEBATES*.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), from the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the *Debates* of this House during the present Session, presented the following as their Fifth Report:—

That as the contracts for the printing and binding of the Official Report of the *Debates* of this House expire with the work of the present Session, and as the contractors have expressed in writing their willingness to accept an extension of their respective contracts for another Session on the same terms and conditions, as those of the present contracts; the Committee recommend that the same be extended accordingly.

Mr MACDONALD (Kings, P.E.I.)

The Committee have had under consideration the question of the translation of the Official Report of the *Debates* of this House, and have decided to recommend:

1. That commencing with next Session, with the object of securing the more prompt delivery of the daily French edition, the English proof-reader be required to prepare for the use of the translators, a fair copy of the daily sheets of the *Debates* as revised and corrected by members for the bound edition, and that thereafter the translation be performed from such revised daily sheets.

2. That the chief translator be required to keep a record of the daily work performed by each member of the translating staff, which record shall show the translation performed, and be signed, by each translator and certified to by the chief, and fyled every Saturday with the Clerk of the Committee.

3. That the appointment of Messrs. Bouchard and Lassalle, as additional translators, for the work of the present Session remaining to be done be continued and made permanent.

4 That Mr. A. E. Poirier be appointed as an additional translator and that his appointment date from the commencement of next Session.

5. That, commencing with next Session, the salaries of the translators be as follows:—

A. Gélinas, Chief Translator.....		$1,200
N. H. Beaulieu, Assistant Translator		$1,000 each
E. Tremblay,	do	
R. Tremblay,	do	
J. B. Vanasse,	do	
J. Bouchard,	do	
J. Lassalle,	do	
A. E. Poirier,	do	

and that in addition to the work of translation, the chief translator be required to make the index.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. BEATY moved that the time for receiving Private Bills be extended one day, and that for receiving the reports thereon, five days; and that the notice required by the 6th Rule to be given by Committees prior to consideration of Private Bills be reduced from a week to one day for the remainder of the Session, pursuant to the recommendation of the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SCRIVER, in moving that the Second Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library of Parliament be adopted, said: The first important matter in this report is the recommendation that the Government shall appropriate $2,000 for the purchase of 300 copies of a second edition of the late Dr. Todd's work on "Parliamentary Government." They are now being prepared, and I believe will soon be printed. Another is that Mr. Thayne, who has been employed as an extra clerk since 1879, in preparing a new and revised catalogue, be placed on the permanent staff of the Library at a salary of $1,000. There is also a recommendation "that the Librarian be directed to report at the beginning of each Session to the Committee the names of those persons who have failed to comply with the rules under which they have been permitted to borrow books from the Library; and that the Librarian be authorized to renew the tickets of admission to the Library to those only who have complied with the rules." There is also a recommendation with reference to an application that was made for the privilege of copying manuscripts, or rather that they should be sent abroad for the purpose of being copied. With reference to that application, and to settle the matter generally, the Committee adopted the following rule:—

"That, while every facility be given to those who desire to copy manuscripts, under no circumstances are the latter to be removed from the Library."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I doubt whether that report which recommends the appropriation of money is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The report only asks the Government to recommend a certain sum of money. It does not appropriate any money.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is a resolution that the Government be asked to appropriate.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is the recommendation :—

"That the Government be requested to ask for an appropriation of $2,000 for the purpose of purchasing 300 copies"—

Motion agreed to, and Report concurred in.

SUSPENSION OF RULE.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved that the 51st Rule of this House be suspended in so far as it affects the petition of the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 131) to amend an Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WHITE. (Hastings). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the time of the House for five minutes, and I regret to do so at this stage of the Session, because I know that all members are anxious to get through with the business. In the Committee a few days ago I made a joke with an hon. gentleman, and I regret it. It is reported in the Montreal *Herald* as follows:—

"Mr. WHITE. They pay me for supporting Bills, and perhaps they do not think you worth paying."

Mr. Speaker, I do not care for the remarks made by the reporter in sending a report to the *Herald*, but the Montreal *Gazette* commented on it, and in addition to that there is a long editorial, and then the Hamilton *Times* said a little on the matter. I believe there was not a single member in the Committee on that day but was satisfied it was only a joke, and that I did not intend to hurt the feelings of the hon. gentleman; and I am sure that the members of this House will believe me when I say that, if there was a particle of truth in it, I would not repeat it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that all the members of the House—and I know it by the laughter with which they have accepted that remark—know that I am cunning enough not to make that open confession and acknowledgment. If I got any advantages from the Grand Trunk Railway or any other company I would know enough to keep my mouth shut. Now, Mr. Speaker, without solicitation from any party, I have received the following telegram :—

"MONTREAL, 31st March, 1884.

"To JOHN WHITE, M.P.

"Am confined to my house by sickness or would have written you Saturday. You certainly have never sought or received any compensation or consideration in any shape or manner whatsoever from this Company, either in connection with its legislation at Ottawa or any other account. Will send letter to-day.

"Yours truly,
"W. WAINRIGHT."

Now, the agent here in Ottawa sends the following :—

"OTTAWA, 31st March, 1884.

"To JOHN WHITE, Esq., M.P.

"DEAR SIR,—I beg to certify that I have known you about 14 years, that I have never known you to travel on a free pass, that you have always purchased tickets at this office, paying for them at the same rates as were charged to other members of Parliament.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
"A. H. TAYLOR,
"*Agent, G. T. R.*"

Mr. Speaker, I hope the *Herald* newspaper, or at least its reporter, will have the kindness to give this denial, and publish this short telegram and this short letter from the agent here in Ottawa, and that the Hamilton *Times*, and the Belleville *Ontario*, will do the same, as they are the only other papers that have referred to this matter. It has been said that I own a foundry, and my brother owns the other half, and that we have received favours from the Grand Trunk Railway; but I say positively from my seat in Parliament that neither directly nor indirectly has the Grand Trunk Railway Company ever carried one pound of freight for me without my paying the outside farthing for doing so. I have never, directly nor indirectly, received, nor have I been offered, from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or any other railway company, anything to promote or assist in any shape or manner any Bills before this honourable House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. gentleman, if he feels that I intended to hinder him at all, will accept my apology when I say that I did not intend to do it. I have been told that the hon. gentleman has a difficulty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Well, if he has it is not my business; that is the business of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and I have nothing to do with it. He has a perfect right to find fault with those who oppose their Bills. If there has been any business transaction between them, it is not my duty to interfere. I hope and trust that the hon. members of this House will accept this acknowledgment of the mistake I made, and that they will believe me when I state that the remark was only made by way of a joke. There were some members of the Committee close by me who have known me for a good many years. The hon. members for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) and Halton (Mr. McCraney) know me well. The hon. member for Huntingdon and myself entered this House together, if I mistake not, fourteen years ago; the hon. member for Halton has been in and out with me during that time. I was opposite them in the Committee, and I am satisfied those hon. gentlemen will bear me out in saying that I spoke by way of joke, and I regret I made the joke.

Mr. MITCHELL. Although I am the person pointed out by my hon. friend, and the person to whom the remark was made, I must say, that though his words were coupled with rather a slighting remark to myself at the time I was in the Committee, it affords me the greatest pleasure to know that the hon. gentleman spoke in joke. I thought, at the time that the remark was indiscreet, and I hoped the hon. gentleman would have corrected it after he made it; but even at this late day it affords me much pleasure to accept the explanation, and to know that there was no foundation whatever for the charge which has been based upon the remarks the hon. gentleman then made.

Mr. SCRIVER. As the hon. gentleman referred to me, I would simply, say that I was present at the meeting of Committee at which he made the remark to which he has referred, and I certainly understood it, as I believe every member of the Committee present on that occasion understood it, to have been made in a purely jocular sense.

PUBLIC BUSINESS—THE FACTORY BILL.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask whether the Government are in a position to say whether they intend to prosecute the Factory Bill this Session or not. I had supposed it would have been proceeded with early, as we have been told from day to day that it would be taken from day to day. It is a measure to which a good deal of interest attaches on the part of two classes, the manufacturers and the employés, and representations have been made upon it. I have no doubt many

hon. gentlemen have suggestions to make; I have myself received some five and twenty suggested amendments, and I would like to know whether it is intended to prosecute that measure or not; if so, I really think it ought to be proceeded with before the very last dying hours of the Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Finance, who has charge of that Bill, I regret to say, is not here to answer, but he will give an answer to-morrow.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 120) to amend the Weights and Measures Act of 1879.

Motion agreed to; and the House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. Hon. members who have this Bill will see that I have caused to be reprinted the suggested amendments that have been accepted.

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman I observe has fixed $10 as the minimum penalty. It is possible there may be cases in which weights have become light from wear and tear, and where no moral wrong was committed. Under such circumstances $10 would be a severe penalty.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Experience has shown that light penalties are inoperative, and it is because we found it necessary to increase the penalty that $10 was fixed as the minimum.

On section 4,

Mr. BLAKE. Why is the minimum penalty made $5, while the amount is $10 in the first clause. Under this clause it is not possible for a trader unconsciously to commit an offense, because he must be aware that the law requires all weights and measures to be stamped. The maximum penalty is, however, fixed at $50 instead of $25.

On section 5,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. Minister explain why he imposes a specific penalty of $40 for forging or counterfeiting stamps used under the Act. In the preceding section there is an elastic provision making the penalty not more than $50 and not less than $5. If the principle of having a fixed penalty is applicable in one case it is applicable in the other.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that we have adopted these fines from our experience of the working of the Act, and we have only amended them where amendments have been found necessary. We have not altered every clause of the Act, and I think we had better allow the section to stand as it is.

On section 7,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the proviso of this clause?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that any time I have attempted to introduce any Bill into this House, I have had more trouble to explain it to the hon. gentleman than any other member of this House. As to the proviso, it is simply, I suppose, because that the scales mentioned there cannot be inspected in any other way.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the meaning of the dormant scales mentioned here?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose they are scales which cannot be used until they are set up.

On section 10,

Mr. BLAKE. Has there been found some difficulty in recovering fees at present so as to render this special provision necessary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. It is understood, I see, to imprison a man if he does not pay fees. I can understand a man being imprisoned for not paying forfeitures or penalties, but it seems rather harsh at this time of day to put a man in gaol for not paying fees. I do not remember at the moment of another instance in which the non-payment of fees is punishable by imprisonment in the common gaol.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In that case I would consent to any amendment which would prevent its having that effect.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, then we had better have the amendment.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps as the only object of the amendment is to include these fees it would be as well to strike out the whole section.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HALL. I have been requested by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who is absent, to move that to the section 26, the following be added as a subsection:—

"Every hermetically sealed package of canned goods, such as fruit, vegetables, fish and the like, must have the exact weight of the contents of such tin, can, or package, legibly and permanently marked on it; and any packer or other person found guilty of selling such goods in any such tin or package, on which the weight of the contents is not represented as above specified or on which the weight is misrepresented, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than $2 for the first offence, and to a penalty of $10 for each subsequent offence, and to seizure and forfeiture of all such tins or packages found on his premises and not marked as hereby required."

Mr. COSTIGAN. Since the introduction of this Bill, I have received several communications, complaining of frauds in connection with the sale of canned fruit and vegetables, owing to cans professing to contain 3 lbs., actually containing only perhaps 2 or 2½ lbs., and cans professing to contain 2 lbs. containing perhaps only 1¼ lbs.; and it has been suggested, in order to meet such cases, that all hermetically sealed packages should contain as much as they profess, for the security of the public. I have no objection to accepting this amendment as clause 10 instead of the one which has been struck out.

Mr. VAIL. Will this provision be confined to goods sold in the country, or will it apply to goods shipped out of the country? It might very seriously affect our export trade in the Lower Provinces, and it should be carefully considered.

Mr. BLAKE. And would the hon. gentleman say whether or not these complaints have been made with reference to home manufactured goods, or to imported goods?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the complaints are more on account of imported goods than the home manufactured.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the home manufacturers who are making the complaints?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the complaints come from persons who are not interested in the manufacture of these goods at all. If the clause should affect goods for exportation, the wording of it might be changed.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman had better not include in the operation of the clause goods for exportation without careful consideration. It would no doubt increase the price of the goods, and as long as the foreign country to which they are sent does not complain, perhaps we had better leave the export trade as free as we can; not that we want to send out false weights, but if there is no weight marked on the cans at all, we had better leave the municipal legislation in the foreign country to regulate the matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The clause might be amended by adding the words, "not to affect such goods for exportation."

Mr. BLAKE. There is just this point that occurs to me at the moment. If there is to be a very minute weighing, it may add considerably to the cost of the article. In the case of many of these hermetically sealed goods I believe it is quite impossible to fill the vessel quite full. The goods are boiled, and a vacuum is created on their cooling. It is impossible, I suppose, to arrange with mathematical accuracy for the precise amount of vacant space. It may, therefore, be impossible to predict the precise weight, to ounces or fractions of ounces, the quantity these small vessels would contain, and unless some margin of an ounce or two were left, the cost of the goods might be increased.

Mr. SPROULE. These goods are usually put up in half pound and pound cans, and so on; and are bought as so many half pound or pound or four pound cans. As they are put up now, they are put up on that principle and are supposed to contain a definite quantity. It would be an advantage to the public to know that they were guaranteed the amount in the can when they bought it for a certain weight.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should be sorry to see any alterations in this clause which would render it inapplicable to the export trade. The alteration proposed is simply this, that we should insist on full and correct measure being given to our own people, but be free, if so inclined, to injure the foreign purchaser. The effect of such a course is evident from the English trade with China, where English goods have been almost driven out of the market in consequence of the untrue, to use the least offensive word, marks on goods to China.

Mr. DAVIES. There is not much danger of fraud in this matter. In the articles of lobster and canned goods, the cans are made of certain sizes supposed to hold one pound or two pounds, or other definite weight, and it is in the interest of the manufacturer himself that the cans should be filled up, because they are put into a boiler and boiled, having a safety valve for the steam to escape, and are afterwards hermetically sealed, so that the manufacturers cannot half fill the can. If this section be enacted, you cannot have a regular stamp to put on the cans because some cans will weigh an ounce more or less than others, and each can, therefore, will have to be weighed and stamped. I do not think the hon. member can give any instance of fraud having been committed with respect to these canned meats, lobster or salmon. The manufacturers are compelled to fill the can right up before boiling, and the cans are marked approximately, as near the weight as possible.

Mr. HALL. Although the motion in amendment is not originally my own, I can state there is great abuse in this respect, certainly as regards canned vegetables which are palmed on the public as half pound or pound tins and often contain very much less than the professed quantity. There can be no difficulty about the amendment. It will only oblige parties canning these goods to exercise more caution in filling the cans, and it is better the cans should be in excess of the weight, and the price raised, than that the public should be compelled to take them at much less than their professed weight. The material is comparatively inexpensive, particularly in the case of vegetables, and the manufacturers will only be put to the trouble of making certain that the quantity that they put in will, after evaporation takes place, give the full weight.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think there will be much difficulty in carrying this out. It will be easy to ascertain the weight of the packages which are made of certain regular sizes, and the dealers in foreign markets will have more confidence in trading with this country when they know to a certainty they will receive the full measure as stamped on the packages.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman can point to any case in which complaint was made in the foreign market that our fish or meats, shipped in hermetically sealed cans, were short in weight. I have had experience here and in London, and know that complaints have been made in regard to salmon, mackerel and lobsters, but I never heard any complaint of their being short in weight. I would suggest that as these complaints are limited to vegetables and fruits, this amendment should be confined to these articles. This canned fish and canned meat business is a ticklish one, already sufficiently handicapped, and if you add on anything which will make it more expensive, great dissatisfaction will be caused. This amendment calls for the exact weight, but it is impossible to get exact weight.

Mr. McLELAN. I have frequently heard complaints that fish exported was deficient in weight. In Nova Scotia that complaint is frequently heard from the foreign ports, and a remedy was adopted in a particular locality by appointing inspectors under the Act to strictly inspect all the fish exported, so that the exact weight marked on each barrel was contained in it. By that means, the standard was raised of the fish in the locality to which I refer. If we have the reputation now of keeping up the weights in cans, it is desirable that we should maintain that reputation and thus hold the market.

Mr. VAIL. There is a great difference between barrels of fish and canned fish. 200 lbs. put in a barrel can be easily weighed, but in case of canned goods a certain allowance must be made for the weight they will lose in the process of canning, and you cannot calculate the weight to a few ounces. Should this clause be enacted, our shippers of canned fish will be in a very different position from the American shippers with whom we have to compete, and a considerable time must elapse before the fact is established that our cans contain the amount professed.

Mr. WELDON. The salmon are put whole in barrels Very few salmon will fill a barrel, and they are put in after being salted. With regard to the canned fish, we know that it is immediately after the fish are caught, and on the fishing grounds, that they put them in cans and hermetically seal them. The cans are all made during the winter, and they are made pretty nearly the size—one pound cans and two pound cans, and it would be utterly impossible to carry out the provision to make them the exact weight. I agree with my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that the canning business is sufficiently handicapped without having this additional burden put upon it.

Mr. DAVIES. Strike out the word "exact." The definition of that would be down to the fraction of an ounce, and it is impossible in these large canning establishments to carry that out.

Mr. BLAKE. A man would not be safe if he put in more than the weight.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Make it "not less than."

Mr. WELDON. I would suggest that this had better stand over to be printed, and then it can be added at the third reading. If is a very important matter to the canning industry, which is a very important industry in the Lower Provinces.

Bill, as amended, reported.

PUBLIC ANALYSTS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may cause such remuneration as he deems proper to be paid to the Analysts appointed under the Bill now before the House for the prevention of Adulteration of Food and Drugs, and such remuneration, whether by fees or salary, or in part by both, may be paid to them out of any sums voted by Parliament for the purposes of the said Bill.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. The analysts, so far, have been paid at the rate of $300 as a fixed amount from the fund, and that has been supplemented by fees of from $5 to $8 on samples. We do not propose to change that, but we propose to employ a chief analyst, who will be attached to the Department in Ottawa, and will have a larger salary than the others. It is not proposed to give him more than $2,000 or $2,400. Of course he will need to be a gentleman of superior education.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he to have fees too?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not as chief analyst of the Department

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me it would have been more convenient for the House if the hon. gentleman had spread upon this Resolution that he is going to create a new public officer, with a salary of $2,000 or $2,400. That should have been so stated, and the hon. gentleman should have asked for authority for that. At the present, the only authority he takes is authority to employ such an analyst as he thinks proper, and to pay him such prices as he thinks right. As long as the hon. gentleman stated that he was not about to alter the Act in such a way as to increase the burden on the Treasury, the Resolution did not seem to be of much consequence; but if it is to result in a new officer being created, with a substantial salary of this kind, he ought to have that spread upon the paper and so have it confirmed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think it is taking a hasty step at all. The Civil Service Act provides for new appointments.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say it was a hasty step. I was simply showing that the financial proposition—and we are not in Committee discussing the financial proposition—ought to be stated in such a manner that the House can intelligently deal with it. But a simple proposition that the Government may appoint whom they please and pay them what they please is no practical solution of the question. Is this gentleman to have $2,000, or $2,400, and to be an officer of the Department? Is he to travel about at all and analyze elsewhere, or are samples to be sent from various places here to him for analysis? What is the precise scope of his functions?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As chief analyst his duties will be confined to his office here. We have analysts in all the large centres throughout the Dominion, and the system may be extended. They are paid a sum which cannot be exceeded by the money at our disposal. I do not think this chief analyst will be appointed this present year at all, but this is only to provide for his appointment. The Resolution provides that if appointed, he shall be paid out of money voted by Parliament for that purpose. As to the duties of the officer, he will not be expected to travel through the country. His duties will be performed here in Ottawa. In cases of appeal from analysts all over the country, they may refer to him, and he will guide and advise them in reference to their duties.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then he is not to analyze anything himself?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He may be analyst in a local capacity; for instance, in the district of Ottawa he will perform the duties of an analyst, and besides that he will be chief analyst over the others.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman says he will be an authority to appeal to. Suppose the analyst in Toronto for analysing food or drinks, wishes to appeal to the chief analyst; are the specimens to be sent down here or is he to go up there?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The specimens will be sent here.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then what is the use of an analyst at Toronto at all if the specimens are to be sent here? There is nothing in the Resolution respecting the number of analysts the Government may appoint, nor as to their location, nor as to their duties.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The appointment of the chief analyst is the only question we are discussing now. Objection is taken that we are to create a new officer a chief analyst.

Mr. BLAKE. The clause is not confined to appropriating money for the appointment of a chief analyst; it extends the appointment to subordinate officers. It provides that the Government shall have power to appoint any number of analysts at any salaries they please.

Resolution to be reported.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No 114) for the prevention of the Aduteration of Food and Drugs.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a point of order. This Bill contains a certain money clause; it is not in order in containing this clause. Under the English Parliamentary practice as under ours, any clause appropriating money must be introduced in the mode prescribed by the Rules of the House. Rule 88 of this House says:

"If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House shall think fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereupon."

This Bill is, of course, in order as a Bill. It was not necessary that there should be a preliminary Committee if the money clause had not been made a part of the Bill; but the money clause being made part of the Bill it seems to be quite obvious that the steps which the hon. gentleman has taken in moving to introduce the Bill, in reading it the first time and the second time, there have been proceedings taken, votes and resolutions passed with respect to charges on the people otherwise than according to the forms of the House. The precedent to which I wish to direct your attention Mr. Speaker, and which seems to be quite conclusive, occurred on 14th March, 1878, and is reported in the English *Hansard* as follows:—

"Mr. MONK rose in pursuance of the notice he had given to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman in the Chair to a point of order. On the 5th March, when the right hon. member, Sir Rolland Blenner-

hassett, obtained leave to introduce a Bill for the purchase of Irish railways, he, Mr. Monk, submitted to the judgment of the Speaker whether the hon. gentleman should not have proceeded in Committee of the Whole House, and the decision of the Chair was that the question could not be solved until the Bill was before the House. He found now from a copy of the Bill that it contemplated the purchase of the Irish railways at a very considerable expense to this country. According to the standing order of this House with respect to the application of public money it appeared that this House would receive no petition for any sum relating to public service or proceed upon motion for charge upon the public expenditure whether out of the consolidated fund or out of moneys to be provided by Parliament unless a consent or recommendation was received from the Crown. And accordingly if any motion was made in the House for any aid from the public revenue whether out of the consolidated fund or out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, the consideration and debate thereon should not be presently entered upon, but should be adjourned until such further day as the House should think fit, and should then be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any vote could pass thereon. Now we submit it to the judgment of the right hon. gentleman in the Chair that the hon. member for Galway had taken neither the one course nor the other; he had neither moved in a Commitee of the Whole House nor did he produce any evidence of the consent of the Crown for any prospective grant of public money for the purchase of the Irish railways. In looking at the Bill it appeared that a certain number of clauses were in italics or in blank as it is called and if the House went into a Committee on this Bill those clauses would be invisible to the eye of Chairman of Committees. But in the Bill it was stated that it was expedient that the Board of Trade should be empowered to acquire work and maintain these railways in Ireland. He was aware that there was an apparent precedent. In 1874 Lord George Bentinck obtained leave to bring in a Bill to stimulate the prompt and profitable employment of the people by the encouragement of railways in Ireland, and that Bill contained no fewer than eighteen clauses printed in italics, or in other words, blank clauses, authorizing the advancement of £16,000,000 sterling for the purposes of the Bill. He had not been able to find any decision by the Speaker of that day as to the propriety of the Bill being brought in otherwise than in a Committee of the Whole. Lord John Russell said he should not oppose the introduction of the Bill, and then went on to say, 'I understand from the Speaker that in point of form no objection exists to its introduction, provided it does not introduce those money clauses which would require a previous Committee' That no doubt was apparently a precedent in point; but then the Bill was brought in under the standing orders of 1847 which differed materially from the standing orders of 1872. In 1847 it was not requisite that any motion for public money should previously receive the consent or recommendation of the Crown. But in 1852 a standing order to that effect was passed, and subsequently in 1856 his right hon. friend the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Ayrton) moved the two standing orders which now regulate the proceedings of the House. The motion of his right hon. friend was passed with the unanimous consent of the House, and rendered more stringent the rules with regard to money bills. The standing orders then adopted not only imposed a restriction upon members of Parliament bringing in money bills, but also on their bringing in bills which contemplated a future application to Parliament for grants of public moneys. He submitted therefore the judgment of the right hon. gentleman in the Chair that the hon. member for Galway was not in order in obtaining leave to bring in the Bill, and, subject to that judgment, he would move that the orders of the 5th instant relating to a Bill for the purchase of Irish railways be read and discharged.

"Mr. SPEAKER. In answer to the question of the hon. member, I will endeavour to explain the practice of the House in connection with the Standing Orders to which he has now called attention. Whenever a Bill is introduced by which it is intended to authorize a charge upon the public revenues, it is the practice, as he has stated, to print the money clauses in italics. Such clauses form no part of the Bill as originally brought in. They are treated as blanks. Before any sanction is given to them the Queen's recommendation must be signified, and a Committee of the Whole House consider on a future day the resolution authorizing the charge. Unless these proceedings are taken the Chairman under the Standing Orders will pass over the money clauses without any question. Without such preliminary proceedings the Bill so far as the public money is concerned, is entirely inoperative. The hon. member has called attention to a precedent of a Bill proposed in 1847 for encouraging the construction of railways in Ireland. That no doubt is a precedent in point, to which I will not further advert, as the hon. gentleman has brought it under the notice of the House. But there is another precedent of a very remarkable kind to which I wish to call attention. In 1868 a Bill was introduced to enable the Postmaster General to acquire, work and maintain the electric telegraphs. The clause declaring that the moneys were to be provided by Parliament was printed in italics; and it was not until after the Bill had been read a second time and considered by a Select Committee that a resolution was come to, in a Comittee of the Whole House, authorizing the application of public moneys for the purposes of the Bill. It is for the House and not for me to determine as to the expediency of allowing such a Bill as that to which the hon. member has called attention, to be introduced. The Bill is now before the House, and having regard to the precedents I have quoted, I feel myself bound by usage and precedent to hold that there has been no infraction of the standing orders or the rules of the House."

The whole theory on which such Bills are introduced is, that for the convenience of the House these clauses, to which it is hoped the consent of the House may be obtained, shall be in them but not of them; they are introduced in italics or blank and are considered as not forming any part of the Bill whatever. The House is thus informed of what the hope of the hon. member who introduced the Bill is as to that which will subsequently be inserted in the Bill; but this is merely done for convenience. Why are these clauses introduced in italics or in blank as the phrase of Mr. Speaker is? It is because to introduce them otherwise than in italics or blank would be to provide and to create a charge on the people otherwise than according to the standing rules of Parliament. It is because there may be full opportunity afforded to criticise the proposals that it is provided that a preliminary consideration in Committee shall be necessary. Here you find a Bill which contains these provisions, and which containing them, not in italics, not in brackets, but as an essential part of the Bill, has been read in the ordinary way, on the motion of the hon. gentleman —read the first time, and read the second time, and has not yet gone into the Committee. I am not saying that the Bill should have been initiated by resolution in Committee. There is great latitude on that subject. I suppose the true rule is that when the main object of a Bill, or the proceeding, is a money grant you should initiate it by Committee; but with reference to matters of administration, or anything else, it is not necessary, though it may be possible, though it may not be improper; but in either case unless you have a Committee, and the money clause sanctioned by the Committee in the first place, you cannot get all the Bill and the money clauses. Now, here we have a case in which the hon. gentleman has introduced as part of his Bill a money clause. The hon. gentleman has moved the first reading of the Bill, and it has been carried; he has moved the second reading, and it has been carried; and we have therefore a case in which the result of a vote of the House has been got as to the charge without the preliminary Committee, and if attention had not been called to it I dare say the Bill would have gone through the Committee without that course which is necessary to make the proceeding regular. I submit, therefore, that this money clause is part of the Bill, that the Bill is not regular, inasmuch as no money clause can be regularly introduced into this Bill in this way and under these circumstances, and that the two votes, the vote on the first reading and the vote on the second reading, were taken without any preliminary Committee to authorize it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course if the main object of a Bill is the granting of money, as in the case of the purchase of telegraph lines, and the other Bill which the hon. gentleman mentioned, then of course the Bill must be initiated by resolution, the royal assent must be obtained and the resolutions concurred in in Committee upon which to found the Bill. But when the main object of the Bill is not a grant of money, although there may be an incidental expenditure of public money, it has always been the practice of the Canadian Parliament to introduce these incidental clauses as part of the Bill, and the fact that the Bill is usually printed in blank is merely a practice we have adopted, nothing more. Now, in looking at the British North America Act you will find that the 54th clause only requires that no Bill for the appropriation of public money shall pass unless the assent of the Crown is first obtained, and until the resolutions upon which it is founded, are considered in Committee. The 88th rule provides that no regulation or vote for public aid shall pass until it is first referred to Committee of the Whole. Well, Sir, this is a mere technical form; the printing of a clause in italics, cannot in any way affect the Bill, especially against our uniform practice. This Bill, without reference to its money clause, can be brought to the stage when the House is called upon to deal with it, and the

House can pass the money clauses supported by the resolutions which have been referred to the Committee on the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman when he says it has been our uniform practice. I agree with him—I stated myself the general practice as to the mode in which it should commence according to the object of the Bill, but I maintain that, in many cases, and I presume the practice is—when the proceeding is initiated by Bill in which it was intended to insert a money clause, this clause is either in brackets or italics. That has been our practice; it is the rule of the English Parliament; though I do not say that there may not have been occasions upon which that practice may have been inadvertently departed from; but I think the hon. gentleman is inaccurate in saying that our invariable practice is to introduce these clauses as part of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have seen cases of clauses introduced in italics, but I think the general practice has been as I have stated.

Mr. BLAKE. I have this to say, that the reason why these clauses are introduced in italics or brackets is simply because of this wholesome fundamental rule to which I have referred, that we cannot have a money vote or a charge on the people except under the 88th rule, which is the same as the English rule. Convenience is consulted by the clauses appearing in a particular way in the Bill, so that you can read them, but the fundamental rule, which is more important than convenience, is observed by their being so placed in the Bill, whether in brackets or italics, that they do not form part of the Bill. In this case we have proceeded with reference to a motion for a charge upon the people without that adjournment to a preliminary Committee which is a salutory provision against hasty and unadvised charges upon the people.

Mr. CARON. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that last Session the Militia Bill was, brought down exactly as this Bill has been brought down and the practice which is being followed to-day was followed with regard to that Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order taken by the hon. gentleman, as I understand, is not that the Bill should have originated altogether in Committee, the main object of the Bill not being a charge on the people, but, that there is a money clause in the Bill, which, the hon. gentleman contends, is inseparably connected with the Bill, and therefore the Bill should drop, it having been erroneously brought to this stage. The practice and the rule unquestionably require that the money clauses should be considered in Committee of the Whole, and the practice is, that to accomplish this object, without any violation of the Standing Orders, the money clauses are originally introduced in the Bill in italics. The hon. gentleman has referred to a decision given by Speaker Brand, where, he says, these clauses were printed in italics and did not form any part of the Bill, and that the Chairman must pass them by, unless they are first passed in Committee of the Whole, and referred to the Committee on the Bill. Now it seems to me that to say that because these clauses are not printed in italics they should be considered as affecting the whole Bill, would be to allow the printer to cast the whole Bill, and that therefore whether they appear in one kind of type or another, cannot make any difference, whether these amendments are in one kind of type or another can make no difference. I think these clauses are not part of the Bill, and if they came before the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, whether printed in italics or not, he should pass them by, unless they have been passed by a preliminary Committee and referred to the Committee on the Bill. I think this is the object: they are only printed in italics to direct the attention of the Chairman and the House to the fact that they are money clauses. I think I am borne out in this contention by the decision given by Speaker Denison in a similar case, in which the discussion was upon the Metropolis Local Management Act Amendment Bill:—

"This Bill was moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Speaker was about to propose the question, when an objection was taken by Mr. Roebuck that the right hon. gentleman ought to have begun by moving the Speaker out of the Chair, and then have introduced a resolution in Committee authorizing the introduction of such a Bill. This point being discussed, and it appeared that although the appeal was to local resources, a main feature of the Bill was the guarantee on the part of the country of principal and interest of any money raised by the Metropolitan Board of Works. Mr. Speaker said:—'Unquestionably if its main feature is the guarantee of money raised by loan, it may reach taxation, and the proper form of proceeding would then be by way of resolution in Committee of the whole House.' Mr. Speaker subsequently said—'I have not the leest doubt of the power of the right hon. gentleman to introduce the Bill, and if the clauses referring to the raising of the money were guarded by being passed through a preliminary Committee of the Whole House, all that is required by the forms of the House will be accomplished.'"

Mr. BLAKE. A preliminary Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. A preliminary Committee. Therefore, I think these clauses ought not to be considered as part of the Bill, and the Chairman of the Committee should pass them by without considering them. It is desirable that they should be printed in italics, in order to call the attention of the Chairman and of the House to the fact that they are money clauses. But I do not think we ought to allow the printer by using one kind of type or another, to cast a Bill, but, as Mr. Speaker Brand said, they are not part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2, sub-section 2, (*a*)

Mr. BLAKE. As this clause reads, it is impossible to comply with it, because it speaks of drugs being sold by a name recognized in the British or United States Pharmacopœia, and differing from the standard of strength or purity laid down therein. An article may have a name recognized in both countries, but a different standard.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It may agree with either one or the other.

Mr. BLAKE. If the standards differ in any respect, you will be imposing an impossible condition on the drug vendor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause might be changed by making it read, "the standard laid down in either."

Mr. BLAKE. In the first paragraph of (*a*) of the same any difference from the standard is fatal; the second paragraph requires a material difference to be fatal. I do not see why the two sub-sections should not be the same in that respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the word "materially" ought to be out.

Mr. MILLS. The effect of the clause will be to prevent any improvement in the manufacture of a drug. A scientific druggist might be prepared to make material improvements in the production of an article, and the hon. gentleman proposes to make it an offence to make a better article than that indicated in the Pharmacopœia.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This only applies when it is sold by a particular name. If a druggist makes an

improvement, all he has to do is to put on the phial a special name.

Mr. MILLS. Take the manufacture of quinine, almost every different establishment produces a different article through its own way of manufacturing. The improvements in its manufacture would, according to the view of the hon. gentleman, necessitate a change in the name.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what is done at present, because as soon as they change the chemical constituents they change the name; that is required to be done to make it intelligent to the profession. Proof spirit, for instance, are equal parts of spirits and water, but it is made above proof or below proof and sold under another name.

Mr. BLAKE. On the top of page two, the first sub-section is as follows:—

"If any substance has been mixed with it, so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality and strength."

This would extend to the admixture of chickory in coffee.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is qualified by (*c*) in sub-section 2.

Mr. BLAKE. No, because chickory is not required for the production or preparation of coffee as an article of commerce in a state fit for carriage or consumption.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order to make a coffee suited to British palates, it may be necessary to mix chickory with it, and in this way it is made an article of commerce.

On section 3,

Mr. BLAKE. How many analysts are supposed to be appointed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have analysts now in most of the chief cities, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax and London, and we will need but two or three more.

Mr. MILLS. The whole Bill should be allowed to stand over. I am rather surprised that the colleagues of the hon. gentleman from Quebec, should agree to a measure of this sort, for if there has been any measure before the House this Session which has attacked Provincial rights, this measure is of that character. What is the hon. gentleman proposing to do? He is proposing by this Bill to regulate the diet of the population; he is proposing to interfere with police regulations. Now, matters of this sort—adulteration of food, the selling of bread of light weight, everything of that sort—have been regarded as a matter of police regulation, and, when we look at the English law on the subject, we find this was regarded as a municipal or police power, and the hon. gentleman is proposing to deal here with a question that comes more clearly within the rule of civil rights, than perhaps any other that has been brought under the attention of this Legislature. I find it is stated by Mr. Cooley, in referring to this class of question, that they belong to the municipal or police power of the Government, and they embrace every relation in the state of society relating to private life. The hon. gentleman might just as well undertake to regulate domestic matters, to say when a child should attain his majority, to say how property shall be inherited or transferred, as to say how property shall be disposed of in a local market. This is not a regulation of trade within the meaning of the Constitution. We know those words have been interpreted both by the Supreme Court of the United States and, under our own Constitution, by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; we know that they have said, that the regulation of trade relates to larger questions than this particular class. The Privy Council in one case said, that the Articles of Union between England and Scotland provided that the regulation of trade should be uniform in the two countries, and yet they point out that there are local distinctions, because these do not come within the general definition of a regulation of trade. This is a regulation of a civil right; it is interfering with the rights of the Provinces, and the hon. gentleman might just as well take charge of all these municipal and local affairs in every town and city of the Dominion, as undertake to deal with this particular question. It is not part of the criminal law, otherwise we could embrace everything, the whole field of legislation, by simply declaring that this or that particular violation of some rule or provision is in itself a crime. I think it is perfectly obvious that, in dealing with this subject, the hon. gentleman is dealing with a matter of civil rights that pertains to the Provinces and ought never to be brought under the attention of this Legislature. We may go on making encroachments upon the Local Legislatures in this way indefinitely; we may undertake by piecemeal to deprive them of those rights and those powers which by the Constitution have been given them. That seems to be the policy that is adopted at the present time. We have several Bills before us, all dealing with questions of this sort, all undertaking, under some pretext or other, to grasp powers that do not belong to this Parliament, but belong to the Local Legislatures, who are much more competent to deal with them and who ought to be allowed to exercise in their own way the powers which are vested in them by the Constitution. It is clear that we have not the power or the right to do what it is proposed that we shall do by this particular Bill.

Mr. BERGIN. Is not adulteration of food and of drugs an offence against the person, an offence against society at large? Is not the result of the adulteration of food and the adulteration of drugs, such as to imperil the life of the individual, who use that food or those drugs, and is it not a crime therefore, and ought not the Government to take such powers as would enable them to discover crime? I really cannot see that there is any force in the argument adduced by the hon. member for Bothwell. I do not believe it is the intention of the Federal Government to be infringing constantly, as the hon. member insinuates, upon the rights of the Provinces. I am sure that he is quite mistaken in supposing that this clause of this proposed Act will have that effect. I am ready to admit that the Local Legislatures could very well pass such an Act as this, but, when they neglect to do it, and it is a matter which involves crime, I think this Parliament ought to attend to it.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman's statement were correct with reference to so much of this Bill as may deal with procedure which is injurious to health—a point which is open to a good deal of discussion—I would point out to him that the Bill goes much further than that. If he will look at the 27th clause, he will find an express provision indicating that the Bill does go further. Sub-section (*a*) of that clause provides that, "if such adulteration is deemed to be within the meaning of this Act injurious to health," certain penalties follow and sub-section (*b*) provides that; "if such adulteration is not deemed to be injurious to health," certain other penalties follow. That proves to the hon. gentleman that indeed it was not necessary to cite it to prove to him, because it is proved by many other clauses of the Bill, that it is not based upon any assumed power directed to the preservation of the life of the community in respect of drugs and of food used, which may be injurious to the health. I will give him another instance. I do not suppose it is injurious to drink skimmed milk, but the Bill deals with that. It is no doubt a very wrong and a very immoral practice to sell skimmed milk as unskimmed, but it does not hurt you; and yet the Bill provides a penalty for it, unless you put on the can, in letters so long, it is skimmed, and the skimmed article is asked for. I must say also that, when the hon. gentleman considers that the Local Legislatures could pass the Bill, and that we ought to pass it because they have

neglected their duty in that respect, he would in fact invoke an assumed jurisdiction on our part in every case in which a Local Legislature did, as he thinks, neglect its duty. The proper course for him and for myself, as citizens of the Province of Ontario, is to use our franchise and our influence to compel the Local Legislature to do its duty within the sphere of its jurisdiction. but not to say: "You have neglected your duty, and we will pass you by; we will not force you to do it, but we will pass you by, and we will do it here." Else you may find, under that view, a very large and extensive area of jurisdiction assumed here and taken away from the Local Legislature.

Mr. BERGIN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman hardly meets the case as I have put it. I quite admit that skimmed milk may not positively be poisonous, but I think he will admit that it would be a geat deal better if it had the proper quantity of cream with it, if it had not been skimmed.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. BERGIN. And I think the hon. gentleman's argument as regards Ontario possesses a good deal of the skimmed milk quality.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member for Bothwell has been good enough to call the attention of Quebec members to the assumed encroachment of the Federal upon the Local Parliament. But, if my memory serves me well, I think the basis upon which that Bill is created was admitted by the former Government, of which he was a part. I remember that an inspector of food and all those things that are sold in the groceries was appointed by the Liberal Government some years ago, and that we have had the report of that inspector every year distributed among the members. So, if we have no authority to go into the shops and investigate, I do not know that we were right then to do what we are trying to do now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Bill is not one for the protection of the public health, but it is to prevent adulterated articles being sent from one Province to another, or from Canada, as a whole, to a foreign country. Beyond doubt it will come within the category that the hon. gentleman alludes to. As to the skim-milk question, I fancy if the hon. gentleman will look at the law in England he will find that it is considered one of the most serious offences against infants and children in England to pass off milk with too much water in it, and it is treated as a grave offence. A milk-and-water diet does not nourish, but it rather starves, and the mothers and the poor children who think they are getting the pure article sometimes get quite a different thing. Chalk and water, for instance, have been very extensively used to adulterate milk, the mixture containing, perhaps, a very little sprinkling of milk. Such adulteration is considered to be an offence, not only against morals and society, but an offence of the character of a crime. It is not enough to limit proscription to adulterated articles that won't poison, that won't kill, but we must include articles unwholesome in themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. I didn't say adulterated; I spoke simply of skim milk.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS. Before the Committee rose at six o'clock I was setting forth some objections that seemed to me to lie against this measure, on the ground of our jurisdiction. One hon gentleman said that I referred in particular to the members for the Province of Quebec. Well, Sir, my reason for doing that was that by the British North America Act, with the general consent of Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, while this Parliament was given jurisdiction to deal with questions of property and civil rights, Quebec was specially protected under that provision of the Constitution. But I specially directed the attention of the hon. members of the Province of Quebec to this matter in order to point out that although they were protected by the Constitution against having the subjects of property and civil rights transferred to the Parliament of Canada, yet by legislation of this sort, by acquiescing in legislation beyond our jurisdiction, the courts would ultimately recognize a course of legislation that was long acquiesced in. This is done in the United States. We know there that where Congress has undertaken to legislate upon a subject that was supposed to lie within the jurisdiction of the States, and the action of Congress has long been acquiesced in, the courts refused to consider the question and to deal with it as if it were raised immediately after such legislation was had. There is no doubt the same rule would prevail here. If the Parliament of Canada should for a series of years legislate upon subjects of this sort and the Legislatures of the Provinces acquiesced in it, and the usurped authority was never brought before the courts, there is no doubt whatever that a court would be reluctant to disturb such legislation. Now I deny altogether the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) that the Local Legislature, by neglecting to legislate upon a subject in the public interest, loses its right to deal with that particular subject, or by its negligence could transfer to this House a jurisdiction of which it was not seized under the provisions of the Constitution. When we look at the provisions of this Act we find that it comes within the ordinary municipal and police law. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill could not pretend to say that he is legislating on the subject of crime. He is not dealing with a branch of the criminal law. We cannot in this House give ourselves jurisdiction over a subject by declaring something done under it to be a crime, and thus to deal with the whole subject on any such ground; otherwise, we might usurp a large field of legislation that does not belong to us. In the British North America Act, section 92, we find this sub-section:

"The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within the class of subjects enumerated in this section, shall be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province."

Now, so far as any offence against this law is made a punishable offence, it is not under the criminal law but under a mere police or municipal regulation. We are dealing with a subject that belongs to the Local Legislature and to which, under that particular provision of the Constitution, they have the power to attach any punishment they think proper, in the form of fine or imprisonment. This matter is referred to in a judgement by Mr. Justice Strong in the case of Severn against the Queen. In that case he says:

"The Provincial Legislatures possess authority to legislate in the exercise of what American authorities have conveniently termed the police power—meaning a power to legislate respecting ferries, markets, fares to be charged for vehicles let for hire, the regulation of the retail sale of spirits and liquors, and on a number of other cognate, but indefinite subjects, which, in all countries where the English municipal system or anything resembling it prevails, have been generally regarded and dealt with as subjects of municipal legislation."

Now, this case is a matter of exactly the same sort. When we look at section 6 of this Bill, we find that the Council of any city, town, county, or village, can appoint one or more Inspectors of food and drink. The hon. gentleman proposes here to confer power upon whom? Why, upon the Council of a town or city. Is the Council of a town or city a body created by the Legislature, and deriving its functions from powers given by this Legislature? Not at all. The hon. gentleman in doing this is giving a power which is a usual thing to give to Councils.

This is a power usually invested in them, and which is vested in every Province of the Dominion. It has been recognized as such and the municipal law governed these questions before Confederation existed. I have here a small work by Justice Cooley, in which he deals with the question of civil rights, as they have been recognized by a series of decisions extending over centuries, rendered by the English common law courts. We find embraced in civil rights, religious liberty, civil liberty and political liberty, the police power and other matters. With respect to these powers, Justice Cooley says:

"The authority to establish for the intercourse of the several members of the body politic with each other those rules of good conduct and good neighborhood which are calculated to prevent a conflict of rights and to ensure to each the uninterrupted enjoyment of his own, so far as is reasonably consistent with a corresponding enjoyment by others, is usually spoken of as the authority or power of police."

That is precisely what this measure proposes to deal with. The regulation of trade has never been held by any court in England, so far as I know, to be a regulation of the morals of trade. That is a municipal regulation, not embraced by the definition, regulation of trade, but under the phrase civil rights. The hon. gentleman by this Bill does not propose to regulate trade in the sense in which that expression is used in our Constitution, but he does propose to regulate trade by police regulations, as in the sense in which that expression is used in the municipal law in this country and in England. It is perfectly clear, then, that the hon. gentleman in proposing this Bill is proposing a serious inroad into the rights of the various Provinces. I think there would be no difficulty, if we were to examine the provisions of this Bill, to show that a large part of the powers possessed by the Local Legislatures would be taken away by it. It is not a question simply of convenience; it is not a question as to which Government or Legislature could deal with the question most efficiently. We are bound to keep in view this fact: that if we denude the Local Legislatures of so much of their power as to seriously diminish their influence, able and competent men will no longer seek to become members of the Provincial Legislatures. It cannot be in the interest of this Parliament or the public at large to make such encroachments on the rights and powers of the Local Legislatures as would impair their usefulness and prevent able and capable men from seeking election and taking part in Provincial affairs. Let me call the attention of the Minister in charge of this Bill to section 8. That section is as follows:—

"If the person having such articles in his possession, or his agent or servant, refuses or fails to admit the officer, or refuses or omits to show all or any of the said articles in his possession, or the place where any such articles are stored, or to permit the officer to inspect the same, or to give any samples thereof, or to furnish the officer with such light or assistance as he requires, when required so to do in pursuance of this Act, he shall be liable to the same penalty as if he knowingly sold or exposed for sale adulterated articles."

This is an attack on legislation in regard to civil rights. I do not say that this Parliament might not deal incidentally with the question of civil rights, where it was necessary to the exercise of a power; but this Bill, from the beginning to the end, deals with nothing else. If the Government have power to legislate on this subject, they have power to regulate market fees, to make police regulations for the sale of the ordinary articles brought into market, to regulate the sale of goods on the shelves of every shop, to deal with all those matters, as matters of bargain and sale, which have been recognized heretofore as subjects for police or municipal regulations. The subject of trade and commerce has nothing to do with manufactures. This has been held by the English courts. The manufacture of a particular article, whether it is of an inferior or superior class, does not differ from the growth of an article. You can no more regulate the manufacture of drugs or any other class of articles than you can deal with the growth of a particular article. In all these cases you are dealing with property and the rights of property, as incident to property, and not making any regulation respecting trade. A similar question was dealt with in a recent decision given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, relating to the Sixth Article of Union between England and Scotland. There is in those articles a declaration that the regulation of trade throughout the United Kingdom shall be uniform, yet the Judicial Committee observed that it had never been held to bind the Parliament of the United Kingdom to make the same local regulations for trade in Scotland as in England, because those local regulations are held to be police laws and not to relate to trade and commerce. The definition given to the words in the British North America Act is similar to that given in in relation to trade and commerce in this article of the Union. I do not propose to discuss this question of jurisdiction further at this moment. The same power which the Government claim under the provisions of this Bill would enable them to determine what the status of every professional man in the country should be; to determine on what terms licenses should be granted to practice the medical profession; on what terms license should be granted to act as a chemist or druggist. The Government might, on the same ground, undertake to regulate every profession in the country. It is perfectly obvious that any such attempt at regulation would be an interference with the civil rights of individuals; and they are equally interfering with the civil rights of parties by the provisions contained in this Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The House will be a little surprised at the speech delivered by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which would have been more consistent if delivered in 1874, when his political friends enacted the law now under discussion. The only difference between that law and the Bill now before the House is this: while the hon. gentleman assumed that the whole power with regard to that question was possessed by the Federal Parliament, we are only trying to make the Bill more workable in the country, and we simply allow the municipalities to co-operate with our officers in carrying it into effect. We are not, therefore, going in the direction of centralization, but in the other direction, for we are giving back to the people what the hon. gentleman took away from them.

Mr. SPROULE. One word with reference to some remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), before six o'clock. He said this principle never had been adopted by the Federal Government of the United States. I find that on the 2nd of March, 1883, an Act was passed by Congress providing for the inspection of tea; another Act passed previous to that time provided for the inspection of coffee, butter, &c. They deal with only a few of these articles, but yet it is an acknowledgment of the principle, and shows that they recognize it as entirely within their jurisdiction. The first Inspection Act passed here was passed in 1873, and it provided for the appointment of inspectors to inspect flour, wheat, and other grains, beef, pork, fish and fish oil, leather, rawhides, petroleum and other articles. Then, I find that on the 29th August, 1873, an Order in Council was passed, I presume, under the superintendence of the late Government.

Mr. MILLS. No; we were not in power then.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. getleman was in power then.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only to say that in that year the districts were extended, and inspectors appointed; while in 1874 the authority of this Parliament in these matters was further exercised. It was recognized at these various times as a principle, that this Government had the power

to map out the districts and appoint inspectors in the various localities, such as are designated here, and I say it is rather strange to find these same parties now contending that we have not the power. It seems almost like the disposition of the hon. member for Bothwell to follow up the opinion which has been attempted to be laid before the people of the country, that there is a disposition on the part of the present Government to interfere with Provincial rights. I think if there is any line of subjects on which we are entitled to legislate it is this. In 1876, England recognized the same principle. It has been recognized in the United States by Acts of Congress, and if we acknowledge the principle in the inspection of butter, why not apply it in other articles as well. I find that the Act passed in Congress in March, 1883, is doing a great deal of good, and I am sorry that there is not some provision in this Act, of a like character to one in the American Act, to prevent goods coming into the country unless they are up to a certain standard of purity. We know that a great deal of spurious tea is now coming into this country from the United States, owing to the passing of that Act, and it is sold in packages all over the country by peddlers to farmers and others, who are induced to buy it, not from its value, but from the prizes of one kind and another which are given with it. There seems to be no law to prevent this being done, and it is taking away the legitimate trade of merchants and others who are endeavouring to sell a good article. We all know that a great many of these articles are sold in the country, which are neither conducive to health or the nourishment of the body, and I think it is well that Parliament should put in operation machinery which, if it does not stop the importation of articles unsuitable for food, should at least prevent their being manufactured in this country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we had better show that there is no desire on the part of my hon. friend to rob the different Provinces of their rights, but that he is actuated simply by a desire to amend the law which has existed since the 26th of May, 1874. That Act was intended to impose license duties, &c., and to prevent the adulteration of articles of food, drink and drugs. It was an Act passed by the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The first clause contains a definition, just as this Act contains, of what adulterated food, drink or drugs mean. It goes on to provide that the Government may appoint in each Inland Revenue division one or more analysts of food, just as this Act does. It provides that the adulterated articles are to be seized and destroyed, that the analysts are to report quarterly to the Department. The power is given to these analysts to procure samples of suspected articles in certain ways. There is also a penalty provided in case the person refuses to admit the officer, or to furnish samples. It goes on to provide how the expenses of the analysts may be collected from the person who exposes for sale these adulterated goods. In fact, the whole tenor of the Act of 1874, in spirit, in intention, in purview, in penalty, and in purpose, is just the same as this Act, only this Act, after some years' experience, from 1874 to 1884, amends, in some few particulars, the Act of 1874.

Mr. MILLS. I have just a few observations to make in reply to the hon. gentleman. In the first place, the hon. gentleman was at that time on this side of the House, and I am inclined to think he did not discharge his duty as well as we are doing at present, or he would have exercised a little more vigilance. In the next place, I never pretended that no mistakes were made up to the present time. The question of jurisdiction, as the hon. gentleman knows, is a difficult question, on which the House is liable to err. But we have now decisions of legal tribunals which enable us to interpret the Constitution, and the hon. gentleman ought not to insist on a line of legislation which those decisions show is beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

Mr. SPROULE.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain the principle on which power is given to the councils of municipalities to appoint inspectors of food and drugs.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It has been felt that in order to make this Act a success, which should enlist the co-operation of the municipalities in the different parts of the Dominion, in order that it might be carried out with the least possible expense, and that the municipalities should have an interest in carrying it into effect, we simply provide means by which they can give us their help.

Mr. BLAKE. These observations are very important, as they indicate a recognition, by those who bring forward this Bill, that, as my hon. friend has pointed out, it deals with a matter of municipal or police organization. The hon. gentleman not only provides that a municipal council may appoint inspectors, but he gives them powers of prosecution, and provides that the penalties resulting therefrom shall go into their revenues; but, he said, that in order to the effectual prosecution of this Act, he feels it necessary that it should be worked in connection with the municipal machinery. But the municipal machinery and the municipal power are not here, but elsewhere.

Mr. COSTGAN. In some cases the municipalities themselves have been anxious to assist in carrying this Act out; but under the old Act they could not do so.

Mr. MILLS. The observations of the hon. gentleman show that the House, on a former occasion, made a mistake in dealing with a subject that belongs to the Local Legislatures and the municipal authorities, and he insists on continuing that mistake. His present proposition shows that he feels that this power can only be properly exercised by the municipalities, to which it rightly belongs. If he proposes to deal with the question at all, he ought to repeal the law altogther.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, I understand that the hon. gentleman objects to this Legislature giving power to any city, town, county, or village to aid in appointing the inspectors. Does this Act look like centralizing power here? If the Bill has power to appoint inspectors, and it has exercised that power, then it can give that power to councils, just as it can to individuals. If the council of any city, town, county or village, does not want to exercise the power to appoint inspectors, it need not—that is all. My hon. friend says that this power has been sought for by the municipalities. This Act in no way says that it can only be worked through municipal councils. It merely says that, for convenience sake, they shall have the right to appoint inspectors, if they choose to do it. That seems very reasonable—so reasonable that even if the hon. gentleman did wish to amend the clause, I do not think my hon. friend should agree to do so.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has failed to apprehend the observations made from this side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very probably; they are not intelligible.

Mr. BLAKE. I will try to make them so. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill was asked the reason for this clause. He stated that in order to make the Act successful, it was found necessary to enlist the co-operation of the municipalities; he stated that some of them desired to co-operate, but they had not the power. What was said on this side was that the clause which gave the power to the councils of cities, towns, counties or villages, to appoint inspectors, and to require the analyst to analyze, which gave inspectors appointed by the councils of these municipalities power to prosecute, and provided that the penalties obtained by such prosecution should go into the municipal revenues,

was a clause which showed conclusively that the Bill was of that character, in fact, which we say it is, and gives municipal or police powers—which was a confession on the face of the Bill that it was of the local character to which we referred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman understands, and so he does not answer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The argument is no argument at all, and is not worth an answer.

On section 7,

Mr. CASEY. I wish to call attention again to a matter to which I called attention last Session—that is, that neither the old Bill nor this one makes adequate provision for securing an analysis of suspected food or drugs. Under both Bills the initiative must be taken either by an Inland Revenue officer or the municipal inspector. The Inland Revenue officers, it appears, must have instructions from the Department, but the local inspector seems to have the power of acting on his own motion. Neither in the one case nor in the other, however, is there any provision for allowing the purchaser who suspects that which he has bought——

Mr. COSTIGAN. Clause 24 covers that.

Mr. CASEY. At first glance this does seem to meet the objection I was going to raise.

On section 14,

Mr. CASEY. It would be advisable, perhaps, as a proper punishment for those who adulterate food, &c., that a provision be made to publish the names of those found guilty of adulteration. They could be published in the *Gazette*, or better still, in the local paper.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That would be a matter for regulation.

On section 16,

Mr. MILLS. It does not require a great amount of common sense to show that this clause comes within the municipal law, and has been dealt with as such in almost every municipality in the Dominion, under some by-law or other as a municipal matter.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this copied from some other Act?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; it is a new clause. The adulteration by water has been, considering the extensive use of milk, declared to be injurious to health, because it is as fatal to the infants that use the milk as if it did contain poisonous substances.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting to a clause, in a Bill of this kind, dealing with the adulteration of milk, but the mode in which we are dealing with it is another question; and I ask the hon. gentleman if he took the provisions of this clause from some other law existing in some other country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is an original clause.

Mr. BLAKE. The provision says if the milk sold comes from an animal fed on unwholesome food. That seems very wide. Would you call distillery swill unwholesome food?

Mr. CASEY. This is a very important point, and it will be left entirely to the analyst to say whether the food is unwholesome or not, but he cannot report what the cow has been fed on from the milk, and I do not think you can lay on him the duty of seeing the cow fed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If it be a question of evidence, the analyst can decide.

Mr. CASEY. In that case, it would be brought to court without the services of the analyst at all, or there should be a consulting veterinary surgeon appointed, to assist the analyst in cases of this kind. If this is allowed, the Department will have to consider what is considered unwholesome food. There are different opinions on this point. For instance, distillery swill—some people contend that it is perfectly wholesome and does not injuriously affect the milk at all, while others say it is very injurious, so that we should have a mass of contradictory opinions. As to the reason urged for including adulterated milk in the Dominion Act, namely that it is poisonous or equally injurious with poisonous food, I do not think it is strong enough. The only ground for legislating against the adulteration of milk with water, or the weakening of it by skimming, is that it is a fraud upon the purchaser—he is not getting what he bargained to get; and I do not know whether that would bring it under our purview or not. The proviso again, making it lawful to sell skimmed milk if it is branded as skimmed milk, I think, will be quite inoperative. I do not think anyone will offer it for sale so branded.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think there is something in the objection of the hon. member for West Elgin as to this clause, because it would give rise to a great deal of difficulty and would be likely to lead to vexatious prosecutions where quarrels arose between neighbours. I would suggest that, instead of the present provision, it should refer to milk of an unwholesome character, and let the analyst judge of the milk itself and not of the food upon which the animal has been fed. The words as they stand at present would give rise to a great deal of trouble, and the object might be gained by saying "milk which is of an unwholesome character," and let the analyst decide whether that is so or not.

Mr. CASEY. Unless the analyst was a medical man, as he would not always be, it would be very hard for him to say whether it was of an unwholesome character or not. I think regulations would have to be framed to say what degree of weakness would be allowed, and what degree of strength would be required, and what ingredients would not be allowed in the milk. It must be made definite in some way or other.

On section 17,

Mr. CASEY. I see the suggestion which I make in regard to milk has been carried out in regard to alcoholic liquors.

Mr. BLAKE. I think this clause, which says that "alcoholic, fermented or other potable liquors, sold or offered or exposed for sale, shall be deemed to have been adulterated in a manner injurious to health, if they are found to contain any of the articles mentioned in the schedule," ought to say "shall be deemed to have been adulterated in a manner which makes them additionally injurious to health," because the clause seems to recognize the fact that if unadulterated they are not injurious to health. I want the Minister to consider that suggestion.

On section 18,

Mr. CASEY. What is the object of exempting certain articles or preparations from the operation of the Act?

Mr. BLAKE. This clause is practically a clause putting the whole operation of the Act as to the subject matters in the control of the Governor in Council, because you can withdraw anything you please from it and put anything you please into it. You may adulterate the Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is from the old Act.

Mr. BLAKE. We are amending the old Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is amended also.

Mr. BLAKE. In what respect?

Mr. CASEY. What is the object of giving this power? Why should any article be exempted from the operation of the Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman will see that this is a very valuable clause. New articles of food may be introduced, new poisons or deleterious articles may be foisted upon the public. The 18th clause provides, that "the Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare certain articles or preparations to be exempt from the provisions of this Act, and may add to the schedule to this Act, or may remove from the said schedule any article or ingredient." The next clause says:

"The Department of Inland Revenue shall, from time to time, prepare and publish lists of the articles, mixtures or compounds declared to be exempt from the provisions of this Act, in accordance with the next preceding section, and shall also, from time to time, fix the limits of variability permissible in any article of food, or drug, or compound, the standard of which is not established by any such pharmacopœia or standard work as is hereinbefore mentioned."

I think it is very valuable. Of course, the Department will not act without clear evidence that the article ought to be exempted, without clear evidence that it is harmless, or, on the other hand, clear evidence that a particular compound or food, or drug is deleterious. That is published to all the world. Then Parliament meets a few months afterwards, and that is a check upon any improper conduct of the Department in that regard.

Mr. CASEY. I can see quite well that it is necessary to give the power of changing the schedule of the Act from time to time as to variability and as to the permissibility or non-permissibility of certain ingredients, but that is not what I object to in this clause. This clause provides that the Governor in Council may exempt certain classes of food from the operation of the Act altogether; that is, he may state that certain classes of food or drugs are not subject to public analysis under this Act, in other words, that the Government may remove the safe-guard which is given to the purchaser in regard to certain classes of goods at their pleasure. I do not see why this should be put in the Act. I have asked the Minister what is the reason, and I cannot find out by my own unaided intellect. This gives a reference to the schedule, and I do not find any schedule except the one referring to alcoholic liquors. That is the only schedule to the Act, but this clause appears to refer to an extended schedule of a similar nature in regard to other articles of food, and that is a schedule which has not been put in the Act. It cannot be the meaning of this clause that this schedule as to alcoholic liquors is the only one subject to amendment. It must intend to refer to a general schedule of the same nature.

Mr. MILLS. This section is, in fact, a proposition that certain kinds of property shall be held by permission of the Governor in Council and not under law. I can easily understand how the Governor in Council might be given power to seize property imported contrary to the provisions of the law regulating the Customs, but this is a proposal to confiscate property within the country. The Governor in Council is to make regulations, and is to make that an offence which before this Act passes is not an offence.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the 17th section, which we have passed, declares that "alcoholic, fermented or other potable liquors, sold or offered or exposed for sale, shall be deemed to have been adulterated in a manner injurious to health, if they are found to contain any of the articles mentioned" in this schedule, cocculus indicus, chloride of sodium, copperas, opium, and so forth. Therefore, the hon. gentleman has satisfied himself that the introduction of any of these articles into alcoholic, potable or other fermented liquors is injurious to health. That is the only theory upon which he asks us to pass the Act. It is proposed to us in this 18th section to give him power, if he pleases, to remove any one of these ingredients from this schedule. He has decided that they are injurious; why should he take power to take them out of the Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the clause must be considered distributive. "The Governor in Council may from time to time declare" that such an article should be exempt from the provision of this Act. That is one part. Then he "may add to the schedule of this Act or may remove from the said schedule any article or ingredient, the addition or removal of which is by him deemed necessary in the public interest." There is the schedule. It can only strike out.

Mr. BLAKE. My point is, that if we decide that all the articles or any one article in this schedule is an injurious adulteration, why then should you propose to take power to strike any of them out?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We might find that we were mistaken, and that they were a poison.

Mr. BLAKE. Parliament cannot assume that; it cannot assume that the Governor in Council is wiser than the collective wisdom of Parliament which had determined an article to be injurious.

Mr. SPROULE. If the analysis proves to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that any article is not injurious, then, no doubt, it will be added to the list. If it should be found that other articles not included in this schedule had been used for the purpose of adulteration, then the Governor in Council would require power to add those articles.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Grey is discussing the question as to the power to add, when the objection is as to the power to remove.

Mr. CASEY. The confusion arises from the fact that there are two separate classes of provisions in this clause. It provides, in the first place, that the Government may exempt from the operations of the Act certain articles and preparations; then, that they may declare that certain articles and preparations need not be subject to analysis at all. Therefore, the purchaser shall have no means of enquiring what is the analysis of the articles and preparations. Now, there is some reason in the argument that the Governor in Council ought to have power to add to the schedule from time to time certain other things found to be unwholesome, and I do not know why they should not. There is room for argument that they ought to have power to declare some things to be unwholesome which were at first considered to be wholesome; but in that case the schedule should not be in the Act at all, but the articles should be left at the option of the Governor in Council. Therefore, I move that clause 18 be amended by striking out the words from "declare" to "and may;" so that the clause will read "the Governor in Council may from time to time add to the schedule," &c.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a great deal in the arguments used by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I have spoken to my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill, and he consents that the words "or may remove" in the 24th line, and the words "or removal," in the 25th line, shall be struck out. I would ask my hon. friend not to press or strike out the power given to the Governor in Council to declare certain articles to be exempt from the provisions of this Act; because in the 19th clause you will find that this power may be beneficial, and it can do no harm.

Mr. BLAKE. It is in the direction of freedom.

Mr. CASEY. It is in the direction of freedom to the vendor, but it is in the direction of taking away certain

rights given to the purchaser. The Act gives to every purchaser the right to have every thing he buys analyzed, and I must press for the striking out of these words. It is a most important amendment to the clause. Whatever might be the intention of the Government in exercising that power, it certainly gives them the power to nullify the whole Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will accept that amendment.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 19,

Mr. BLAKE. You will see that by the 18th clause any change the Governor in Council makes is to be published in the *Canada Gazette*. Then, in the 19th clause, there is an additional provision which I do not object to, and that is to prepare and publish a list of articles declared to be exempt, so that besides the publication in the *Canada Gazette* there is to be a departmental publication. But in the second half of that clause there is also provision to fix from time to time the limits of variability permissible in any article of food or drug. There is no provision for publishing that at all, either in the *Gazette* or otherwise. It is a most important thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are quite right.

Clause amended by adding, "such departmental orders shall be published in the *Canada Gazette*, and shall take effect at the expiration of thirty days from the date of such publication."

On section 24,

Mr. CASEY. This clause aims at effecting what I stated was desirable some time ago; but it is not as perfect as it should be. I think the purchaser who wishes to have a sample analyzed should take the same steps as the inspector or revenue officer who procures samples for the same purpose, and I have drafted an amendment to that effect. I think this clause should provide that the private prosecutor, as I may call him, should make the same offer as to the verification of sample as the inspector is required to make under section 9, and the burden of proof would not be thrown on him, as to the sale or identity of samples, any more than it is upon the inspector. In that case, the proviso about the burden of proof would not be necessary, while as it is, I am afraid it will be practically inoperative, with regard to the private purchaser, because, generally speaking, he will have no other proof of the sale than his own evidence.

On section 27,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Should not the innocent vendor have recourse upon the manufacturer or compounder for the cost, as well as penalties, in case he proves his innocence? In such cases the manufacturer is primarily responsible, as he is the one who sells the article, and it may be a hardship upon the merchant who handles a great many articles not to have recourse for the cost.

Mr. BLAKE. It does seem rather hard that the vendor should have to pay the cost in such cases. You put on him the burden of proving, first, that he did not know that the article was adulterated, and secondly, that he could not have found it out with reasonable diligence, and if he has accepted that burden and successfully carried it out, you say he shall pay the costs of his lawyer and the costs of the Crown. I think when the hon. gentleman provided that the vendor should be exempt in any respect on proving these two things, he should be exempt altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. I think you will find that when the retail trader ascertains that his goods are not up to the standard, and knows from whom he purchases them, he will not be likely to purchase them from the same manufacturer again. If you make it only applicable to the manufacturer, the provision would be almost useless.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I think that when, as now, the retailer is exempted from the penalties on proving the two things I have mentioned, he should also be exempted from the costs, which may be very serious.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There might be a few cases of hardship of that kind; but the question is, whether it would be wise, in order to relieve such cases, to do away with that liability.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course it will be the desire of the Minister and the Government that these articles should be subjected to a test. I do not know that the Department would willingly relinquish all claims for costs. But supposing a retail merchant became subject to the costs, his recourse should be on the wholesale merchant, and the wholesale merchant should have his redress on the manufacturer. It seems to me that the adulteration should be traced back to the guilty person, and he should bear the costs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that would be the best course. I do not desire to speak with confidence, but it seems to me that if a merchant sells an article which has been adulterated by some one else, he has recourse for the fraud by the general law of the land. But if not, I would ask my hon. friend to consider that well, and to provide for it, if it can be provided for, in this Act, which I doubt.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If it were provided for in this Act, I think my hon. friend for Bothwell would come out strongly for private rights. But I rather think we had better leave the clause as it is for the present, and my hon. friend will look into it.

Mr. BLAKE. I rather think there is the common law power which the hon. gentleman refers to, and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) confirms my recollection. If so, it is one of those civil rights which the common law gives, and which the hon. gentleman can neither grant nor take away.

On section 30,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would ask, in case a person having reason to suspect that an adulterated article is being sold, mentions the matter to one of the officers whose duty it shall be to prosecute, is it the understanding that the information given by that person shall be deemed confidential? I suppose it would not be necessary to use the person's name; and it seems to me the Act could be carried out more effectually if the name were not divulged by the officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe, as a matter of departmental practice, both in the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue, the name of a person giving information is not given up. Under this Act, there is no necessity of giving it up. A party says Mr. so-and-so is selling adulterated tea or sanded sugar; the analyst goes and examines the article; if the sample is all right, it passes, and if it is found to be adulterated the man is punished; and there is no need of giving up the name. That is the ordinary practice.

On the schedule,

Mr. BLAKE. I find that the schedule speaks of "chloride of sodium if in excessive quantity." That is a very vague phrase. Who is to decide whether or not the quantity is excessive? I do not know whether or not common salt is an essential ingredient in any of these liquors, but I

have read that it is frequently put in beer merely for the purpose of inducing thirst. If it is not essential to the production of these liquors, I would prefer that the words, "if in excessive quantity," should be struck out. The clause as it stands is very vague.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I believe common salt is used.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the argument of the hon. member for West Durham is the best answer that could be given to his captious remark, when I suggested that power ought to be retained to regulate this schedule by the Governor in Council. I suggested that if experience showed certain articles to be required to be used in the manufacture, the Governor in Council ought to have power to add them to the list, but if not needed, to exempt them. The hon. member for West Durham now raises the same objection. He intimates he is not settled in his mind whether these articles are or are not used. As I understand him, he speaks in an indefinite way, as though we were not in possession of the knowledge whether they were or not used for the legitimate manufacture of the articles; if they are not, they ought to be exempt; if they are, or it is found in the future they will require to be, through any improvements in the manufacture, power should be given to add them to the list.

Mr. BLAKE. My argument applied only to common salt, and I did not state that other hon. members were equally ill-informed as I am on the subject. Parliament is legislating on the subject, and we ought all to be well informed before legislating. I was asking for information. I dare say some hon. gentleman connected with the trade could tell us something about it. I am sure the hon. gentleman has a colleague who could tell us at once whether salt is necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Strike out the words "in an excessive quantity."

Mr. DAVIES. Before the Committee rises, the hon. gentleman will do well to consider the sub-section of section 2, brought to his notice by the hon. member for West Durham. Under it, any man who sells any innocuous mixture, such as coffee and chickory, is liable to a penalty. Chickory is often added to coffee, not for the reason stated in the proviso, but because many people like it, and if a man sells chickory and coffee and proclaims that he does so, he should not be liable to a penalty. That sub-section does not meet the case, and provision should be made to meet it.

Progress reported, Committee to sit again.

SUPPLY.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS.

160	Observatory,	Toronto	$5,250 00
	do	Kingston	500 00
	do	Montreal	500 00
	do	New Brunswick	1,500 00

Mr. WELDON. What was the change at St John?

Mr. McLELAN. The services of St. John and Fredericton were combined in the city of St. John, effecting a saving of $1,000.

Mr. WELDON. What is the salary of the gentleman in charge?

Mr. McLELAN. The same as last year.

Mr. WELDON. What was the saving in making the change and taking the observatory from an efficient man in St. John and putting it in the hands of an inefficient man?

Mr. McLELAN. It was reported that observations were necessary at other points in New Brunswick, and the sum voted was all employed under the arrangements then made, but a saving was effected by combining certain services in the city of St. John.

Mr. WELDON. What is the saving in St. John?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot give the exact figures—from $500 to $1,000.

Mr. WELDON. The gentleman who had been in charge there had been for twenty-five years making these observations, and the man who was put in his place was not fit for it. A man had to be sent from Toronto to instruct him. What was the cost of sending the person from Toronto to instruct the person now in charge? As regards the gentleman who had previously charge of this observatory, he had been since fifty years taking observations with regard to the weather, in St. John, and his statistics were very valuable. It was a matter in which he was much interested; he did the work most faithfully, and I believe would almost perform it for nothing. The result is, that the service is not so well performed. The proper number of observations are not secured, and I believe the wind diagram is not published at all in St. John. It is published at Fredericton, and that is very valuable, but in St. John, on the Bay of Fundy, it is much more important. I understand that the wind diagrams are published only at Parry Sound, Presqu' Isle, London, Port Stanley, Toronto, Halifax, Fredericton, Sydney and Yarmouth, and that the Government is not satisfied with the way the service is conducted now.

Mr. McLELAN. The Government is perfectly satisfied with the performance of the work at St. John, and the hon. gentleman has, I think, asked for returns in reference to the expenses of Mr. Gordon's trip to St John, which will be furnished him. The hon. gentleman will observe in the Report that the service at St. John is spoken of as being consolidated, and at a considerable saving of expense. I saw Mr. Gordon not long ago, and he reports that the services have been very well performed at that place and no complaints have reached me in any way regarding it. Mr. Murdoch was a good officer and performed the service very satisfactory, but it was thought unnecessary to have Mr. Murdoch and Mr. Patterson performing the two separate services and that it could be well done by one gentleman at a saving of expense,

Mr. WELDON. No application was made, I believe, to Mr. Murdoch, to reduce the expenditure of his office, and at the place where the observations were made by him, great facilities were afforded him, and he was dismissed without any explanation, and without any application to see whether the expense of his office could not be reduced. Mr. Hutchinson really knew nothing about the matter. Did I understand the Minister of Marine to say that it was on the recommendation of Mr. Gordon?

Mr. McLELAN. It was proposed to have observations taken at Sackville as an important point, and a consultation was held with him as to the means by which the funds could be provided for that service, and the suggestion was made that there should be a combination of the two services at St. John, and that in that combination a sufficient saving could be effected to provide for the service at Sackville. I think I overstated the amount of the reduction at St. John. It was not so much as $1,000.

Mr. WELDON. I should doubt very much if it reaches $500. The whole expense, in Mr. Murdoch's time, did not reach $1,000, I think.

159. Grant for Meteorological Observations, including instruments and cost of telegraphing weather warnings $48,000.00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman inform us how many stations have been established in Manitoba and the North-West Territories?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). And British Columbia?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And in British Columbia? There is a very large area there which, to a very considerable extent, as the hon. gentleman probably knows, has been to the present time a blank, and I believe the American staff have been communicating with the Department here as to the desirability of extending their stations. What has been done in that direction, if anything?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Gordon visited the North-West during last season and made arrangements for the opening of a large number of stations at various points along the Canadian Pacific Railway, and at other points with which there is telegraphic communication, and he has also made a recommendation that there should be storm-signal stations provided for Lake Superior in connection with the stations he proposes to open—some are already opened—in the North-West, at Rat Portage, Calgary, Prince Albert, Battleford, Touchwood, Regina, and some other points. He proposes to open sufficient stations, and these will be in communication so as to serve storm-signal stations for Lake Superior during the coming year, and they will be in operation in time for the opening of navigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman—I suppose he has not—any means of communication with any station on Hudson Bay, as yet?

Mr. McLELAN. No; not yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far north is the furthest meteorological station we possess?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared to give the furthest one north.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I should like to ask the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he would not take into serious consideration the establishment of some meteorological station in British Columbia. It is very far west, and I see here there are observatories at Toronto, Kingston and Montreal, all of them comparatively close together. Surely the results obtained must be very, very similar. Now, west of the Rocky Mountains, I think it would be very interesting to scientists generally, and certainly to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, if some meteorological observations were taken in British Columbia. A small vote, say of $500, I think, would accomplish a good deal, and if the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries feels inclined to go $500 better, it will not be despised, but I think a small sum would be well spent in the prosecution of those observations.

Mr. McLELAN. The subject will be considered.

Mr. BLAKE. They do not blow at all out there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They can raise the wind there without it.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

162. To provide for expenses of Steamboat Inspection $25,000 00

Mr. DAVIES. I want again to call the Minister's attention to the necessity of appointing an inspector in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman knows that this very winter there are at least three steamboats now needing large and heavy repairs, and I see by the return he has brought down that Mr. Coker practically acknowledges that his state of health was not such as would enable him to go to the Island, and he produces a certificate from his doctor, saying it was more than his life was worth. I do not blame him at all. I know the passage across to that Island is a very arduous and dangerous passage in winter. But the hon. Minister knows that the steamboats must be repaired during the winter. There can be no satisfactory repairs done in the summer at all. The boats are now being repaired, and how is it being done? The Steamboat Inspector simply has to relegate his duties to someone else whom he has selected. I have no doubt, from the names of those whom he has selected, that they are very good men, in whom I, at least, have confidence; but still the public at large have not got that security which they ought to have in this respect. The boats are not being inspected by a man who is amenable to the Department and responsible for his inspection; they are being inspected by men who are good enough in themselves, but who are not responsible in the sense of having a position to maintain, and in the sense of being directly responsible to the Minister for their work. Now, that state of things will recur more or less every winter, and it cannot be a matter of much moment to the Department for Mr. Coker to possess this as part of his field. The interests of the public will be better subserved if one inspector is appointed for the Island. The reason is that the Island is separate from the mainland, and the inspector acknowledges that he cannot get there, and he has not been able to get there this winter. The boats are now being repaired, not by a Government inspector, but by some gentleman to whom he has relegated his duty.

Mr. McLELAN. The appointment of an inspector for the Island will depend very much on the amount of work that is to be done on the Island. Under the present arrangement, the Lloyds have their official inspector there and the owners have him in charge of their boats. Mr. Coker is perfectly satisfied with the inspection that is being done by the official inspector of Lloyds.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows the number of boats on the Island. There are three boats carrying passengers and freight from the mainland to the Island, and he knows these boats must be inspected every winter; he knows the gentleman to whom he has referred is as competent a man as is to be found in the Dominion.

Mr. McLELAN. These two boats are undergoing repairs, and the repairs made this winter will serve for a number of years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe the total amount of fees received last year was about $12,000, and that the total expenditure was $16,000. Now, under these circumstances, the hon. Minister ought to give some explanation of the necessity, which does not appear at first sight, for the increase of $4,000 in expenditure. So far as the Public Accounts show there seems to be no necessity whatever for this increase of $3,000, nor did the Minister, in bringing down the vote, state any facts warranting him in demanding $3,000 more.

Mr. McLELAN. The vote last year did not meet the whole expenditure. If the hon. gentleman will look at the returns, for a few years he will find there is still to the credit of this fund a very considerable sum, and that during the period—I forget how many years—the fees for inspection were reduced because the receipts were larger than the expenditure. But, during the past year additional inspectors were appointed, and the number this year is still larger than it was last year. Additional inspectors had to be appointed very lately, in order to overtake all the work, owing to the increased number of boats and the increase in the work of inspecting hulls, machinery and boilers. Should the sum at the credit of this fund be exhausted, it will be necessary to increase the fees for inspection, and to make the receipts equal the expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are these additional inspectors to be placed? And are they already appointed?

Mr. McLELAN. We have inspectors at St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Manitoba and British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that two gentlemen were employed only nine months, and others for a shorter period. But the Minister does not say where the new inspectors will be placed.

Mr. McLELAN. One is appointed for Manitoba; an additional one has been appointed in Ontario, and one is to be appointed in British Columbia. The additional Inspector in Ontario is Mr. Taylor, who only served a portion of the year. Another one has also been appointed for the St. Catharines district. There are fifteen inspectors with a salary of $1,000 and travelling expenses.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) Is this sum of $25,000 to include the inspection of hulls?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. What will be the remuneration to the inspector of hulls in British Columbia? Also the salary of the Inspector of Steamboats in British Columbia?

Mr. McLELAN. The inspector of boilers and machinery is to have $1,200. The inspector of hulls has not yet been appointed.

Mr. BAKER. I wish to impress on the Minister the desirability of having the inspector of hulls distinct from the Inspector of Steamboats. The former should be a man who is a shipwright by trade. The person whom it is intended to appoint as steamboat inspector at the present time, I think I can confidently state, is not a man to be the inspector of hulls. He will make a good inspector of machinery and boilers, but will not do for the inspection of hulls.

Mr. DAVIES. Why is the hon. gentleman asking so large a vote as $25,000, when the expenditure was only $16,000 last year? I see the expenditure has been increasing $1,000 a year for a number of years.

Mr. McLELAN. The inspectors appointed last year were not paid for the full year, and additional inspectors have been appointed for the coming year. It may even be found necessary to appoint one or two more to overtake all the work and prevent delay in making inspections. We have fifteen officers now.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think the salary of a hull inspector is too low at $1,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a grievance which has arisen in connection with the operation of the inspection laws. The tug *Michigan*, belonging to the International Wrecking Company, received extensive repairs to her boilers last winter. Inspector Risley was requested by the parties having charge of the repairs to visit the vessel and see if they were being made in accordance with the law. He failed to do so. He came to inspect the vessel in September, and refused to do so because the boilers had not been raised so that he could see beneath them. The repairs had cost several thousands of dollars, and the boilers were in excellent condition. As it was then about the commencement of the wrecking season, it was a matter of great importance to the owners that the vessel should be allowed to proceed to work. The inspector was requested, at all events, to grant permission for the vessel to run until the end of the season, when the inspection could be made, as several weeks would be required to raise the boilers. His refusal to apply the test, although the boilers were in excellent condition, led to the vessel being tied up during the latter part of the wrecking season, which caused great loss to the owners. I wish to ask the Minister whether Inspector Risley's action in this matter was strictly in accordance with the law; whether it was necessary to insist that the vessel's boilers should be raised so as to bring into view the bottom as well as the sides and top; and whether, if the boilers had been proved to be in good condition, he should not have given a permit for the vessel to run, on condition that the boilers would be raised and an inspection made at the end of the season?

Mr. McLELAN. Without having the papers before me I am not prepared to say that Mr. Risley acted strictly according to the law or not. I suppose, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, he acted too strictly according to the letter of the law, and not in the spirit of it. I dare say the hon. gentleman thinks that the inspector should have not so strictly followed the letter of the law; and perhaps that may be a proper view to take. In the working of a new Act, no doubt there is friction, and occasionally shipowners make complaints; but we are getting the Act gradually to run smoothly, and I hope it will be so worked that, while the law will be fully carried out, the people will have no cause of complaint.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is a case of very great hardship. The loss that resulted to the owners probably amounted to several thousands of dollars. No doubt the vessel's boilers were in excellent condition, and I have reason to suppose that Inspector Risley was fully aware of the fact. Mr. Risley was not without blame, he having declined to visit the vessel when repairs were being made, though he was at a point adjacent at the time. I certainly think this is a case where, if the inspector acted according to the letter of the law, he did not act according to its spirit. It seems to be absurd to refuse to make a test of the boilers when, having been repaired, they were in a better condition than they were years before, and in consequence of the Inspector's action, the vessel lost the best half of the season.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

196. Repairs and working expenses—Intercolonial Railway $2,500,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We shall be glad to hear the hon. gentleman's explanation as to the present condition of the Intercolonial Railway. I may make one remark, and it is this: I observe always, in addition to the $2,500,000, several hundreds of thousands figure in the capital account for rolling stock for the line. I think, as I have always said, it is high time the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway should be wiped out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman, during his absence from this House, which we all deplored, has forgotten the explanations that have been given. I did flatter myself that I had convinced the hon. gentleman that it was quite proper to add to the capital expenditure for rolling stock so long as you had a correspondingly increased business to provide for. That subject has been very fully discussed in the Committee on various occasions, and I think I succeeded in satisfying hon. gentlemen that the Intercolonial Railway forms no exception to the other railways in the country in that respect; that it is necessary and incumbent on the manager of every railway to keep the rolling stock furnished from capital account in a state of thorough repair and efficiency, not to allow it to run down, but to maintain it in good order; that whenever there is a large increase in the traffic of a road, it is necessary that the increased provision for that traffic should be made from capital account. I proved by evidence, on various occasions—by the Manager of the Grand Trunk, whom the hon. member for Northumberland will accept as a very high authority, the then Manager of the Great Western, and the Manager of the Northern—that rolling stock required for increased business was provided from and charged to capital account; and that all that was incumbent on the management of any railway was to maintain the road in a thorough state of efficiency, and that the rolling stock provided from capital account should not be allowed to run down. That will have to be accepted, I think, as the correct procedure in this matter. Such has always been the case. The

expenditure on rolling stock, in 1874, up to 30th June, charged to capital account, was $2,640,427. In 1874-75 there was added to that to meet the increased business, charged to capital account, $583,904; in 1875-76, $141,364; in 1876-77, $316,552; in 1877-78, $125,245; in 1878 79, there was no increased charge; in 1879-80, $19,995; and these figures indicate the fact that there was no increased business, comparatively, to provide for. In 1881, the increased charge to capital account was $224,920; in 1881-82, $358,859; in 1882-83, $628,244; and from the 30th of June, 1883, to the 31st December, the charge to capital account was $236,109, making a total to the present time, from the first, of $5,275,442. I draw attention to the fact that an examination of these figures, and of the figures which indicate an increased volume of traffic, will show at once that the amount charged to capital account to provide for the increased business was not in excess of the business itself.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Was not a large amount, in 1874-85, for steel rails?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I dare say there was a certain amount of it. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to a statement of the increased business, which will show at a glance that the demand for increased rolling stock charged to capital account has not been at all in excess of the business. The earnings amounted, during the last fiscal year, to $2,370,921, which was an increase over the preceding year of $291,658, and exceeded the earnings of 1879-80 by no less than $864,622. Any person acquainted, as the hon. gentleman from St. John is, with the operation of railways, knows that you cannot have any such increased earnings without having a very large increase in the volume of traffic. The number of tons moved in 1882-83, was 974,961, or 132,005 tons more than during the preceding year, or 409,037 tons more than in 1879-80. The number of passengers during the past year was 878,600, against 779,994 during the preceding year, or 581,483 in 1879-80, or an increase in three years of 297,117 passengers. I think I have only to refer to these figures to show, at a glance, the necessary demand for increased rolling stock to carry on a business of that kind.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Does that include the Prince Edward Island Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; we treat them separately in taking the estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, we can quite understand that, from time to time, as the road is completed and gets in working order, it ought to be expected to increase in business. With respect to some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, however, I may say that during 1874-75-76, and if I recollect aright, a part, at any rate, of 1877, that road was being actually constructed, in large part. I think it was not fully completed until 1877, if my memory serves.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The fact is, it is not quite completed yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I see, to our sorrow; because the hon. gentleman spent $1,000,000 odd on capital account in 1883. But what I mean is this, that no fair comparison can be made between the years when the railway is in process of construction, when it is not completed, and when, as a matter of course, a large amount of rolling stock is most properly charged to capital. I have never objected at all to charges to rolling stock rendered necessary by the building of 100, or 200 or 300 miles of additional road. That would be quite fair and reasonable, but I have pointed out, over and over again—and in point of fact, we had come to the conclusion, in 1878, to stop the capital account altogether. It may be sometimes a fair thing to spread the expenditure for rolling stock over two, or three, or four years. But there is no doubt about it—I am not going to say, in the present instance, that the thing has been done—if you go on keeping the capital account open for rolling stock all the time, there is a great temptation, and in some instances a great liability, to sums which should properly be charged to revenue account being charged to capital account. It makes things look pleasant; it gives a surplus when none exists, and in 1883, I see that $668,000 were charged for rolling stock to capital account. Well, it is no doubt true there has been an increase in the quantity of goods carried, an increase in the number of passengers, and an increase in the receipts, but I submit that $668,000 appears, *prima facie*, to be more than the increase which the hon. gentleman named would warrant, and it certainly is open to the risk I have pointed out. If this account be always open it is exceedingly convenient to put large charges for rolling stock to that account, and we really cannot tell whether the road is paying its way or not, so long as that item remains open.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that I was not resting my case on a comparison between the years 1876-77. I was taking the last three years as an indication of the impossibility of providing for the business—fortunately the increased business—of the road, without having a large increased charge to capital account for traffic. If you take the years 1876-77, you will find that the number of tons carried on the Intercolonial Railway for those years was 421,327. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman how I am to move 970,961 tons of freight in 1882-83, with the rolling stock which would be sufficient for 421,327 tons in 1877. The thing is perfectly impossible. You cannot, if you have merely rolling stock enough to handle your traffic, handle the largely increased traffic of last year—a traffic which is $291,000 over the traffic of the previous year—you could provide for no such increased business as that without having a large increased amount of rolling stock; and I say the manager of a railway is bound to keep, in a thorough state of efficiency and repair, all the rolling stock he has put on the road by capital account. In 1876 there were 100 locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway. Since that time there have been added thirty-five, which are charged to capital account. So, all the rolling stock will be found to be in proportion to the amount of the business of the road. Of those 100 locomotives, a large number have been worn out and have gone to the scrap heap, and have been replaced by revenue account. I am quite certain that every member of this Committee will be only too glad to have a demand made for increased rolling stock if it is required to handle increased business.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Last year I think the hon. Minister stated that the contract with the Pullman Car Company would expire some time this year. Has he renewed that contract; if so, on what terms?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The service of the Pullman Car Company has not been at all satisfactory. The Pullman cars on the Intercolonial Railway have been below the present standard—have not had the conveniences and comforts of the more modern ones; and the question arose, as the contract terminated this year, as to what arrangements we should make for the future. We have entered into a provisional arrangement, under which that contract will terminate in August, 1885, the date at which the contract between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Pullman Car Company terminates. We made that arrangement because we think it very important we should have a through Pullman service, in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway, between Halifax or St. John and Montreal. We have put the contract on much more favourable terms for the Government than before. It is provided that the Company shall put on two first-class additional cars, with all the modern improvements, and that all the other Pullman cars shall be

sent to our shops to be modernized at the expense of the Pullman Car Company. So that we shall have a greatly improved service in the meantime, and in August, 1885, when the contract with the Grand Trunk terminates we hope to make better arrangements for the service. It is also provided that at that time, after all these cars have been put in first-class condition, we may take over the Pullman stock on the road at its actual cash value at that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the present arrangement for the conveyance of wheat to Halifax?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry to say that the comparative failure of the wheat crop in Ontario last year rendered it not a matter of very much consequence what the rate should be, as it has been found impracticable to obtain any large amount of grain during the present year. I believe the rates have been comparatively experimental.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my recollection is correct, the charge from Rivière du Loup to Halifax is between three and four cents per bushel.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who has been shipping grain over the Intercolonial Railway, tells me that it was six cents per 100 lbs. from Chaudière Junction to Halifax.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the Grand Trunk Railway carry freight at a proportionate rate between Montreal and the Chaudière?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been no definite settlement of a permanent rate; but the Grand Trunk Railway has been extremely accommodating in giving a very low rate over that portion of its line, with the view of encouraging the shipment of grain at Halifax.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad to hear that it has been disposed to encourage trade in that portion of the Dominion.

Mr. VAIL. It has been reported that the Allan Steamship Company have exceptional advantages for the shipment of their freight over the Intercolonial Railway. Is that the case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Practically, the Allan Company and the Dominion Company are upon a par in that respect. They are the principal lines that come to Halifax, and regular lines of steamships coming there, that give regular quantities of freight to the Intercolonial Railway, have a lower rate than those that may come at irregular and uncertain periods. We attach great importance, of course, to preventing freight for Toronto and Montreal going by way of Portland and Boston, and with that object, have made as low a through rate as we possibly could; and I am glad to be able to say that we have been able to give such prompt dispatch, owing to the efficient condition of the road, as to enable us to compete very successfully with either Portland or Boston for through freight going to Montreal or Toronto.

Mr. VAIL. Is that a permanent arrangement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has been in existence for the last year or two. There is no permanent arrangement beyond the present year.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman say what, if any, special rates have been arranged for the carrying of coal from the Spring Hill Mines to Montreal?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where large quantities are carried, the rate is a low one; I do not, at this moment, remember the exact figures, but I know that coal is carried at a very low rate.

Mr. DAVIES. Is it under $1 per ton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. DAVIES. Is the carriage of coal from Spring Hill Mines to Montreal, or as far as the Intercolonial carries, under $1?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. There is a return moved for, and I wrote a note to Mr. Schreiber asking him to have that return brought down at once.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not appear to expect any considerable increase of trade on the Intercolonial; that is to say, the vote asked for is precisely the same as last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the same; but I think the Supplementary Estimates for 1884-85 will contain something.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is anything in the Supplementary Estimates for the present year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps they will contain a provision for an increased number of coal cars. I am told the Spring Hill Company are prepared for a great increase in the output and have made large contracts in Montreal for the delivery of coal, so that we will have to ask for some additional cars for that work. We hardly expect so great an increase in the traffic as last year has shown. I do not think we can reasonably expect that to be maintained during the present year. I do not expect to have to ask for any material increase in the rolling stock, except to have provision for additional coal cars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the working expenses, and there is nothing expressly put down for the maintenance of the rolling stock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All the maintenance is included in this service. Locomotive power, $630,000; average expenses, $540,000; maintenance of way, $600,000. The grant for locomotive power includes the keeping of the locomotives in a state of efficiency. The car expenses include the cars now there. Station and train expenses, $300,000; general charges, $210,000.

197. Repairs and working expenses—Prince Edward Island Railway..... $210,000 00

Mr. DAVIES. Early in the Session I moved for a return showing the comparative wages of the employees on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, but have not yet obtained it. I intended, if I had possession of it, to use it, with a view to inducing the hon. member to make better arrangements for these employees. While there is every reason that the principal employees on the Prince Edward Island road should not be paid anything like the sum they are paid on the Intercolonial, because their responsibility and work is much less, there is no reason why the men who are at manual labour should be paid on a different scale. A great discrepancy exists between the wages paid them and those paid at Moncton; and the consequence is, that the best men are drawn away from the Island. The hon. gentleman gave as his reason for this discrepancy that the Prince Edward Island Railway does not pay, but that is no reason why these men should not be paid fair wages. The working expenses of the Intercolonial are $2,809 per mile and those of the Prince Edward Island road only $1,337 per mile; or the Intercolonial Railway is more than double the Prince Edward Island road. True, the receipts of the Prince Edward Island road are not large enough to pay expenses, but that is not a reason why the workmen should not be paid fair wages. I think the hon. Minister has not given this question the consideration he ought to give it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must join issue with the hon. gentleman *in toto* on this question. I am very sorry I have not been able to bring down the report asked for, but the Department has had to communicate with Moncton and Prince Edward Island before it can get the documents

necessary to make the return. The papers are not necessary for the discussion, for I concede all the hon. gentleman claims. I concede that the employees of the Prince Edward Island are considerably below those of the Intercolonial Railway, but I deny that because the Prince Edward Island Railway does not pay is no reason why the men should not obtain pay the same as if it did. The hon. gentleman is unsound in his premises. What is the Grand Trunk Railway doing at this moment? What is the reason that Mr. Hickson has issued a document to make a large reduction in the pay of the employees? Their responsibility is as great and their duties as onerous as before; perhaps there never was a time, in the history of the Grand Trunk Railway, when every person had to labour with such assiduity and energy in order to grapple with the unusual difficulties, through the quantity of snow this winter. And yet, notwithstanding that, we find they are told that they must submit to a reduction in pay. Why? Because there is a reduction in the returns, because the receipts have fallen off. Why, the hon. gentleman knows that all the manufacturing industries in Great Britain, all the manufacturing industries in this country, are susceptible of the same thing. When things are prosperous, when the institution is paying, they pay the employees better. When there is a glut in the manufactured articles, when they cannot get sales, they reduce the pay and they reduce the time of the employees, and they tell the employé, whose family requires just as much bread, that he cannot have more than three days' work in the week. What principle is there which applies to other railways, which applies to great institutions like the Grand Trunk Railway, which applies to other industries in the country, that does not apply to the Prince Edward Island Railway? It is the same thing precisely. What did I do with the Intercolonial Railway? When I had to meet Parliament with the statement that we had to tax the people of this country $500,000 per annum to meet working expenses on that road, I reduced the wages of the employees from the highest to the lowest, and told them that the moment the accounts could balance, the moment the road could pay its way without taxing the people of this country, I would be only too glad to restore them. And I am only too glad to be able to say that three years ago I found we could balance the account, and that the balance, though small, was on the right side of the ledger, and it has been annually increasing, and we can maintain it. But that is not the condition of the Prince Edward Island Railway. There is no place in the civilized world where the people of the country have railway facilities afforded them to the extent they have on Prince Edward Island. Why? Because no company would continue to run a railway under the circumstances of having to pay $100,000 per annum to do the work of the country, with a small population They have more railway in proportion to their population and in proportion to the size of the country, and they have the work done and performed at the cost of the rest of the people of this country. I say that under the circumstances, their responsibilities being altogether inferior, the amount of the duties they perform being altogether inferior to those that are performed on the Intercolonial Railway, they have no ground to demand that I should pay them any more, while the state of the account is in that condition, than is absolutely necessary to secure the proper and efficient performance of the service. I do pay all that is required, in order to get all the employees that are necessary, and to get the service performed vigorously and efficiently; and having done that, I do not feel that, coming to Parliament as I am obliged to come, year after year to ask that out of the taxes of the people of this country that road should continue to be operated, I am in a position to go on increasing the wages beyond what I find is necessary to get the work efficiently done. It is very agreeable to the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, to be able to pose here as the advocate of the workingman, to be able to confront me and the Government, as the hard oppressive, grinding taskmasters of the poor people of Prince Edward Island. I have no doubt he will make a good deal of capital out of it, but he will make it on unsound premises, that I am sure cannot be sustained in this House. I pledge myself to the hon. gentleman to-night, as I pledged myself formerly to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, that the moment we can balance the account on the Prince Edward Island Railway, as we have on the Intercolonial Railway, I will consider, with the greatest pleasure, the increase of the wages of the employees. Then there is another point. It is not so expensive to live on Prince Edward Island as it is to live in Moncton.

Mr. DAVIES. Just as expensive, and more so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask him what the cost of the products of the farm is in Prince Edward Island, and to compare that with the cost in Moncton. There is a very essential difference. Living is less costly, and you can obtain labour of every kind at a lower rate in Prince Edward Island than you can in Nova Scotia or in New Brunswick. Under the circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman has established a case for increasing the deficit between the earnings and the expenses of the Island railway by increasing the wages of the employees over and above that which I find necessary in order to secure the services of thoroughly efficient and good men in every department.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman does me an injustice in imagining that I raise this for the purpose of making political capital. I can assure him that I never mentioned this subject at all at any public meeting in Prince Edward Island. I have mentioned it in Parliament alone, where I thought it my duty to do it, and I do not see that there is any political capital to be made out of it, unless the case justifies it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I desire to say just one word before I forget it. He says employees are not allowed to complain. No statement could be more unfounded. There is scarcely a day on which I do not receive letters from the humblest employees of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, asking for an increase of payment; and I am able to say, at this moment, that no employé was ever, to my knowledge placed at the slightest disadvantage by the fact of his stating in the strongest and most impressive manner the grounds on which he claimed an increased payment. All these letters are received and considered; every one of them comes before myself, and they are all dealt with and decided upon in relation to a principle of what is considered fair and just; and I am happy to be able to assure the hon. gentleman that his impression that the employees are placed at a disadvantage who complain of the inadequacy of their remuneration, is entirely without foundation.

Mr. DAVIES. I am glad to have the assurance of the hon. gentleman that that is the fact at present, because I know that not very long ago a circular was issued to that effect, whether from the Department in Ottawa or the superintendent of the road I am not aware, prohibiting the making of these complaints: but that is neither here nor there, as to the justice or injustice of the claim they prefer. He has based his argument that it is fair to discriminate between the wages of the employees on the Intercolonial and those on the Prince Edward Island Railway, on the ground, first, that the cost of living in Moncton is greater than the cost of living in Charlottetown. Where did he get his information? I can assure him it is not the fact. The cost of living in Charlottetown, I do not hesitate to say, is greater than in Moncton. The civic taxation is very much larger.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do they not make extensive contracts in Prince Edward Island, for potatoes at 18 cents a bushel ?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is talking about contracts made in the remote parts of Prince Edward Island, where factories are established for the purpose of making starch out of potatoes, and that is a very special thing. These starch manufacturers take the large and small potatoes just as they come from the field, and then they do pay 18 cents a bushel. But, if he wants to buy potatoes in Charlottetown, as a workman living there, and fancies he will buy them there for 18 cents a bushel, he never was more mistaken. I have lived in Charlottetown all my life, and I know that the expense has been increasing every year; and I believe firmly that there is no part of the Dominion where the cost of living is more expensive than it is in Charlottetown. Therefore, I say the idea the hon. gentleman possesses is very incorrect, and the conclusion he draws is incorrect too. As to the rate of wages, he says there is a general reduction all over the world, and they must be content to have their wages reduced, and that the Grand Trunk Railway has been reducing the wages of its workmen. But that does not apply at all. If it does, it should apply to the Intercolonial as well as to the Prince Edward Island road. It does not apply to the Intercolonial, and while it may be very well for the Grand Trunk Railway to reduce wages all along their line, he is applying his rule between particular portions of the Government railways. Both these railways are worked by the Government and the workmen do the same amount of work on the Island railway as those at Moncton, and should receive the same wages.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not reducing their wages.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman was arguing that because there was a general reduction all over the world they should not complain. If there is anything in that argument, he should apply it to the Intercolonial as well as to the Prince Edward Island Railway. Here are two Government railways. He divides them into two parts. There are many parts of the Intercolonial, which, if separated from the other parts, would not pay, if you kept a special account. You take the Intercolonial Railway as a whole and you ought to take all the Government railways together, and the same rule that applies to the workmen on one road should apply to those on the other. So far as the argument about responsibility is concerned, I do not ask that those who have greater responsibilities on the Intercolonial Railway should not receive higher wages than those on the Prince Edward Island road. That argument is a good one when applied to the superior officers, I acknowledge. I did not contend that the superintendent of the Island road should receive the same salary as the superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway; that the accountant who does only one-third as much work, on the Island railway, should receive the same pay as the accountant on the Intercolonial Railway. But when you come down to the lower grades of men, who do the same amount of labour on the Island road that is done by the same class on the Intercolonial Railway, it is unjust and unfair to discriminate between them, and pay one man less than you do the other for the same work. I confine it simply to the same class of workmen on both roads, and I have not heard the hon. gentleman give any reason which justifies the enormous discrepaney that exists between the men of the same class on these two roads.

Mr. HESSON. That is enough.

Mr. DAVIES. Now, let the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) just hold his tongue a moment. I have a right to bring this grievance before the House, and discuss it with the Minister of Railways, who will call me to order if I am out of order. I am not going to be stopped by the hon. member for North Perth. He knows nothing about the circumstances, and he had better wait to express his opinion on a subject that he knows something about.

Mr. HESSON. You have been telling us about it for a long time.

Mr. DAVIES. Then there are the conductors on the Prince Edward Island road who receive a much lower salary than conductors on the Intercolonial Railway. I say here is a further injustice. The Prince Edward Island conductor has no hope of promotion. He remains on the little Island railway for ever with a smaller salary, while on the Intercolonial Railway there is hope of promotion, and the officers rise gradually from year to year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We sometimes bring the Island conductors over to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DAVIES. Not often. I do not know an instance of it at present, though there may be some. I wish the hon. gentleman would take that course and bring efficient and active men from the Island to the Intercolonial Railway, as that would remove the grievance, to some little extent. The hon. gentleman knows that some of the best conductors on the Island railway were going to leave altogether about a year ago, and he had to pay higher wages to keep them. When the comparative returns come down, I can establish all my statements.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for North Perth knows nothing about this case, although the hon. gentleman has occupied fully an hour in the debate this evening, endeavouring to give information to the members of this House, and still he says we do not know anything about it. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about himself.

Mr. DAVIES. I rise to a point of order. The complaint I make is, that the hon. gentleman made such a noise when I was speaking that I could not make myself heard by the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not a point of order; that is a point of disorder.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is wrong again. He has been endeavouring to enlighten the House for a long time upon a point that we could easily appreciate in five minutes.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman seems to have constituted himself the censor of the House, to determine how long my hon. friend, or any one on this side, has a right to speak.

Mr. HESSON. I determine to express my own views. I am responsible for the views I express here, and I am determined to express them. I say the hon gentleman has occupied so much of the time of the House that he must not complain if there is a little impatience exhibited by hon. gentlemen on this side.

Mr. HACKETT. The employees of the Prince Edward Island Railway have no reason to complain of the treatment they have received from the Minister of Railways. It is true their wages are lower than those paid on the Intercolonial Railway, but I think the Minister has endeavoured, to the best of his ability, to carry out the principle that men should be rewarded according to the labour they perform. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has stated that a great discrepancy exists between the wages paid on the two roads. It is true that conductors on the Island railway have not received the same compensation as those on the Intercolonial Railway, but the Minister has explained that they do not perform the same labour, and have not as great responsibilities. I must say that the conductors on the Island railway are as good men as can be found in this country; I think they are fully competent to assume the responsibilities of conductors on any railway in Canada,

and I hope the Minister will give them a chance to improve their condition. The hon. member for Queens has made a very long statement with regard to this question. Well, I suppose he is interested. No doubt this question comes home to him very closely. I would wish that when he makes some complaint with regard to the working of that railway, he should go outside of his own family circle. The hon. gentleman complained that his own people, those who are very intimately connected with him, have not received justice. Now it is very wrong, I think, that because the hon. gentleman has some fault to find with the management of the public works of this country, he should bring his grievances here for the purpose of airing in this House what he may think a matter connected with himself. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, thinks that his own family, in this regard, has not been fairly provided for. I know very well that the hon. gentleman's family have been in the past very fairly provided for in Prince Edward Island; and a very important member of that family, in fact, I may say, the father of the hon. gentleman, is in the employ of the Government under the superintendence of the Minister of Rail ways, and I think he has dealt very fairly with him. When the Minister found it necessary to curtail the expenditure in connection with the Island railway, he found it necessary that the hon. gentleman's father should take a somewhat smaller salary than he had been receiving from the former Government; but when he found the Government railways were paying an equal *pro rata* on the Island with those on the mainland, he raised the salary of the hon. gentleman's ancestor. I think it is not right at all that the hon. gentleman should come here and find fault, simply because his father has not received a larger salary. The hon. gentleman's father is, of course, a very respectable man and a fine gentleman, and it is proper that the son should endeavour, if possible, to secure for his father increased pay. But I do not think, on that account, the hon. member should find fault with the Minister of Railways as to the management of the Prince Edward Island Railway. The Minister has dealt as fairly with the employees on the road as circumstances would allow, and I hope he will find it possible in the future to increase the pay of the conductors. The Minister has already increased the salaries of the locomotive engineers, and I have no doubt the conductors would find no fault if they were compensated in the same manner as the engineers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does the debt of the Steel Company now stand?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I believe the debt has been discharged, and that the Government are now a little in the Company's debt. We have been in the habit of receiving from the Company large quantities of supplies, and although there was a time when the Company was somewhat in advance of us, and I confess I was a little apprehensive as to the result; but we stopped making any payments for supplies, and by receiving the ordinary supplies we required, and retaining the bounty to which they were entitled from the Government on the manufacture of the iron, I believe the balance has been placed on the right side.

198. Repairs and working expenses Windsor Branch Railway..... $20,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Windsor Branch is held on a lease for twenty-one years, on the terms that we receive one-third of the gross earnings to maintain the line. The amount we receive is a little more than sufficient for that purpose.

Canals—Maintenance and Repairs.

199. Repairs and working expenses..... $440,052 00
200. Salaries and contingencies of canal officers 30,670 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. Minister expect from the canals, in the shape of receipts, for the next year? How does he find the improvements are working? What probability is there of increased trade? Has the hon. gentleman anything to say in regard to the policy of the Government as to the reduction or abolition of the tolls.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was a considerable reduction and re-adjustment of the tolls on the canals made a year ago, and the result has been an increased revenue. I will bring down the statement as to the receipts for last year and what we expect for the present year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is no further action intended to be taken with respect to the tolls?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to call the Minister's attention to the fact that a considerable number of complaints have been made by vessel owners as to the rates charged for towage through the canals.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think we have any control over the rates of towage. I will, however, make enquiry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This matter, if within the control of the Government, is one of considerable importance to the trade and should be investigated. A good many parties who otherwise would make use of the canal are disposed to stop their vessels at Buffalo, on account of the towage expenses.

164. Geological Survey..... $60,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What information has the hon. gentleman to give upon this vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I must refer the hon. gentleman to the Report of the Minister of the Interior, which shows what work has been done last year, and I think also points out what is to be done in the ensuing season. The hon. gentleman will remember that the amount has been considerably increased. The old vote was $50,000, and it covered all the salaries and contingent expenses. The whole of the salaries are now charged to Consolidated Revenue, and the $60,000 will be expended strictly in the work of the Geological Survey at the various points indicated by the Director of the Survey.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know whether the Department has purchased one or more diamond drills?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suggested, two or three years ago, the desirability of obtaining one or two of these drills, and making a series of borings, to a reasonable depth, at certain points in the Dominion, and I rather think that something of that kind was done, though not very extensively or systematically. I think that probably more important information could be got in that way than in almost any other way in which the amount could be expended. I am not speaking to the prejudice of the regular topographical surveys, or geological surveys, but it has been found that these instruments are becoming very valuable and economical in making these enquiries.

Mr. HALL. Hon. gentlemen are aware that a Select Committee was appointed a few weeks ago to make enquiries with reference to this Survey. That Committee has met from time to time and taken evidence, and their report will be submitted to the House in a few days. It will, however, be so near the end of the Session, that I fear no practical result will be obtained during the present Session, and I feel it therefore to be my duty, as Chairman of Committee, to make a slight reference to some facts which have been adduced, and to the result of their investigations. There is

a general feeling throughout the country, and I believe it is shared in this House, that the practical, useful result of the Geological Survey is not proportionate to the expenditure, and it was in order to get evidence upon that point that the Committee was appointed. Now, the appropriation for 1881-82—I select those years because they are the years to which the last report applies—was $110,000. The application of that money was as follows: removal from Montreal, $10,000; the purchase of Indian curiosities, $1,232; the purchase of natural history collection, $2,719, and the purchase of books and instruments, from Sir William Logan's estate, $4,500. These items make, in all, $18,451, leaving a balance of $91,549 as the amount which is supposed to have been devoted to the practical work of the Survey. Now, as to that work, I think it is a proper statement to make that the public have derived no return from it, except in the addition to the Museum, and the volume of reports which has lately been furnished to the House I cannot speak as to the value or extent of the additions which have been made to the Museum; I have no doubt that valuable improvements have been made, but the expense cannot have been very large. But so far as the report is concerned, the result is that it contains merely the report of Dr. Dawson's explorations in the Bow and Belly River district, to which 23 pages are devoted; Dr. Ell's explorations in the Hudson Bay district, 29 pages; Dr. Bell's explorations in New Brunswick, 56 pages, and Mr. Wilmot's examination of the mines in Quebec, 14 pages. Then we have Dr. Selwyn's essay on the change of nomenclature, three pages—a change which, I may say, has been much criticised by scientific men, as an unwise change; Dr. Selwyn's notes on the geology of south-eastern Quebec, and his Report of Progress for the two years. This Report of Progress makes reference to the work of other members of the staff; to Mr. Webster's work in the Province of Quebec; Mr. Broad's, in New Brunswick; to Mr. Fletcher's, in Cape Breton, and others. These references to the actual work of the staff are very brief, most of them occupying only eight or ten lines space, and none of them being over a page or a page and a-half. Now, what strikes the Committee is (although there may have been useful work done by the Survey—and we believe there has been useful work done, and that the staff is a valuable one) but the complaint is that the public are not getting the benefit of that work. It certainly is, we believe, a just ground of complaint that of the work which was done in 1881 by these gentlemen there is not more to show for it now, for the use of the public, than six, or eight, or ten lines in the volume of the published reports. The facts would seem to show either that the work was not worth what it has cost, or else that the country should have got the benefit of it before the information became too old to be of any practical use. A striking example of that fact is Mr. Vennor's work in the phosphate region of this vicinity, to which great attention has been called, and to which American and other capital has been directed. There was a great demand for practical information as to the extent, location and value of these deposits, and Mr. Vennor was employed. His work, in 1877, 1878, 1879 and 1880 was carried on exclusively in that region, and though his work may have been very valuable, as I believe it was, there is not a published line as to all that work during these four years. He has left the Survey and there is nothing left behind him to show what his work has been. It has been said that the fault was Mr. Vennor's, that he should have made a report, and that he should not have left the Department without leaving his report. The Committee do not feel disposed to make references to any particular member of the staff, but they simply wish to call attention to the fact that the practical results of the work are not commensurate with the expense involved. They consider for instance that Mr. Vennor should not have been paid a large salary and travelling expenses during these four years without making any report at all, or else he should not have been employed. I could give a number of illustrations in the same direction, but I will not trouble the House with them. I think these facts are pertinant, and I think the attention of the Government should be called to the conviction of the Committee that while we believe that the appropriation is not too large, still there is a lack of practical usefulness in the work of the Department. There has been very great delay in bringing out the reports of the Survey, and one of the suggestions of the Committee will be that instead of waiting for these reports until the end of two years, the results of the operations of the staff should be brought out separately, as they may be applicable to particular districts. It seems very unnecessary, for instance, that a person who wishes to know about the coal regions of British Columbia, should have to wait for two years for a volume of reports which he finds gives him a great deal of useful information, information which is interesting enough, but not interesting to him, about the coal regions of Cape Breton. It would be more satisfactory if the work in particular districts were reported upon, and the reports promptly published and circulated at their actual cost. We have had before us the result of the work of the Geological Survey in the United States. There the Report is a very valuable volume of 700 or 800 pages, which can be purchased for 50 cents, and is replete with a vast amount of practical information respecting the mineral resources of that country. Our Reports seem to be very defective in that respect; they seem to lack in practical usefulness, so far as actual mining operations are concerned. These practical operations are very extensive in the Lower Provinces as well as in the Province of Quebec, but the references to them in the Reports are very meagre, embracing only two or three pages in some cases, while in others the most important mines are not even reported on at all. I call the attention of the House, and the Government especially, to these facts, in anticipation of the report of the Committee, because the report will be presented at so late a period that the matter could not in any other way have received the attention of the House.

Mr. MILLS. This Committee was appointed before I came into the House, and I have not seen the order of reference; but it seemed to me to be in some respects a rather extraordinary enquiry. I do not say that it is at all an improper one; but there are certain matters being disclosed before the Committee which, in my opinion, ought to have been disclosed before the Minister, and ought to have been known to him. In fact, it is very important that every Minister should know precisely how his own Department is organized, and what is the condition and discipline of his staff. These facts are being disclosed before the Committee, and, to a certain extent, the enquiry has become a species of departmental scandal. With regard to the matter suggested by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), there is no doubt that the geological investigation carried on by the Government, with the limited amount of money hitherto placed at its disposal, has been necessarily theoretical, and for the purpose of ascertaining the geological features of the country. An enquiry, with the view of ascertaining its mining resources is, of course, of very great importance; but my impression is, that if the Department turns the attention of those upon the staff to those particular features of geology to which the hon. gentleman has referred, it will be found necessary to vote a larger amount of money than has hitherto been placed at the disposal of the Department. Investigations, with the view of ascertaining the practicability of mining operations at any particular point, will necessitate boring, as the hon. member for South Huron has stated, and that of course means a considerable addition to the expenditure. I do not see any reason why the Reports should not be got out at an earlier

period. The branch is now at the Capital, and is under the supervision of the Minister, which was not the case when it was in Montreal; and the results of the field work done in the summer season, when alone operations can be carried on, can no doubt be made in the winter, and be published before the winter season is over. But it will, of course, require a great deal of diligence on the part of every member of the staff to have the work in such a state of forwardness that the Report can be placed in the hands of members before the Session closes. But I arose merely to call the attention of the First Minister to the disclosures that are being made before the Committee, which I think ought to receive the early attention of the Minister in charge.

Mr. HALL. I do not know that the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell were intended as a reflection on the Committee——

Mr. MILLS. Not at all.

Mr. HALL—but I think that the Committee did not feel that they could exercise any control over the gentlemen who appeared before us. We had the Director himself there and certain members of his staff. It is true they made certain criminations and recriminations against each other; and although it was unpleasant for us to listen to them and to know that such feelings existed, at the same time we did not think we could control them or prevent the gentlemen of the press from attending the meetings and publishing the proceedings. Of course, there was evidence that the relations of the members of the staff towards each other were such as to injure the usefulness of the service; but the Committee did not feel that it was in their province to do more than refer to this circumstance and not to attribute the fault either to the Director or to the members of his staff.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure that the hon. member who moved the Committee moved it with the object which was patent on the Resolution—to have general enquiry upon the progress and development and practical working of the survey; and it was thought that it would be a useful Committee. I regret, however, that it has almost degenerated—perhaps the Committee could not help this—into a sort of trial of the Director on the evidence of his subordinates, and perhaps *vice versa*; for there has been crimination and recrimination. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that much of the evidence that was given against the Director ought to have been laid before the Government by those gentlemen who gave that evidence. If the Director was guilty of laches, was incompetent, or neglected his work in any way, that ought to have been stated by these gentlemen to the Government, and they ought not to have kept their breath until it was brought out by a Committee. I can speak for the Minister of the Interior, that he will be glad to get the report of the Committee and to weigh well its conclusions; and if it reveals any defects in the system, he will be glad to correct them. Of these matters which have come out, of course I know nothing; neither does the Minister of the Interior. All I can say is, that the present Director was selected with the greatest care by his predecessor, Sir William Logan. Sir William Logan, whom we are all proud of, not only as a man of world-wide reputation, but as a Canadian, had his whole soul absorbed in the Geological Survey of Canada. When failing health rendered him unable to do the work, his great desire was to obtain a fit man to succeed him in what he regarded as the work of his life. He went to England and consulted Sir Roderick Murchison, who was considered the great geological authority of his time; and Sir Roderick Murchison said that of all the men he knew, there was no man at all equal, in his opinion, for that work, to Dr. Selwyn, who was then the Director of the Geological Survey in New South Wales. Well, he has been here for many years, and I would be slow to believe that he had failed to come up to the standard which Sir William Logan went to seek, and which he thought he had found. Perhaps there may be faults of temper and other faults—those little rifts in the lute which occur occasionally to impair the harmony—and which must affect the efficiency of the service. However, that is something to be looked into. The hon. member for Bothwell has truly pointed out that this is a Geological Survey and not a mineralogical. The two are distinct. If you are going to look for the useful minerals, you must have a School of Mines, which must be a distinct branch, and must be paid as such. The general geological survey which relates to the general geological appearance of the country, which shows the various strata, and so forth, is the chief branch. Of course, in the progress of a general geological survey of the country, there crops up frequently, of necessity, the other question, the search for metals used in industries. But we cannot have two surveys, unless we have a double vote—a large vote for the search of useful minerals, and a general vote for a Geological Survey. That is all I can say upon this just now. The vote is a liberal one compared with that of former years. It used to be $50,000, with the expenses and contingencies taken out of that, so that there was a very small sum left for the actual service. Now, the expenses are paid out of the Consolidated Revenue and the whole amount is expended, as it ought to be, on the survey proper. Hon. gentlemen spoke about certain items not strictly geological, which were charged against that fund a year or two ago; as, for instance, getting those Indian curiosities. For a very small sum there was obtained a unique collection of Indian curiosities from British Columbia; the Indian curiosities were disappearing rapidly, through the introduction of European implements of all kinds, and it is well those were secured. I believe the collection was made by Dr. Powell, who was Superintendent of Indians in British Columbia, and it is a great source of interest to all persons interested in ethnology. That is the only item which was not strictly geological; at all events Parliament was aware of it and thought it was a good purchase. The whole of this money will be expended in the Geological Survey this year.

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC AND THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Annual Grant to Supplement the Indian Fund.

165.	For Indians of Quebec—To relieve distress	$1,200 00
	For purchase of blankets for aged and infirm Indians of Ontario and Quebec	1,600 00
	For Indian schools in Ontario and Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia	10,400 00
	For Annuities under the Robinson Treaty	15,680 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this amount of $10,400 divided?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. $5,000 to supplement the Indian school fund of Ontario and Quebec; $2,200 to be expended in New Brunswick, and $3,200 in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MILLS. Before last year it was usual to keep the appropriation for each Province separate; of course the Indians come under control of the Dominion Government, but it is desirable this distinction of Provinces should be kept up, because the Indians in one Province might be a considerable charge and those in another but a light burden. I called the hon. First Minister's attention, some few years ago, to the manner in which he was dealing with the Indians of Ontario and those of Quebec. The Indians that reside north of the height of land, received a certain sum for the surrender of their land, and this sum became an Indian fund; the Indians of Quebec had never any lands to surrender and have not taken any lands. There are some residing north of the St. Lawrence, at the height of land, who state that they never made any surrender of their lands, yet the timber has been sold off those lands as timber limits, and that, so far as I know, the Government of the Dominion,

as trustees for those Indians, have not interfered in any way, have not sought to secure any right of use in the soil, or to obtain anything from the Government of Quebec in the interests of those Indians. Now, the hon. gentleman will see that he is not acting uniformly or according to a uniform principle, for certainly the Indians in the unsurrendered districts of the different Provinces have as much interest in the lands in one case as in the other. I do not say the Government here can obtain any title to these lands from the Indians, but where the Indians have made no surrender, the Government here, as trustees for the Indians, can see that their rights, whatever they may be, are protected in dealing with the Governments of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman comes here to ask for $4,200 from the public Treasury, whereas, in the case of the Province of Ontario, the hon. gentleman makes no such demand, because he goes to the Government of Ontario and says, you shall not take possession of these lands until you deal with the Indians, until you obtain from the Indians the surrender of their interest in their lands, and pay them or agree to pay them a certain consideration. Now, this has not been done in the other case, and I think there should be some uniform rule acted upon. If the Government, acting as trustees for the Indians, are going to abandon any claim on behalf of the Indians in the one Province, they should act precisely in the same way in every other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the difference is that the Indians in Ontario are rich and the Indians in Quebec are poor. The former are fortunate enough to have secured, early, reserves of considerable value and fertility, and the hon. gentleman knows that the Indian Fund in Ontario is very considerable, and they are able to take care of their own poor. In Quebec, with some few exceptions, the reserves are small and the Indians in some portions of the Province, are far in the inhospitable portion of Quebec, in the vicinity of the Labrador coast, far up the Saguenay, and elsewhere, where their lands have not been valuable, and even if surrendered, would not generate a fund at all equal to the fund in Ontario. All we can say is that this sum is spent each year in Quebec. As a matter of humanity, it is voted. We cannot allow them to starve, and I am informed, from the information in the Department, that a less sum would be insufficient, and that even with that sum there is a considerable degree of privation and suffering, in long winters like the present.

Mr. MILLS. I am not stating that the sum is extravagant at all. My observations were not directed against the inadequacy of the reserves in the Province of Quebec, nor has the Indian fund in Ontario arisen from reservations or the disposal of reservations, but from the disposal of their interests in the country generally. Take the case of the Robinson Treaty—the hon. gentleman knows they have surrendered their claim to a larger extent of territory, but that the Government were not allowed to deal with the country until that surrender was made. I understand that Indians in the Province of Quebec have, in districts recently taken possession of by the Government, made a similar claim, but as they are few in numbers, they have no effective means of enforcing their claim against the Government, and so far as I know, the hon. gentleman has not taken any steps to assert that claim against the Government of Quebec. He has not said, before you deal with this property you must extinguish the Indian title. It is not a question of their rights to reservations, but their rights to the country generally, where no official or general surrender has been made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. The question in my mind is whether, if that had been done or were done now, the Indians would not have had a larger sum than the hon. gentleman is taking out of the country now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that the various Governments have been rather lax in that matter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to bring before the notice of the Superintendent-General a few points with reference to the Indian schools. There came into my hands—I think sent by the Rev. gentleman direct, Mr. Wilson of Sault Ste. Marie, whom my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) knows very well, and says takes a great interest in the Indians—a copy of a letter addressed to the Department, in which he advocated what he considered would be great improvements in the matter of Indian schools. As far as I remember, he suggests that there should be a system of Government inspection, and that there should be a system of compulsory education—it amounts to that—and that that might be carried out by the way of imposing fines in withholding the annuity money from such children as did not attend school between certain ages, and also that the money that was thus derived by way of fine might be distributed among the band, or devoted to the extension of school building, or to the purchase of prizes to be given as a reward of merit to those who deserve it. He also suggests that a very great difficulty arose from the difficulty of enrolling the pupils, from the fact—though I was not aware of that, and it is perhaps more the case there than among those Indians that I am more acquainted with—that their names were not so clearly known. My hon. friend from Algoma says this gentleman is disinterested and has the means of knowing, and he says that there are difficulties, and the schools are not working as well as might be desired. He says, for instance, that where forty children should attend, perhaps not more than twenty do attend; and he goes the length of saying that after they have attained the age of ten or twelve years, and made sufficient progress, they should be drafted into the larger institutions, such as the Mohawk Institution, and that they should be fined if, when they attained the age of fifteen or sixteen years, they had not either learned or been apprenticed to a trade. I do not speak in the way of endorsing those propositions or not, but the Superintendent-General will agree with me that any suggestions coming from anyone who is labouring among the Indians, and is really interested in them, and whose recommendations come from a purely unselfish source, are worthy of consideration, and I think the grant taken for Indian schools is a very small grant indeed. If I remember aright—but I would ask the Superintendent-General—I think the Indian schools do not derive any grant from the Provincial Governments—do they?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think not.

Mr. PATERSON. I think not. Then is not this the case, that while our other public schools are aided by the Provinces, and the Indian schools are not aided by the Provinces, and whereas a large part of the cost of Provincial Governments, including school grants, is derived from this Government, and as this Government receives it by way of Customs duties and Excise, to which the Indians contribute, a very strong case is made out, as a matter of equity and justice, that there should be grants given by this Government to supplement such moneys as are contributed by the Indians themselves. Would it not be perfectly justified if the grant was on a much more liberal scale than it is, if that be necessary? I do not know the circumstances of all the bands. The large band with which I am more familiar is aided very much in the work, as the Superintendent-General knows, by the grant of the New England Society; but it seems to me that a case of justice and equity can fairly be made out for a very liberal grant, not as a matter of charity, but common justice, because the Provincial Government pay funds to the public schools of Ontario, and the Superintendent-General says they do not pay them to the Indian schools. The Provincial funds are derived in a large mea-

sure from moneys received from this Government, and received by this Government by way of taxes as Customs and Excise duties. To these moneys the Indians contribute, as do their white brethren, and not receiving aid from the Provinces, it is perfectly right and proper and only a matter of justice, that their schools should be aided by the Government here. If they are in a state of inefficiency for want of funds, I think the Government would be justified in supplementing this grant. There are good school facilities on the reserve that I am more particularly acquainted with; but it is possible that on some other reserves the bands may not be as wealthy, and perhaps the New England Society do not contribute to all the schools.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They do not.

Mr. PATERSON. In such cases as that, while justice should be meted out, I think a too sectional view could not be entertained altogether. I would like the Superintendent-General to give his views on the public schools, as to whether he thinks a system of Government inspection is desirable, or whether the suggestions made to the Department are feasable and worthy of consideration. I do not know that the amount Government contribute to these schools would warrant much interference on the part of the Government; but I suppose, as guardians of the Indians, they would be entitled to take that position. As to whether the imposition of fines and compulsory education might be made to work, I do not know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Wilson is regularly engaged, and has been successful, I believe, as a minister, a teacher and guardian of children. I believe that the education given to the Indians in the front is very fair; that they rather take pride in the education of their children, and that with their contributions and their share of this fund, with the aid of the New England Society, they have a full proportion of school opportunities for education. There are Indians all over the Dominion in all stages of civilization, from near barbarism upwards. However, the general inspection of schools would be a good thing. The hon. member for Bothwell, when he held the position of Superintendent-General, will, perhaps, remember that there was a good deal of difficulty about that—where the Indian children were educated, by denominational societies; these latter resisted strongly anything like general inspection, or anything like a selection of schoolmasters, or their being examined. They insisted that as they raised the missionery funds in their own denominations, and had charge of these Indians and their schools, they should select the teachers without reference to the Department. However, it is a subject of growing interest. One of the Bills I have introduced this Session provides—though it can only be valuable for the Indians who are in a somewhat advanced state of civilization—for municipal organization, and gives them power to make education compulsory. I hope the Act will work well. They can pass by-laws to that extent, and have somewhat the same right of compulsion in the educational matters as is the case among the whites. I do not think it would be well to impose any penalties or cut off an Indian from his annuity if he don't send his children to school. That would cause great dissatisfaction, and would do no good. Still, as the Indians are progressive, we can introduce the white system from time to time.

Mr. DAWSON. I can say that the Mr. Wilson, who has been mentioned, is a very estimable man, and has done a great deal for the Indians at Sault Ste. Marie. He has collected a considerable fund in England and elsewhere, for maintaining his industrial schools at Sault Ste. Marie, for which there is a Government grant of $1,800 a year. There is an industrial school for boys and another one for girls. They are working so satisfactorily and doing so much good that clergymen of other denominations—his school is in connection with the Church of England—have followed his example and have established industrial schools at Wikmemikon, where large numbers are attending them. The other day they sent, through me, from Wikmemikon, at the lower end of Manitoulin Island, some complaints and reports, which I sent to the Deputy-Head of the right hon. gentleman's Department; and I believe instructions were sent up to the local agent to enquire into the matter. They complained that the funds were entirely too little for the number of scholars who were attending. They showed a very large and close attendance, both at the girls' and the boys' schools. The children were making very great progress. There the Indians live near together in a sort of community; they raise a good deal of wheat, and are getting to be very comfortable on the Island of Manitoulin, and therefore they are able to keep their children at school. They had for two schools, with nearly 100 children in constant attendance, but $1,200 a year. They had to board these children, and could not maintain themselves without foreign aid. They have missionaries collecting for them in different parts of the world, who get but very little; still they collect enough to enable them to live. While on this subject, I would draw the attention of the Minister to another subject of great importance. There were schools authorized among the wild Indians at Nipigon and other places—I think five in all, and an appropriation of $200 a year was made for each school. This sum, in a wild country like that, is too little to attract competent teachers, so that the Indians to this day are without schools, though they were quite willing to send their children to school. I sent in a representation the other day that $50 a year should be added in each case to enable them to maintain their schools, and I hope the Department will see its way to make that small additional grant, more especially in view of the fact that there is a very large amount due to those Lake Superior and Lake Huron Indians, under the Robinson Treaty—I believe as much as $300,000. Now, with such an enormous fund as that in prospect—enormous, as compared with their position—it is much to be regretted that the rising generation should be without education; and I think a point might be stretched, and even a little additional sum given yearly to promote education. I may also say that the improvement within the last two years has been very marked among all the Indians of Algoma. They are showing a desire to have their children educated, above all things, and liquor has been kept from them in a great measure of late years, so that their condition is very materially improved. I am very sorry to say, however, there is one very marked exception to this rule, and that is the case of the Indians at Garden River. They are the poorest Indians in Algoma. The other Indians are comparatively rich; if they are not so, it is their own fault, for they can obtain plenty of work. But at Garden River the soil is poor, and during last fall they were compelled to live solely on turnips. These poor people cannot afford to keep up their schools, and they have a very devoted teacher among them, who, although very badly off himself, manages to teach a great many of their children. His name is Rev. Mr. Ouillette, and a little addition might be made to the sum paid him. He at present receives $200, and an additional $100 would enable him to keep body and soul together with less difficulty than at present.

Mr. MILLS. Are the Indian schools inspected?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indian schools are inspected by the public school Inspectors of each Province.

Mr. MILLS. Are they inspected in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The are inspected by the Indian Agents.

Mr. DAWSON. With respect to annuities under the Robison Treaty, I desire to enquire whether any progress has been made towards arriving at a settlement with the Ontario Government. A demand was made on that Government for arrears due the Indians under the Robison Treaty, the sum now amounting to $300,000. My opinion is that the Dominion Government should fund the amount, in the meantime, and trust to obtaining it from the Ontario Government in the future.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the Indians have been very badly treated under this Treaty. They have not received the money which was due them. Considerable progress has, however, been made towards a settlement with the Ontario Government. I understand from the Minister of Finance, that he believes that in the course of this spring there will be an adjustment—it has been approaching for some time—between the Quebec and Ontario Governments, in regard to their respective liabilities. The moment that is arrived at, the fund belonging to the Indians will, of course, be adjusted, and they will be paid over the amount from some source or other. Looking at the matter from one point of view, the Indians have not suffered morally from this failure, as regards payments due them. However, that is no reason why they should not receive their money.

Mr. MILLS. The point in dispute is this: The Dominion Government claim from the Ontario Government the amount of money which the Indians were entitled to receive for the surrender of their claims under this Treaty. The Ontario Government oppose it on two grounds. First, that this is not a charge against the Provincial Government but against the Dominion Government, which, in taking over all the assets of the two Provinces—Ontario and Quebec—at the time of Confederation, took over this liability, and that therefore it is a charge against the Government of Canada, and not against a particular Province. Second, that if the lands were liable, as the Dominion Government claim the greater portion as lying west of the meridian drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi, no claim can be made against the Ontario Government, when the lands, it is claimed, do not belong to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have made some advances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some years ago the vote was $14,000. Will it increase or remain stationary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Treaty allowance to the Indians is $4 per head. For many years they have been paid only $1 per head; for some years they have been paid $4. They ask payment of arrears between the $1 and the $4 per head—that is their complaint.

NOVA SCOTIA.

166. For Indians of Nova Scotia generally..... $5,032 56

NEW BRUNSWICK.

167. For Indians of New Brunswick generally... $4,890 00

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

168. For Indians of Prince Edward Island generally..... $2,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that, in a good many cases the money appears to go to missionaries which, I dare say, is a mode in which the Indians may get as much benefit as any other way, but still if the money was intended for maintenance and assistance of destitute Indians, it would not be strictly in accord with the vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clergymen in New Brunswick generally act as missionaries and, to a certain extent, as agents. Their salaries altogether amount to $1,630.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point is, that the most of this small grant appears to go as salaries to white men, rather than as food or grain given to the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that is so. These officers have been there for a long time, and there is a general impression that these clergymen who, by the way, receive small sums, are an excellent moral police.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

169 { For Indians of British Columbia generally... $25,650 00
Surveys 7,700 00
Reserve Commission 11,055 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The salaries of white men apparently constitute a large portion of this expenditure. I notice by last year's detail that there were several items which struck me as scarcely being chargeable to expenses for Indians, among them being an address presented to the Marquis of Lorne and performances of various kinds given in his honour. I think these amounts might more properly have been charged to the vote for the entertainment of His Excellency.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). $1,900 for schools seems a small amount?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the sum is insufficient. I think, also, that owing to the different character of the Indians in British Columbia from those on the east side of the Rocky Mountains, we will be able to have fewer agents and more schools. The Indians of British Columbia are a different race; it is said that they have a considerable admixture of Mongol blood, and they are sturdier, stronger, and hardier men, more like white men than those on the east side of the Rockies, who are wild and untamed—more like deer than oxen. It is reported also that the chief cry of the Indians to Lord Lorne was that they wanted more schools. That is a subject to which I hope to address myself this summer.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). What the right hon. gentleman has stated is perfectly correct. There is a great amount of Mongol blood in the native Indians of Vancouver Island, at all events. They are strong and hardy men, very useful on board steamboats. I have known them to pick up six 50 lb. sacks and run along with them and put them on board ships. I may say that Dr. Tolmie, who has been in British Columbia for many years in connection with the Hudson Bay Company, has taken a great interest in Indian matters, and he has suggested to me that somebody should be appointed to teach those Indians farming, and arrange farming matters for them. I hope the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs will give his attention to the matter.

Mr. GORDON. I can bear testimony as to the good character of the Indians of British Columbia generally. I think they are advancing as rapidly as could be expected, especially at one point on the coast. A gentleman went there twenty years ago, when the Indians were comparatively savage. He taught them reading, writing and arithmetic, so that they were able to correspond with their friends. He also got workmen to teach them the mechanical arts. They have erected a saw mill, which they are running; they have sash and door factories; and two years ago Mr. Duncan engaged a Paisley weaver from the district of Cowichan for six months, and at the end of that time this gentleman showed some very fine specimens of shawls which were woven by the Indians. In fact, the Indians are in advance of the whites in that industry. I regret very much that circumstances have occurred there recently which are calculated, to some extent, to destroy the usefulness of that gentleman's labours—a dispute having arisen between him and the church. With the merits of the case I am not familiar; but to the efforts of Mr. Duncan, in bringing these Indians from a state of complete savagery to such a condition that they are able to correspond with their friends, and that they labour and lead lives of sobriety,

too much praise cannot be accorded. There are other points where similar results have been achieved. At Cowichan, twenty years ago, a man's life was hardly safe; but for several years there has been a Catholic mission there, and the missionaries have induced the Indians to take to agriculture to some extent. I quite agree with the suggestion which has been made, that where the land is suitable for agriculture a teacher should be appointed to teach the Indians agriculture. I think that the sum mentioned is entirely inadequate for schools among the Indians. For instance, there is not a school in the district of Comox. The agent of that section has to traverse the whole west coast of Vancouver Island, so that he cannot visit Comox more than once or twice in twelve months. In the district of Nanaimo there is no Indian school. A clergyman holds the services of the church there, but so far as I know, no effort is made to educate the young Indians. Still, they are gradually becoming more industrious; the young men are giving up the pursuits of fishing and hunting, and are taking to working in the mines and on the steamers that ply on the coast. They are the best sailors we have. At the time I left Vancouver Island, nearly all the stevedoring was performed by Indians. They are so far advanced that they performed this work by contract; and although they do it for less money than the Chinamen used to do it for, yet they will make $3 or $3.50 a day, when the Chinaman would only make a dollar. I do not wish to detain the Committee, but I thought it necessary to mention the inadequacy of the educational facilities for the Indians of British Columbia, and the desirability of having teachers in agriculture and arts.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. Minister when he expects that this service will come to an end. It was expected that three or four years would complete the labours of the Commission. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to inform the Committee what amount of work has been accomplished, how many Indians have been located, and when the Commission are likely to reach the conclusion of their labours.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the right hon. gentleman answers that question, I would like to suggest that a great deal of benefit would accrue from a survey of the swampy lands of the Saugeen Peninsula being made with a view of forcing a road through them. They would thus be made of great value, not only to the Indian Department, but to the white settlers of that district. I should like, also, to call the attention of the Government to the condition of things that exist in that Indian territory at the present moment. An edict has lately gone forth from the Indian Department, which fell like a bolt from the skies upon the settlers of that neig b rhood, cancelling some 500 lots belonging to settlers and others in that part of the country. I am quite sure that the intention of the Government, in cancelling the sales of these lots, was a good one—that the cancellation was made for the benefit of the Indians, and also of the settlers; but it has been somewhat unfortunate, owing to the mode in which it has been done. No notice was given of this sudden change of policy, and the consequence is, that many *bonâ fide* settlers will find themselves in the occupation of lots, the sales of which have been cancelled over their heads. There are others who have spent very large sums of money in that district—men who have really built up that country —who have given employment to the settlers there, who have enabled them to sell their produce, by purchasing from them what they otherwise could not have sold, and who by that means have enabled the settlers to contribute to the revenue of the Indian Department. These men stand now to lose large sums of money, which they invested in land there on the faith of an understanding which I am informed has been in existence in that part of the country for some years. I merely desire to call the attention of the Government to the matter, in order that they may see, as I am quite sure they desire to see, that no injustice is done to any of these parties, and that a hard and fast line is not adopted, but that each case is dealt with on its merits. I have been informed already that, so far as actual settlers are concerned, this will be done; but whatever arrangement is made, I hope that those men, who are the innocent purchasers of Indian lands, and who have spent large sums of money in building up that part of the country, will not be allowed to suffer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is one of the cases where lands have been sold years and years ago, belonging to the Indians, and the parties who bought them have not yet paid for them. Some have gone on making improvements and others have not, but they have been going on year after year without paying up. There must be an end to that. The Indians have a right to get the price of their lands, and the Government want the purchasers to pay or else the land will be taken back and sold to others. The hon. gentleman says that they have built houses and made improvements, but if they paid their debts to the Indians, the Indians would have no cause of complaint. The truth is that the Indians have no friends but the Department. There is a continual pressure by the white man to disregard their rights. True, they are sometimes not pleasant neighbours, but they are the original owners of the soil and we must put up with them with all their faults. We have no desire to deprive any man of his house and farm, but he must pay the debt he owes the Indians. With reference to British Columbia, there is only one Commissioner there, Mr. O'Reilly, better known in British Columbia as Judge O'Reilly. From my acquaintance with Mr. O'Reilly, which is of recent date, I formed the highest opinion of him and his trustworthiness. I cannot say exactly when these reserves will be finally laid out and set apart for the Indians; I am discussing the whole Indian question with Mr. Smythe, the First Minister of British Columbia, who is now here, with a view of expediting the surveys and the getting these reserves confirmed by the Government of British Columbia. As regards the suggestions made by my hon. friend opposite, that the Indians should have a farming instructor, we are trying to give small salaries to good farmers in the vicinity of Indian settlements to teach the Indians practical farming. While this will not be a heavy charge on the Treasury, it will be a substantial addition to the farmer's income.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman get an annual report from Mr. O'Reilly, as Commissioner, showing the number of reserves set apart and the number of families provided for each year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that almost the whole of this $25,000 really goes to provide the salaries of some nine or ten white gentlemen; for instance, of the Fraser Agency, the total expenditure is $2,770, of which $1,700 go to the superintendent and his travelling allowances; $214—expenses connected with the visit of the Governor General; so that a very small sum will go directly to the benefit of the Indians. The same holds good as to the others. I do not quite understand the services these Indian Agents render; they may perform valuable public services, and great services to the Indians, but British Columbia is a long way off.

Mr. BAKER. And well we know it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Distance lends enchantment to the view.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had the Prime Minister as representative once, and he is supposed, conse-

quently, to know a great deal about British Columbia. No doubt he will be able to give the information I require.

Mr. McNEILL. I only wish to explain what I am afraid I did not sufficiently explain a few moments ago, namely, that there are two distinct classes of persons to which I was referring. One class is composed of the actual settlers, as to whom I received the assurance that their cases would be judged on their individual merits; the other class is that of people who are not actual settlers in the country, in the accepted sense of the term, but are men who have paid large sums of money to third parties for lands for the purpose of cutting timber on them, and who have offered their money to the Department for the deeds of these lands, at the suggestion of the agent representing the Department in that neighbourhood, but have had the money refused and their lots cancelled. One of them, I know, now stands in the position of being liable to lose $2,000, owing to the representations made and the course now pursued. All that I ask is that such cases as these will be dealt with on their merits, as well as the case of the actual settlers, to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt.

Mr. McNEILL. That is all right.

Mr. GORDON. I desire to make a remark with reference to the general benefits the Indians are supposed to derive from this fund in British Columbia, so far as it has come under my observation. I will cite one case of extreme hardship. For instance, there was an Indian shot at Nanaimo, by accident I think, last summer, and application was made to the Superintendent for relief for that Indian, and it was denied him, simply because he was not living on his reservation. At the same time, it was publicly stated in the newspapers of the Province that other Indians who frequented Victoria, particularly the Indian women who frequent Victoria, very often, it is asserted, for anything but proper purposes, are in the habit of getting aid from the superintendent in the way of medicine without question. It is a matter of public notoriety there, and I am satisfied that if the Department becomes aware of the facts, and I think it is right they should, any little differences of that kind will be remedied. In the district of Cowichan, there is a gentleman who has an application before the Department for redress. He purchased land from the Provincial Government some fourteen years ago. He paid for his land, received his Crown grant, but the Indians have held the land ever since and will not give it up, and when he applies to the Provincial authorities they say they cannot deal with the Indians, who are under the charge of the Dominion Government, and the poor man has been kept out of his property all these years. He has not the means to carry it to the courts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is his name?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Dodds.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know his case.

Mr. GORDON. The case is before you now, I think.

Mr. MILLS. That is an old case.

Mr. GORDON. Cases of that kind should be attended to, so as to show the Indians that where there is authority it will be exercised, and to teach them to obey that authority. I think there is nothing worse for an Indian than to understand that the law does not apply to him the same as anyone else. With regard to the duties of these different agents, I am afraid that the Indians do not get the full benefit of the money that is voted, but I have no doubt the hon. gentleman at the head of the Department will look into the matter and effect the necessary remedies.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) seems to think that the whole of this vote ought to be spent in beef and flour, tobacco, tea, sugar, oatmeal and religious books, and articles of that nature. The only fault I have to find with the vote is that it ought to be three times the amount. Then the amount spent in salaries would compare much more favourably with the total expenditure.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman does not exactly apprehend the position in which this appropriation for the Indians of British Columbia stands, as compared with the Indians of some of the other Provinces. I believe British Columbia never secured the surrender of the Indian title; on the contrary, when an attempt was made on the part of the Government to locate the Indians, very serious objection was made by the Government of British Columbia to allowing them any reservation unless it was purchased for them by the Dominion. In the Province of Ontario—and it is precisely the same in the Province of Manitoba and throughout the North-West Territory—the Indians were recognized as having a certain right of occupation in the soil, and the white population were not allowed to go into possession until that right was extinguished. The moneys which have arisen from the extinguishment of that right have become an Indian fund, and the Indians are largely provided for out of that fund. The hon. gentleman will see, by looking at this vote, that the appropriation made to British Columbia is very much larger than that made to Ontario and Quebec, taken together; so that we are in fact charging the Dominion of Canada—the older Provinces, that have already provided for their Indians in another way—with a large portion of the expense of providing for the Indians of British Columbia. I have no doubt whatever that this Committee would be willing to appropriate a much larger amount for the benefit of the Indians of British Columbia, if the Government or the people of British Columbia were to place at the disposal of the Government here a fund, in proportion to the number of Indians or the extent of their territory, as large as the Province of Ontario or the North-West Territories have placed at the disposal of the Government. When British Columbia came into Confederation, I believe there was very little being expended upon the Indians. Perhaps the First Minister remembers whether there was anything at all expended by the Government of British Columbia before that Province became a member of the Confederation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very little.

Mr. MILLS. Very little indeed; and an hon. gentleman who represented that Province in this House for a long time maintained that this was useless expenditure, that it tended to pauperize the Indians, and that the more money was expended in that way the worse off the Indians were. I do not know how far that might be true, but there is no doubt that there is a view of the matter that the Government should guard against, and that is to take no steps to make the Indian population of the Dominion feel that they are dependent upon the Government of Canada for the means of subsistence, and that habits of self-reliance should in this way be undermined. I do not know how far this has been done in British Columbia, but I should judge from the statement made by my hon. friend from South Huron, from the Public Accounts, that the Indians have not been very much injured by this expenditure, for so small a portion of it has reached the Indians that they have not been much demoralized; but, if the suggestion of the hon. member for Victoria were carried out, the Indians there might suffer as seriously as the Indians in some other portions of the Dominion.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) apparently forgets that expenditure in the Dominion must be taken as a whole. There is a very large amount of expenditure in the other Provinces which

we have not enjoyed yet in British Columbia. Our position is a peculiar one. We have about 33,000 Indians there, who are essentially a part of our population, and the expenditure which is here mentioned as expended partly for their benefit has very largely to be devoted to administration and to looking after the Indians. If you take the North-West Territories, I find in the Estimates here there is pretty close upon half a million for the North-West Mounted Police. What are they for but to look after the Indians? We have got nothing of that sort in British Columbia. These agents, and those sent to assist them, act in pretty much the capacity and perform very similar functions to the North-West Mounted Police and the agents in other Provinces. The expenditure, as far as the Indians are concerned, is very small in the Province of British Columbia, and I reiterate the statement, that if the vote were considerably increased this discrepancy would not be so apparent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister was to state what the superintendents did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will remember that British Columbia is an enormous country.

Mr. BAKER. Tremendous.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, immense; and there is a large population of Indians. It has been laid out in very large districts, where agents have been appointed, whose duty it is to look after the Indians as the Indian Agents do elsewhere, to keep the peace among them, and, where they are settled on their reservations to act in every respect as an Indian Agent would in Ontario and Quebec. There is only one superintendent, Dr. Powell; but there are several agents, having their districts assigned to them. Some of them are exceedingly good officers. They keep peace among the Indians, they endeavour to stop the use of spirits, and they are really making themselves generally useful, as Indian Agents do. As I said awhile ago, I think instead of paying these large salaries that we have been doing ever since British Columbia joined us, we had better, by-and-bye, as the Indians settle on their different reserves, have farmers employed to act as agents, and have more of them, with a small sum of $200 or $300 added to the farmer's annual income, and have them settled among the Indians, or in the immediate vicinity. Our agents are very good men, on the whole; peace is being kept in that country, and the Indians are progressive, as you hear from the hon. gentleman from British Columbia.

Mr. MILLS. I apprehend that the progress the Indians have made in British Columbia has been due not so much to the efforts of the agents as to the growth of industry among the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely. That is an additional reason for altering the system, reducing the salaries, and increasing the number of farm instructors. But all these expenses are not to be considered as so much subtracted from the sum voted for the Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not necessarily condemning the system, but I merely call attention to what is a very patent fact, that the whole of this pretty large vote substantially goes to pay eight or nine gentlemen in British Columbia.

MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

170	Annuities	$173,460 00
	Agricultuaal implements	10,398 22
	Tools	1,917 54
	Cattle	10,555 00
	Seed grain	3,115 00
	Ammunition, &c	4,439 50
	Provisions (Annuity)	31,756 54
	Supplies for destitute	287,046 10
	Clothing	2,700 00
	Schools	48,204 00
	Surveys	18,000 00
	Farm wages	22,700 00
	do maintenance	5,600 00
	Sioux	2,000 00
	General expenses	66,380 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not propose to detain the Committe very long just now, especially as the House is so thin; but I suppose the hon. gentleman will allow us to discuss this pretty fully on Concurrence, if occasion requires.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right. It is past one, and a thin House.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that discussion on Concurrence is often difficult to obtain. Will the hon. gentleman say why the vote for annuities this year is $24,000 less than last year? Has the number of Indians become less, or have the frauds that have been committed in two or three agencies been discovered?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are various causes, which the hon. gentleman can quite understand. I am afraid there has been an excessive payment to the Indians that has gone on from the very beginning; frauds have been practised, and men have been paid twice. The Indians are now being very rapidly settled on the reserves. Great exertions will be made to get them settled this summer. There are some few flying parties, some broken bands, if I may say so, headed by men of bad character, who like to infest the frontier so as to cross over occasionally into the neighbouring country. There is a mutual system of foray going on, stealing horses, cattle, and that kind of thing. But we are getting them all pretty well to the north of the Pacific Railway, far from the frontier, and getting them settled on the reserves. The moment they are on the reserve the Indians can be identified, the heads of families can be known, and the expenditure can be brought within a reasonable compass.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to invite the attention of the Minister to some matters that I think of consequence, and upon which further information might be desirable than what is given in the Report. Among the things which I notice in the Report is, that there are 225 salaried officials in the employ of the Government, in connection with this Department, whose salaries amount to $50,582.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not very much.

Mr. MILLS. It is very considerably more than it was a few years ago. In 1878, the same service was $37,038; it is now, altogether, $109,638. That is a considerable advance, with the same number of Indians to be provided for. Then there is the amount paid for farm instruction. I observe in the Report brought down that the cost of farm maintenance last year was $80,840. I do not find anything in the Report as the result of that expenditure. A certain quantity of grain was produced in connection with the Indian service in the North-West; but these products were raised, not on Indian farms, but on Indian reservations. It would be an advantage to the Department if a statement was submitted showing the amount produced on each farm. The payment of fixed salaries to parties so far beyond the supervision of the Government is not, of course, calculated to make them labour to the best advantage. We were told, when in office, by the hon. gentleman, that we ought not to have expended money for the payment of Indians when their annuities were being handed them. Such payments were necessary in 1875-76-77 and 1878. The hon. gentleman stated that so soon as the Indians were placed on their reservations no such expenditure would be necessary. Yet we find that in 1878, $28,500 were expended in that way, and no less than $50,817 last year. So we have an expenditure which it was

anticipated would be got rid of, absolutely increased. A large expense is involved in feeding Indians, the amount this year asked being $287,000. I understand that very recently orders were given that the quantity of provisions dealt out on certain locations should be diminished, and that several Indians have died of starvation—in the neighbourhood of thirty—during the past few weeks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No such report has been made.

Mr. MILLS. I have a statement in my desk as to where the Indians were located, and the number who died. It is very desirable that we should have information on this question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will endeavour to answer fully, on Concurrence, all the points mentioned by the hon. gentleman, all of which are important.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:45 o'clock, a.m) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. GIROUARD presented the First Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:—

The Committee, to whom was referred the question, whether Sir Charles Tupper is now member for Cumberland, or whether he has vacated his seat, beg leave to report that Sir Charles Tupper has not vacated his seat, and is still the member for Cumberland.

The Committee, to whom was also referred the Bill (No. 111) respecting the Independence of Parliament Act, 1868, 41 Victoria, Chapter 5, beg leave to report the said Bill, with amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted with the Minutes of Proceedings, and all the documents referring to the case, and in possession of the Committee.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE *DEBATES*.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in moving that the Fifth Report (page 1240) of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the *Debates* of this House during the present Session, said: This report has relation to the French translation of the *Debates* about which there was some discussion a few days ago. The Committee, in presenting the report, had two objects in view. The first was to fairly remunerate the translators, but the chief object was to secure, if possible, a more rapid delivery of the French copy of the report. The practical difficulty in accomplishing that heretofore, has been that the translation had to be made from the revised proofs, and those revised proofs were hardly in the hands of the translators for a week, at any rate, after the revision of the speeches. The time then was so far gone that I am rather inclined to think that the printers looked upon the printing of French copy as a matter of less consequence than the printing of the English, and considerable delay occurred in this way. The proposal now made is that, if a speech, for instance, is delivered in the House at night, the next day the member receives a copy of his speech pasted on paper with a view to his making such correction as may be necessary in the speech. Two of these will be prepared in the *Hansard* room, one retained in that room and the other sent to the member. When that speech is returned to the *Hansard* room, the copy retained will be corrected exactly in accordance with the correction made by the member, and that corrected copy will go straight to the translators' room, and the translation will be made from that, so that we will have a translation from the corrected report without waiting for its being printed. Then we also propose in this report that the chief translator shall keep a daily record of the work done by the translators. So far as the reporters are concerned, as they have what are called ten minute takes, and one comes in after the other to the table, there is no difficulty in knowing that each reporter does his fair share of work; but there is no such check in the case of the translators, and it is important that the Committee should know who are doing good work, and who, if any, are not accomplishing what they ought to accomplish. It is therefore proposed to have this check. The chief translator is to keep a daily record, which is to be signed by him and by the translator himself, so that the Committee may know not only the quantity of work done, but may be able, if there be any defect in the work, to detect who is defective, and, if that cannot be remedied, some one else will have to take his place. The report further recommends that two gentlemen who were appointed this year, towards the middle of the Session, for the purpose of enabling the report to be got out, shall be appointed as additional translators permanently, and, in addition to that, there is one other translator recommended for appointment, making in all eight regular translators, in addition to the two gentlemen who are at the Table, the two French reporters, who are supposed to assist, but experience up to this time indicates that they will not more than count for one efficient translator. Now, looking at the object which the Committee have in view, and which it must be admitted is one of great importance, especially for the speedy delivery of the French report, I may say that, this Session, up to last Monday, the end of the month, we had 1,269 pages of *Hansard*. The daily edition, taking the average of the whole, averaged 25½ pages. We had 25½ pages for each day during that time, but, during the first 13 days of the Session, we had but 116 pages of *Hansard*, or but nine pages per day, and that is including one day, the day of the debate on the Address, upon which we had 25 pages. Then in the subsequent 38 days, we had 1,181 pages, or an average of 31 pages a day, taking the whole time; but included in that we had 18 days when there were 31 pages and upwards, nine days when there were 35 pages and upwards, two days when there were 40 pages, two when there were 42 pages, one when there were 46 pages, and one when there were 48 pages—that was the day when the longest debate of the Session took place. The general estimate is that three pages, or three to four, at any rate, is what may fairly be expected from a translator each day. If that be the case, then the number we have now, allowing three and a-half to four pages a day, ought to be able to give us the French translation so that it will be in the hands of the French members within three or four days at most of the time of the delivery of the speeches; and, in that way, that which has been a very serious grievance up to this time will, we hope, in future be removed, and the French members will be able to distribute their *Hansard* to their own constituents in their own language, within a reasonable time of the delivery of the speeches in Parliament. I beg to move the adoption of the report.

Mr. COURSOL. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Committee have taken a step in the right direction; they have acknowledged that the French translators ought to form part of the regular organization of the *Hansard*. It is just what we claimed the other day. However, I think that the Committee ought to go further; they

have done an act of justice towards the translators by giving them the increase mentioned in the report, but I see that this increase is to take place only next year. I think that the Committee would act wisely and would do justice to them, by giving them this year that salary which is small enough in itself; for these gentlemen will not have any more work next year than they will have this year. If the French *Hansard* is not completed up to the present day, it is not for the want of zeal on their part; on the contrary, I am credibly informed that there are, at the present time, 300 or 400 pages of translated copy in the printer's office. The translators, who have done their duty until now, should not be blamed because that copy has not yet come out of the printer's office. Since the increase of salary given to the stenographers is to be paid this year, I think that in justice to the translators, the $1,000 salary granted to them should also be paid immediately. Moreover, it is to be required of the French translators that they remain here for three weeks, and perhaps five weeks, after the Session, to finish their work. Since it has been found necessary—and very properly, I believe—to appoint a new translator, I do not see why he is not asked to help the others this year, so as to enable them to finish their work as soon as possible, for the translators are mostly members of the press; they have other business to attend to; they have to earn their living, and in consideration of the small salary which is granted to them, it seems to me that their work should be diminished by the addition of this new translator to their number. I think that as a mere matter of justice, the members of the Committee will see the necessity of giving to the translators, even this year, this salary of $1,000. At any rate, if the House is of opinion that they deserve a salary of $1,000, it seems to me that this salary, and not the $800, should be given to them this year. I still entertain the hope that the *Hansard* Committee will be pleased to take this matter into consideration, and that the House, especially, will see that the French translators be fairly treated. I is not a favour we ask, it is simply an act of justice. The translators are performing a duty which is just as important as that of the reporters of the *Hansard*, but they receive less pay. The speeches reported by the stenographers are translated into French as rapidly as it is possible; it is necessary for the translators to have a good command of both languages; they are obliged to write themselves whatever they have to translate, to read over and correct their own manuscript before sending it to the printers, and to read it over again when it comes back from the printer's office. It is easily conceived that they work just as much as the stenographers, as every speech taken by stenography is sent to them to be translated into French. It is a long and tedious work which requires the highest degree of intelligence, the greatest zeal and assiduity on the part of these gentlemen. I hope the House, with its usual impartiality, will remedy this want of justice on the part of the *Hansard* Committee.

Mr. AUGER moved in amendment that all the words after "That" in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

"In the interest of economy, it is inadvisable to continue the system of paying out of the public funds a body of Official Reporters and Translators of the Debates of this House."

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dupont,	Laurier,
Allison (Lennox),	Fairbank	Lesage,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Livingstone,
Auger,	Gigault,	Mackenzie.
Bain (Soulanges),	Girouard,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Wentworth),	Grandbois,	McCraney,
Béchard,	Guilbault,	McIsaac,
Bernier,	Guillet,	McMullen,
Blake,	Gunn,	Patterson (Essex),
Blondeau,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Bolduc,	Harley,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Ray,
Bourbeau,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Hurteau,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Kinney,	Thompson,
Catudal,	Kirk,	Wells,
Cockburn,	Landerkin,	Wheler,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Wilson, and
Desaulniers,	Landry (Montmagny),	Yeo.—61.
Dodd,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dugas,	Moffat,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Welland),	Mulock,
Baker (Victoria),	Fisher,	Ouimet,
Beaty,	Fleming,	Paint,
Bell,	Gagné,	Paterson (Brant),
Belleau,	Gault,	Reid,
Benson,	Gillmor,	Riopel,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Billy,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bossé,	Hay,	Scriver,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Brecken,	Hilliard,	Small,
Bryson,	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Burns,	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Ives,	Springer,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kilvert,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Cameron (Victoria),	King,	Tassé,
Carling,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Caron,	Langevin,	Trow,
Cartwright	Lister,	Tupper (Pictou),
Chapleau,	Macdonald (King),	Tyrwhitt,
Charlton,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vail,
Colby,	McDonald (CapeBreton),	Wallace (York),
Cook,	Mackintosh,	Watson,
Costigan,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Weldon,
Coursol,	McCallum,	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	McDougald,	Wigle,
Cuthbert,	McIntyre,	Williams,
Daly,	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Davies,	McNeill,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dawson,	Massue,	Woodworth,
De St. Georges,	Mills,	Wright—101.
Desjardins,	Mitchell,	

Mr. COURSOL moved in amendment that the report be referred back to the Committee with instructions to amend the same by substituting in the fifth paragraph for the words "commencing with next Session," the words "including the present Session."

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken on the main motion. He must get some other person to move the amendment.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved in amendment that the report be sent back to the Committee with instructions to amend the same by expunging the following paragraph:

"4. That A. E. Poirier be appointed as an additional translator, and that his appointment date from the commencement of next Session.

"And by leaving out in paragraph 5 the name of A. E. Poirier.

Mr. Speaker, I make this motion in order to be consistent with the vote we have just taken. If we think that the expenses are increasing, I do not see why an extra employee should be added to the list of the employees we have already. I think that all those who have just voted to abolish the *Hansard*—because it is too expensive a publication for this House—will be consistent with themselves and will vote to have the report referred back to the Committee, with instruction to strike out the name which it is proposed to add by the report. These are all the explanations I have to give for the present.

Mr. SCRIVER. The Committee were fully convinced from the information given them that it was absolutely necessary to employ an additional translator as otherwise the translation would be kept back in such a way as to render it almost useless. It appears that the work is now in arrears for about four weeks, and it will be necessary for

the translators already engaged to remain that time after the close of the Session, in order to complete the work. A majority of the French members of the House have made frequent complaints to the Committee in regard to this matter, and the Committee, after considering it carefully, and being satisfied that the present staff were inadequate to discharge this duty with sufficient promptitude, decided to engage another assistant. I may say that since the long night sittings commenced, the average quantity of printed matter has been nearly thirty pages of the *Hansard*. The translators consider that three pages a day is a fair day's work, and it was necessary, therefore, even allowing for the work that can be done by the French reporters, that a regular staff of eight translators should be appointed, and in view of this fact the Committee decided to appoint another one. Mr. Poirier was chosen because his testimonials were of the very best kind, and he was personally known to many members of the Committee as an accomplished journalist, and as a man specially qualified to undertake this work. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee were as reluctant as any members of this House can be, to add to the expense already made necessary to carry on this work; but it seemed to them that if the work was to be made at all satisfactory to the French members of this House it was necessary to engage another translator.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) suggested that as the House voted nay to the last amendment they ought to vote yea to this one. I differ with him altogether. As long as we preserve the system of an official debate, I have always voted to make it efficient and have supported any proposition that would tend to give us a thoroughly efficient and satisfactory report. I believe that it is worse than useless when it is otherwise. One of the conditions of its being efficient is that the French translation should be not merely good, but also rapidly brought out, so that our French confreres may have an opportunity of having the reports of important debates early while yet they are fresh and while their course is directed to them. The report of the Committee, both collectively and also in the statements of the hon. member for Cardwell and the hon. member for Huntingdon, indicate, that for the work this number of translators is required. When the press of the Session commences—and you cannot anticipate the debates—there is somewhere, upon an average, about thirty pages of the report daily, and the hon. member for Cardwell considers three pages a day good work for one translater. You have a proposition now to have eight translators on the permanent staff besides the two stenographers, whose work, the hon. member for Cardwell says, must be deemed equivalent to only one; you have therefore, the present equivalent of nine translators, when ten would be required to do the work. It seems, therefore, that the suggestion of the Committee is a right and proper one, in order that we may have an efficient French as well as an efficient English report. I propose to support the report of the Committee, in the view that as long as there is an official report it should be correctly and expeditiously brought out.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know the reasons that have prompted the hon. member for Montmagny to make this motion, as he has given to the House but very brief explanations. I for one, Mr. Speaker, will not be suspected, I am sure, of speaking in an interested manner upon this motion. I know that some members of the Committee and members of the House complained the other day, either that the salaries given to the translators were not adequate for the work they had to do, or that their number was not sufficient to do the work imposed upon them. I do not want to discuss the action of the Committee—I suppose they have thoroughly considered the work the translators have to do. They have asked for the appointment of an additional translator, and against the gentleman whose name is mentioned I have nothing to say. We are not to judge of the political qualifications of the reporters and translators of the *Hansard;* but if I were to say anything I would say that so far as efficiency is concerned, so far as knowledge of the language is concerned, and so far as thorough qualification for the work is concerned, the gentleman whose name appears in this motion is as well qualified as any others at present on the staff. I did not know before his name was proposed by the Committee, that he was an applicant, but upon learning it I am very much pleased that he is to be nominated as one of the permanent officers of the staff. On the general question, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think I can speak with entire disinterestedness. We should not call up any unpleasant reminiscences of the past, when the question is to secure a competent officer of the House. The only questions that we should consider in the choice of reporters and translators for the *Hansard* are those of knowledge, ability and general qualification.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is one reason why I cannot support this amendment, and it is this: that while I voted cheerfully for the abolition of the report as now conducted—although I failed to accomplish what I intended by my vote—it now comes to a matter of supporting the Committee in their decision upon a domestic question. I have always taken it for granted that the House should support its standing Committees in their reports unless special reasons may be urged against such a course. I have heard no such reason urged at this time, and I shall support the recommendation of the Committee, which is considered essential to the system, so long as we have it; otherwise I would fail in the discharge of my duty to the House, although I voted for the original amendment.

Mr. BERGIN. I rise merely to say that the Committee appointed this gentleman as one of the translators on the recommendations as to his qualifications, and we declined to consider his politics at all. We felt that it was not the duty of the Committee to enquire into a man's politics but into his qualifications, and that politics have nothing whatever to do with a man's qualifications as a servant of this House.

Amendment (Mr. Landry) negatived.

Mr. AMYOT moved in amendment that the said report be amended by substituting in the fifth paragraph, for the words "commencing with next Session," the words "including the present Session." He said: I think that by this arrangement all parties will be satisfied, and we will have a permanent and effective staff for the *Hansard*. If the translators deserve that salary, they deserve it as well this year as next year. It is nothing but justice to give them immediately the salary to which they are entitled in the opinion of the Committee, and I think, also, in the opinion of this House. It is a trifling matter to this House. We must remember that this year they have done the work with only seven men, and they are, therefore, more entitled to increased remuneration this year than they will be next year when there will be eight men. As I said at the beginning, it will be satisfactory to all parties and there will be an end to the discussion.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Committee hesitated long before concluding to advance the salaries of the translators. It was felt that the same argument would not apply to the translators as to the *Hansard* reporters, as the latter had been trained to the work, possessed special adaptability and their places could not be supplied. It was considered a matter of justice towards them to advance their salaries, and the advance to take place after this Session. After considerable discussion it was finally concluded by the Committee to advance the salaries of the translators in the same pro-

portion as the reporters, about one-third, the reporters advance being one third. The question as to the time when it should go into effect was also discussed, and it was decided that it would take effect, as in the case of the *Hansard* reporters, next Session. I think it would be entirely unfair to take the advance retroactive in one case and not in the other. I think that the Committee arrived at a decision which the House should sanction. I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not, and the salaries they receive are so much to the good. The case is very different with the *Hansard* reporters. They have no other employment. Although they are nominally employed here during only three or four months, they are practically unable to obtain other employment during the recess. I repeat that the proposal to make the advance retroactive in the case of the translators and not in that of the reporters is unfair.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if the motion in amendment, as proposed, by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) is adopted, Mr. Poirier, whose name appears in the fifth clause of the report, will receive this year a salary of $1,000 without doing any work at all.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) His appointment only takes effect next year.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) By virtue of the fourth clause, his appointment only takes effect next year, and in the fifth clause it is stated that these gentlemen will only begin next year to receive the salary stated opposite their names, but the amendment which has just been moved asks that this salary be paid to them this year. Now, a word in answer to the hon. Secretary of State, who says he does not know the reasons which may have induced me to make a motion in amendment——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that; I said the hon. gentleman had given no reasons.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) In that case, I think it is better not to make them known.

Amendment (Mr. Amyot) negatived, and report concurred in.

THE LATE PRINCE LEOPOLD.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that a Message had been received from the Senate with an Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty of condolence on the death of His Royal Highness, Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany, to which the concurrence of this House was desired; and the said Address is as follows:—

"*To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty,*

"MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

"We Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty with the renewed assurance of our attachment to Your Majesty's Person and Government.

"The intelligence of the further affliction which has befallen You, in the early and sudden death of His Royal Highness, the Duke of Albany, has deeply touched the hearts of Your Majesty's subjects in this part of Your Empire; We speak in their name, as well as in our own, when we humbly tender You the expression of our respectful and earnest sympathy.

"Your Illustrious Son had spent some time in Canada, during the residence here of the Marquis of Lorne and Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise.

"Our attention was thus naturally drawn to the high position he had, so early in life, attained in the world of Literature and Science, and we had looked forward with confidence and hope to the increasing usefulness of his already distinguished career.

"Your Majesty's bereavements have indeed been many and grievous, and the interest which You have so often and graciously shown in the afflictions of Your subjects, of low as well as of high degree, has intensified our sympathy with Your own: Your Majesty's sorrows, we say it with respect of dutiful subjects, have been ours.

"We pray that the God of consolation may comfort Your Majesty, and long preserve You to Your people."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said Address be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT ST. CLOTILDE.

Mr. HOLTON enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a post office at St. Clotilde, in the parish of St. Jean Chrysostome, county of Chateauguay? If so, when, and who will be named postmaster?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. DESJARDINS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring down during this Session some measure to compel railway companies to do away with level crossings on roads or streets leading to and in the vicinity, or within the limits of large centres of population?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to provide for that matter, as it is already provided for by 46 Vic., chap. 24, an Act further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act which provides as follows:—

"In case where any portion of a railway is constructed, or authorized or proposed to be constructed upon, or along, or across any turnpike road, street, or other public highway on the level, the railway company before constructing or using the same, or in the case of railways already constructed within such time as the Railway Committee shall direct, shall submit a plan and profile of such portion of railway for the approval of the Railway Committee, and the Railway Committee, if it appears to them necessary for the public safety, may, from time to time, with the sanction of the Governor in Council authorize and require the company to whom such railway belongs within such time as the said Act directs to carry such road street or highway either over or under the said railway by means of a bridge or arch instead of crossing the same on the level."

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of saying whether or not there is any truth in the rumours which have been heard within the last day or two, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have represented that the arrangements recently made with them are inadequate, and that they have asked for a modification of those arrangements.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No such communication has been made, so far as I am aware, to the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE FISHERY AWARD.

Mr. DAVIES. The proposition to which the House is asked to accede, in the resolutions which I intend to move, is that Prince Edward Island is entitled to a portion of the amount awarded to Great Britain, as against the United States, at the Halifax Fishery Commission. This proposition has been discussed once or twice in the House, but not at any great length, and it has never been submitted to the House in a form in which the sense of the House could be taken upon it. Hon. members will better understand the few remarks which I shall make on the subject, if I read the resolutions to the House:

That by the terms of the Treaty of Washington, 1871, the privilege of using the territorial waters of the Dominion of Canada and the then Provinces of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland for a certain term for fishing purposes, in common with British subjects, was granted to American citizens, on and after such times as the necessary laws to

carry the treaty into effect were passed by the Imperial and Dominion Parliaments, the Legislatures of the said Provinces and the Congress of the United States, in consideration of the payment by the United States Government of such compensation as should be determined by Arbitrators appointed by such Treaty.

That the necessary legislation in the premises was passed by the then Province of Prince Edward Island, in the year 1872, while such Island constituted a separate Province, and being also passed by the Imperial and Dominion Parliaments and the American Congress, the Treaty came into force on the 1st July, 1873, from which date the American fishermen have continued to use and enjoy the said Fisheries.

That immediately upon the passing of such legislation, Prince Edward Island as such separate Province and as a consenting party to the Treaty, became entitled to a share of any award which might afterwards be made in favour of Great Britain as compensation for the fishing privileges conceded by the Treaty to the Americans.

That Prince Edward Island entered the Confederation on the 1st July, 1873, upon certain specified terms which did not either expressly or by implication transfer to the Dominion the right vested in the Province to a share of such compensation.

That subsequently the Commissioners appointed under the Treaty awarded to Great Britain the sum of $5,500,000 as compensation for the privileges accorded to the United States fishermen.

That the Imperial Government paid out of such award to the Province of Newfoundland the sum of $1,000,000 as its share of the award and the balance of the said sum less certain expenses, was paid over to the Dominion of Canada, which now holds the same.

That in the opinion of this House the Province of Prince Edward Island is entitled to receive such a fair proportion of said award as the value of the privileges conceded by that Province to the Americans, before entering Confederation, bears to that conceded by the Dominion as constituted when the Treaty of Washington was ratified.

I have read the resolutions because they contain a recital of the historical facts connected with this question up to and during the time when the award was made. I may say that the people of Prince Edward Island, irrespective of party, have come to the conclusion that they are entitled to this sum, and I hope the reasons which induced them to come to that conclusion will be sufficient to induce a majority of this House to come to a similar conclusion. The question of the general right of the Maritime Provinces, as such, to share in this award, was brought before the House and discussed at great length in 1880, when it was decided in the negative. That question I am not going to revive. I take it that the large majority which voted against the right of the Maritime Provinces to share in that award as such has completely settled that question, and it is not my desire to revive it in any shape or way at present. But the decision of the House on that general question does not in any way touch the claim which is now presented for the consideration of the House. That decision was based upon an argument which was submitted to the House by the Prime Minister, and which ran something in this way: That under Confederation the coasts of the Provinces were merged with those of the Dominion at large; that the term royalties used in the British North America Act, did not apply to the fisheries; that the right to fish was one of common right, belonging to all the people, and could not be granted by the Crown; that the British North America Act conferred the right of legislation on the subject of fisheries upon the Dominion, and having the right to legislate it has the right of administration, and that the rights of administration and responsibility must be co-relative and must draw to it all the advantages. The proposition which I submit is one which does not trench upon the previous decision of the House in the slightest, nor is in any way involved in it. When that question came before the House for discussion, the claim which I have the honour to present now was brought to its notice then by my hon. colleague, and the then Minister of Justice took occasion to remark that whatever the merits or demerits of the claim might be, it must be understood that it was not then being passed upon. I will trouble the House while I read some of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice at the time, because I am anxious to assure hon. gentlemen that I am not introducing for the consideration of the House any question in reference to this award, which has been decided by the House, but an entirely new question, which has not been passed upon by the House. The Minister of Justice said:

'With regard to the observations of my hon. friend from King's, P.E.I., it may be said that the claims of the representatives of that Island stand in a somewhat different position from that of the older Provinces, and it may be possible that there is something in their view of the case. It is quite true that negotiations did take place between the Island and the United States, with the consent and knowledge, I believe—I was not in the Government at the time—of the Dominion Government, on which, and under which, perhaps, certain rights and considerations may be due to the colony, which may not be due to the other Provinces. I can only say that, should that, on investigation, be found to be the case, should the Government find, on a full and intelligent application of the facts that, under the Constitution and law, and under the Terms under which this Island entered the Union, that any consideration that can be extended to it, the representatives may be quite sure that the fullest and fairest considerations will be given to any claims that may be established."

This was the speech of the Minister of Justice in 1880—the present Chief Justice of Nova Scotia. Hon. gentlemen will see that the claims of Prince Edward Island were not being passed upon by the House, and were understood clearly to be reserved; and the Minister of Justice of the day though he did not give any expression of opinion assenting to the justice of the claim, clearly, was very careful in not denying this justice, in saying that it was an open question, a question to be discussed and decided upon after fuller investigation was given to the facts than had been given to them up to that time. Well, a notice of motion was given by an hon. member from the Island, somewhat similar to the one I present to-day, but it never was reached; and we stand to-day with this claim, which has been pressed by successive Governments of the Island on the Dominion Government from time to time—we stand to-day knowing that claim is unsettled, and I submit these resolutions for the purpose of having it settled, if possible. I may say that I quite agree with the Minister of Justice of that day, that in order to have an intelligent apprehension of this resolution and the claim which the Island makes, we must have a clear understanding of the facts which took place, and the action of the Island on the subject, before it became part of the Confederation. In 1871 Prince Edward Island, then a separate and independent Province, was being pressed by the Imperial Government to yield its consent to the Washington Treaty, so far as it affected that Province. Prince Edward Island was very averse to yielding that consent, for reasons which were submitted to the English authorities in the form of a Minute of Council, and which were somewhat similar to those which moved the Privy Council of Canada of that day. The people of Prince Edward Island were averse to selling their territorial rights in these fisheries for a sum of money. They expressed themselves as very doubtful, if they did consent to such a sale, whether the Treaty guaranteed the payment of that money. And in the Minute of Council, which was forwarded to the Home Government, they urged and argued strongly, that instead of receiving, in return for the concessions they were asked to make to the Americans, a sum of money, they should receive certain trade advantages. In the Minute of Council which is dated July 17, 1871, it is stated:

"That the natural market for its principal productions is to be found in the United States, as was very satisfactorily proven during the continuation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854; that the fisheries of this Island are the best and most valuable in America, and are much appreciated by the fishermen of the United States; that the different Governments and Legislatures of this colony have always hoped that these fisheries would have done much to secure the advantages of another Reciprocity Treaty, or of some tariff concessions authorizing the free admission of the products of our agriculturists who form the majority of our population, and which would have resulted in promoting the prosperity of the colony; that by the treaty now under consideration the inhabitants of this Island are asked to surrender to the citizens of the United States these invaluable fisheries without receiving in return any just or fair equivalent such as was hoped to be obtained. * * * The Committee submit that a commercial arrangement with the United States, in consideration of the use of the fisheries, would have been most acceptable; but as the Royal High Commissioners were unable to induce the American Government to change its commercial policy, the people of this Island being extremely loyal and devotedly attached to British institutions, would be most unwilling to throw any obstacle in the way of an amicable settlement of all causes of difference between

Great Britain and the United States, and would therefore willingly accept any reasonable money compensation, in addition to the privileges granted, as an equivalent. But under the treaty, nothing of the kind is guaranteed them"

Here we see that in the year 1871, two years before the Province of Prince Edward Island became part of the Confederation, its Government expressed their reluctance to concede the use of its fisheries to the Americans, for a mere money consideration. They felt that it should be made a matter of commercial treaty; but they went on to say, that while they yielded to the strong and urgent remonstrances of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, they submitted they had no positive guarantee, if a sum of money was awarded under the treaty, that it would be paid to them. Earl Kimberly wrote, in answer to that Minute of Council, a despatch intended to remove any doubt on that point, and stating if the Government of Prince Edward Island ratified the Treaty of Washington, he, so far as he could do it, would give them a guarantee that the value of the concessions made by them would be estimated by the arbitrators, and after being estimated, would be paid to them. In the despatch, which is dated the 3rd September, 1871, His Lordship states :

"Her Majesty's Government have learnt, with much satisfaction, that the Prince Edward Island Government have so willingly acceded their wishes in this respect. With regard to the observations contained in the Minutes of Council, which you have forwarded, to the effect that the Prince Edward Island Government would readily accept any reasonable money compensation, in addition to the privileges granted, as an equivalent, but that under the treaty nothing of the kind is guaranteed, I do not understand why the Prince Edward Island Government should object to the reference of the question of the money compensation to arbitration, which seems to be the fairest way of determining such a point, more especially as the fact stated in the Minute, that the rights of fishing conceded by the United States are comparatively worthless, is, it must be presumed, capable of distinct proof."

There His Lordship gave an assurance to the Government of Prince Edward Island, and through them to the people of that Province, that if they passed the legislation necessary to ratify the Treaty of Washington, the amount representing the value of the privileges they conceded by that treaty would be awarded to them; and, although His Lordship does not expressly say that it will be paid, the only logical and legitimate inference to be drawn from his despatch is that if they ratified the treaty, the amount awarded would be paid. Well, Sir, the people of Prince Edward Island did ratify the treaty, and I submit that without their ratification, the treaty would have been of no use, and would have had no force whatever, so far as the Island was concerned. The 33rd article of the Treaty of Washington expressly says that articles 18 to 25 inclusive, which are the fishery clauses of the Treaty :

"Shall take effect as soon as the laws required to carry them into operation shall have been passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, by the Parliament of Canada, and by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, on the one hand, and by the Congress of the United States on the other."

So that, by the very terms of the treaty, the Legislature of Prince Edward Island was made a consenting and assenting party to it, without whose assent and consent those articles would never go into operation. Articles 18 to 25 provide—First, that certain concessions shall be given to the Americans; and secondly, that the Americans shall pay for those concessions whatever the arbitrators may award. The people of Prince Edward Island were asked to accede to those terms, and we did so, after having submitted to the Colonial Ministry that there was a possible doubt about the payment of the money, and having received his answer that we should not entertain any such doubt, because the terms of the treaty were clear enough. Now, the question arises, what right had we in those fisheries at all? I submit that we had every right at the time. I submit that the very fact that we were made by Great Britain a party to the treaty proves conclusively the existence of our right. It is not necessary to the purpose of my argument that I should meet the objection that we had no rights as against Great Britain in those waters which she could not give to a foreign nation without our consent. I merely say that Great Britain did not attempt to do anything of the kind; and the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government when he made his speech in this House in 1871, asking the House to assent to the treaty, expressly declared that the rights of the Province in those fisheries had been secured to it beyond all doubt, and secured in such a way that it could claim them as territorial rights, and Great Britain could not dispose of them without the assent of the Province. The words of the hon. gentleman were these :

"The recognition of the proprietary right of Canada in her fisheries forms a portion of the State papers of both countries. Now, the rights of Canada to those fisheries are beyond dispute; and it is finally established that England cannot and will not, under any circumstances whatever, cede those fisheries without the consent of Canada. So that, in any further arrangement between Canada and England, or England and the United States, the rights of Canada will be respected, as it is conceded beyond dispute that England has not the power to deprive Canada of them."

Now, the point I want to make is this—that if Canada had territorial rights in her fisheries secured to her by that treaty — territorial rights which she possessed and which could not be taken away from her, rights which, according to the right hon. First Minister, it was finally established England could not and would not, under any circumstances whatever, cede away without her consent, the same argument applies, in all its fullness, to the Province of Prince Edward Island which then was a separate Province and had as great a right in her fisheries, in the fisheries surrounding her coast, as Canada had in those surrounding her coasts. The right of the smaller Province in her fisheries was as great as the right of Canada in hers. Then we found ourselves, in the year 1871, in this position, that Prince Edward Island possessed certain clearly defined territorial rights, rights which the hon. First Minister says the State papers show conclusively Great Britain could not and would not attempt to force her to surrender without compensation, and that she, with the despatch of Lord Kimberly in her hands, agreed to cede those rights, the right to use those fisheries to the United States fishermen provided the value of the rights she was ceding should be assessed by arbitrators in the manner provided by the Washington Treaty. That treaty recognized the right of all of the Colonial Provinces to act independently one of the other. The Provinces of Canada, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island were equal in power, *quoad* the fisheries surrounding their respective coasts. Prince Edward Island ratified the treaty the 29th June, 1872, Canada the 14th June, 1872, and the United States Congress, the 1st March, 1873. I therefore submit this proposition to the House, from the treaty and the State documents I have read, that in the year 1872 before Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, she had, as a separate Province and as an independent consenting party to the Treaty of Washington, the right to a share of any award which might be made under that treaty, and I take it as an undisputable fact—a fact which will be conceded by everybody—that had Prince Edward Island remained in her independent position and out of the Union, no question would have been raised by Great Britain or Canada or by anybody as to her right to receive a share of the award. What the share would be would of course, be a matter of decision by arbitration to be indifferently chosen as between her and Canada. If that proposition is conceded, that before entering Confederation, Prince Edward Island had a vested right to a share of the monies subsequently to be awarded, the only question left for our consideration is, did Prince Edward Island, by the terms agreed upon between her and the Dominion of Canada, surrender that right? That is a simple question,

which can easily be determined by referring to the terms of the Union. I submit these terms do not, either expressly or by implication, establish any surrender made to Canada by Prince Edward Island of the vested right she then possessed. These terms of the Union were very particular and special in defining what should be surrendered by the smaller Province to the larger Provinces, and what should be ceded by the larger to the smaller. Everything the Island was to get from Canada was expressly stated; everything she was to give up to Canada was expressly stated. If Canada took from us a steam dredge, they stated: "We take it and give you so much in return;" if they took a Court House, they made a similar statement; and any other Provincial property or right we possessed which they desired to have was expressly put in those terms, and the sum they were to pay, awarded. Nothing however was said, either expressly or by implication, about the vested right we possessed to a portion of this fishery award, and therefore I submit, as a proposition which ought to meet the acceptance of the House, that if the Island had this vested right, under the fishery articles of the treaty, to a portion of the award, and has not surrendered that right by any of the terms of Confederation entered into between her and Canada, she possesses that right still and has the right to have the sum settled and paid over to her by a fair arbitration, or any other mode which may seem to the House right and proper. It has been argued by gentlemen who take a different view of the case, that when Prince Edward Island came into the Union, she came under the British North America Act, and that the right to legislate upon the fisheries was vested in the Dominion under that Act, and this Act applied to the Island from the day she entered the Union. That is so; but I contend that the Island could only hand over to the Dominion the rights which she possessed at the time, and did not profess to, nor could she hand over the rights she had already parted with, before she came into the Union—the right which she had sold to the Americans for a term of years—to fish in her waters. That right the Canadian Parliament could not interfere with. It was something which we had sold, and which had parted from us. I acknowledge that the right of legislating with regard to those fisheries will be vested in this Parliament after the expiration of the treaty with the Americans, but the right of legislation has not and cannot be held to embrace or interfere with the right we sold to the Americans for a sum of money. If the award had been made shortly after the Washington Treaty was entered into, every one knows that the money would have been paid to the Island; nobody would have asked the Island to pay it back, and it can never be contended, as a matter of justice, that because a delay took place in the rendering of the award, the Island should be deprived of the right she undoubtedly possessed at the time of Confederation. We only surrendered to the Dominion those rights which had not been parted with by us before. We entered Confederation, and with respect to those rights which we had not parted with, we stand in neither a better nor a worse position than the other Maritime Provinces. But with respect to the rights we had sold before entering the Union, we do stand in a different position. Those rights had been changed into a debt due to us, vested in us which we did not and were not asked to surrender to the Dominion at the time we entered the Union. That money was in the nature of a rental. If the sum had been fixed at the time, it would have been paid us. We have in the case of Newfoundland, an authority which stands *quoad* the Washington Treaty on a similar footing or nearly so to that of the Island before the Island entered Confederation. We have in that case a clear authority and precedent for showing what Great Britain would have done with the money. We all know that, technically, this money was awarded to Great Britain; but the moment Great Britain received it, she handed it over partly to Newfoundland, and partly to the Dominion; if we had not joined the Dominion, we would have stood in the same position as Newfoundland and the Dominion itself, and England would have handed over to us what was considered our fare share of the award. The question is, did we surrender it? And that is the only question. I submit that we did not surrender anything to the Dominion, that we did not surrender any assets of the Provincial Government which are not expressly stated in the terms of Union to have been surrendered. We had lots of other assets besides this debt due to us by the United States for the use of our fisheries. We had treasury bonds lying in our treasury, we had moneys due to us by banks, we had other debts due to the Province. There were none of them expressly assigned, but no one has ever argued that they passed to the Dominion. They stand in no other position than this debt. There is no difference that I can see, and no one has ever had the hardihood to assert that these other assets of Prince Edward Island should be handed over to the Dominion. The mere fact that the money happens to have been paid to the Dominion, after we had become a part of it, should not entitle the Dominion to hold on to it. Great Britain paid the money to Canada merely as trustee to those entitled to it. The money is ours as a constitutional right; the money is ours because it was paid for a concession which we made to the Americans before we became part of the Dominion at all; the money is ours because it was paid for a right in the concession of which the Dominion had no concern; the money is ours because the right was vested in us as a Province at the time of Confederation, and was not ceded to the Dominion; and, comparing small things with great, I say there is just as much ground to assert that the portion of the award that was paid for the territorial rights of Canada should be ceded to Prince Edward Island as to assert that the amount which was awarded for the territorial rights of Prince Edward Island should be ceded to Canada. Of course, the portion coming to Canada would be larger, but that makes no difference in the principle. This question has been passed upon by a Committee of a Privy Council, consisting of the Finance Minister and two other Ministers whose names I forget. The report made by that Committee of Council is very short and very meagre; it does not enter into the circumstances connected with this claim at all; it merely says that, inasmuch as Prince Edward Island happened to enter into the Union on the day the treaty came in force by proclamation, therefore we have no rights; but they evade the whole argument. The mere accident that the President of the United States proclaimed a day for the treaty to come into force which happened to be the same day on which we came into the Union does not affect our right to a share of the award for a concession we made and legislated away two or three years before we came in at all. I will not trouble the House at any greater length on this subject. I dare say some other hon. gentleman from the same Province that I come from may desire to address the House upon it, and I will leave the matter in the hands of the House. My main contention, summed up, is this:—That we were induced to become a party to the Washington Treaty by the representations of the Earl of Kimberly that we had a guarantee in that treaty that any concessions we made would be paid to us after the award was made; that, in the face of that despatch of the Earl's, we ratified the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty much against the wishes of the Government of the day; that having ratified them and being an independent, separate colony, our ratification entitled us to receive, and we had in us at the time a vested right to, a portion of the money that was subsequently to be awarded; that, when we made our Treaty of Union with Canada, none of the Provincial assets passed from the Province to Canada except such as were expressly mentioned; that this debt or unascertained sum of money

due to us by the United States was not mentioned in the terms, and, not being mentioned, remains to us at this day; and that the mere coincidence of the President of the United States proclaiming the 1st July, 1873, as the day the treaty was to come into force, and that being the day on which we entered the Union, does not and cannot take from us the vested right we possess.

Mr. BRECKEN. As my hon. colleague remarked in his opening, this is not the first time that this important question has been brought under the consideration of the House. I think I am correct in saying this is about the third time. I have listened very carefully to the arguments advanced by my hon. colleague, and I think he has pretty well covered the question. I think he will agree with me in saying that we have not advanced anything new, that the arguments put forward this afternoon were pressed upon the consideration of the former House of Commons in 1880. I have myself always had a very strong view as to the justice of the claim of the Island to a share of that fishery award, and I do not know that I can advance very much in addition to what has fallen from my hon. friend. In 1871, as he has stated, we were pressed by Lord Kimberly, the then Colonial Minister—and the House must bear in mind that Prince Edward Island was not then in Confederation; we did not enter Confederation till the 1st July, 1873; we were then a separate Province—and Secretary Fish, through the English Ambassador at Washington, Sir Edward Thornton, pressed upon the English Government the necessity of the Province of Prince Edward Island, anticipating what would be carried out by the treaty, and allowing Americans to fish in our waters. I was a member of the Government which drew up the minute which has been read by my hon. colleague, and I believe my name is attached to it. I remember the circumstances very well. We then considered that, when this treaty took place, we ought to receive some consideration, and what he said is quite correct, that the Island looked for commercial advantages and commercial considerations very much more than they did for anything in the way of money consideration. The matter was brought under the consideration of the Island Government, and we acceded to the wish expressed in Lord Kimberly's despatch, and the Americans were allowed to fish in our waters. The treaty was made, and, as my colleague stated, in the articles of that treaty it was stipulated that the Imperial Government, the Dominion Government, the United States Government, and Prince Edward Island should, by legislation, confirm the terms of the treaty. In June, 1872, we did our part and confirmed the terms of the treaty, and what did we do? At that time we were out of Confederation. We agreed to the terms of the treaty, and we looked forward to a share of the money. I need not go over what was read by my hon. friend. We had an assurance from the Colonial Minister that our rights would be protected, and a request was made—and here is a point my hon. friend has not touched upon—that we should be represented at the Commission in Halifax. Lieutenant Governor Robinson, who was then the Governor of the Island, in a despatch to the Colonial Secretary, dated the 26th July, 1871, wrote as follows:—

"I may add that, in the event of the Acts necessary to give effect to the treaty being passed by the Legislature of P.E.I., my Government will apply to your Lordship for permission to send a representative to Halifax for the purpose of conferring with the agent of the Imperial Government whose appointment is provided for in the concluding paragraph of article 23 of the treaty, and of urging upon him the claims of this island, to a just share proportionate to the value of our fisheries of whatever compensation may be awarded as an equivalent for the privileges which the colonies are asked to surrender.

"My Government are, of course, aware that Great Britain and the United States are to be represented before the Halifax Commission each by one agent only; but they believe that it would be competent to Her Majesty's Government, as aforesaid, to receive information on the subject of our fisheries from a representative to be appointed by the Government of Prince Edward Island."

Mr. Odo Russell, Secretary of State, reports as follows:—

"I am to add that as regards the desire expressed by the Government of Prince Edward Island, that some person should be appointed to attend the Commission at Halifax, it appears to Lord Granville that it would not only be permissible but highly desirable that Prince Edward Island should furnish the fullest information before the Commission as to the value of the inshore fisheries on her coasts. The 24th article of the treaty provides that the Commission shall be bound to receive such oral or written testimony as either Government may present, and it will consequently be competent for the Government of Prince Edward Island to send to Halifax any person who may be selected as best capable of giving evidence on its behalf."

I think these two documents show that at that time Prince Edward Island was recognized as possessing separate and independent claims and rights, such as the Island of Newfoundland had when she received her million dollars. Now, as my hon. colleague has fairly conducted this argument, and has not imported any feeling into it, I wish to follow his example. However, I cannot abstain from making one remark, and it is this: In 1877, when the Commission were sitting at Halifax, my hon. friend was the leader of the Local Government, and he was employed by the Federal Government, then led by the hon. member for East York, to appear at Halifax as one of the advocates, I suppose, of the Dominion generally. Now, Sir, I cannot but express my regret that the hon. member, then Premier of Prince Edward Island, with all the information before him, having these two dispatches that I have just read to the House showing that this Island had been independent, and had a right to be recognized by the Commission, having also an assurance from the Imperial Government that she need not be at all doubtful as to her right of getting her share—I say, I think it is matter of great regret that my hon. friend did not then insist upon the rights of his Province to have a representative before the Commission in Halifax. I think it is a matter of great regret, because I expected that my hon. friend, upon becoming a member of this House, would have brought up this question before. At the last General Election in 1882, one of the most serious charges that my hon. friend brought against me was that during the years from 1879 to 1882, I did not advocate the interests of my Province in this House as I ought to have done, but contented myself with moving for papers; and that when an amendment was proposed by an hon. gentleman then representing Halifax, who is now Governor of the Province, I did not advocate the claims of the Province as distinctly as I ought to have done. The answer I made was that if I had erred how much more had my hon colleague erred when Premier of Prince Edward Island in not insisting upon the rights of that Province. He was before the Halifax Commission as counsel, and I suppose that he discharged his duties well. Why did he not have a representative of Prince Edward Island there, and if, as he argues here to day those separate rights existed, why were they not urged before the Commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to interpose one word, as I was in office here at the time. The reason, and a very sufficient reason, why Prince Edward Island had no representative was that the treaty did not provide for her sending a representative.

Mr. BRECKEN. I am quite well aware the treaty did not provide for it, but I am proceeding in the line of the argument of my hon. colleague, and I say that if our rights exist to-day, as I claim they do, they existed in 1877 when that Commission sat. Although my hon. friend was counsel for the whole Dominion I should have supposed that, coming from Prince Edward Island, and his special duties being to collect information affecting the fisheries of that Island, he would have taken advantage of the opportunity to advocate the claims of Prince Edward Island then, as well as now. That would have been a more opportune time for him to have done so in his double capacity as Premier of the Province and as Dominion counsel before

the Commission. He ought to have urged our separate claims as the present Premier of Newfoundland did.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon gentleman contend that any counsel acting on behalf of the Commission could have asked the Commissioners to award a separate claim for any Province? The hon. gentleman knows that the arbitration was as between Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. BRECKEN. My hon. friend held a brief as counsel for the whole Dominion at large, but he was also Premier of the Colony at the time; and if that right existed then, as I contend it did just as strongly as it does to day, I say that it was the duty of the hon. gentleman, in some shape or form, to have brought that matter before the Commission. His clients were the Dominion Government, but he was also the Premier of the Colony and he should have made some effort to have pressed the claim which he says exists now, and which must therefore have existed then. The hon. gentleman is quite right when he says that in 1871 we consented to agree to the views of the Imperial Government, though they were contrary to our own views in the matter, and that in 1872 we confirmed that arrangement by legislation. And if that was the position we occupied when we legislated in June 1872, whatever award might be given by the Commissioners for the overflow of the Dominion fisheries within the three-mile limits, we would have our share of it in proportion. We had bonds in the Treasury, we had money in our coffers, we had claims due us, but when we went into Confederation they were not handed over, nor were they asked for; and when this share was awarded, and we had legislated as we did under the treaty, we were then in precisely the same position as Newfoundland. That Commission sat in 1877. Suppose it had sat in August, 1872, and the award had been given, and a month or two after we had, by our legislation, confirmed it, would we not have been entitled to our share just as much as Newfoundland, and can it be said that because of circumtsances over which we had no control that Commission was delayed until the year 1887, that rights which existed in 1872, by this delay, were taken from us? I do not see how that is going to be the contention. I remember very well the debate which took place in this House in 1880, and the very able speech delivered by the First Minister at that time—and, of course, in regard to constitutional questions both the House and the country look upon the right hon. gentleman as a very high authority. The First Minister contended,—and no doubt theoretically he was correct,—that the right to fish within the three-mile limit was an Imperial right; that it belonged to Her Majesty's subjects in general; that fishermen might come from Ontario, Quebec, the North-West or any other part of the Dominion, and fish within that limit; that it was a common right, that it was not in the shape of a royalty, although Prince Edward Island particularly might enjoy greater advantages than other people from the fact that they are in the neighbourhood. But if that was an Imperial right, why did not the money awarded go into the Imperial treasury? Why was it handed over to the Dominion of Canada? Then there comes another argument: If it is not a territorial right but an Imperial right, and if the waters around the shores of the various provinces are the property of British subjects in all parts of the Dominion, why were $1,000,000 given to the Island of Newfoundland? If the hon. gentleman will turn to the evidence taken before the Commission they will find from the statements of one of the American counsel, Mr. Forster, that as regards the matter of the fisheries, the most valuable fisheries were around Prince Edward Island. We know very well that the Newfoundland bank fisheries are beyond the three-mile limit; and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that there is no part of the Dominion of Canada more seriously affected by allowing Americans to fish within the three-mile limit than Prince Edward Island. I happen to know something about the matter, for when I was Advocate-General, an American schooner was seized, brought into harbour and condemned, and we had the whole evidence taken. If the Americans were excluded from the three-mile limit, taking one year with another, it would be disastrous to them in the prosecution of the mackerel fishing on that part of the coast. It is true that sometimes they may follow fishing outside of the three-mile limit; but, as a general rule, if they were prevented from fishing within that limit they could not prosecute fishing with success. Here is another point which gives Prince Edward Island a particular claim for the portion of the award. The Americans resort to a mode of fishing very different from that pursued around our coast by our fishermen. We have very few fishing schooners, and the general practice is to fish with boats. The Americans come there with seines and take fish of every description, probably not 25 per cent. of which are of any value to them, for they only take mackerel, and the other fish are thrown overboard, decompose in the water and damage our fisheries. Another consideration which goes to show that we should receive a portion of the award is, that the Americans will throw vast quantities of bait on the surface of the water for the purpose of drawing fish around them, and in that way they will draw schools of mackerel from the waters in which our men are fishing. These are arguments to show that we really have sustained a loss. I do not think that I need press the case further than to say that we were outside the Dominion when the bargain was made, and when it was ratified; and if the Commission had sat promptly, as it should have done, we would have been in the same position as the Island of Newfoundland. I agree with one remark made by my colleague, that men of all shades of politics in Prince Edward Island consider that we have a just and equitable claim to a fair share of the $5,500,000 awarded by the Halifax Commission and paid by the United States Government to Great Britain for the privilege of fishing within the three-mile limit.

Mr. McINTYRE. As this subject has engaged much attention among the people of Prince Edward Island for many years, I desire to say a few words in regard to it, especially as I had not the honour of having a seat in Parliament the last time it was considered here. I am glad the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has placed the case before the House in its proper light, because when it was last introduced it was in connection with the cases of the other Maritime Provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It must be remembered that we were altogether in a different position from those Provinces at the time the Washington Treaty was negotiated. At that time, as has been said, we were an independent Province; but as Great Britain was anxious that we should give our adhesion to the treaty, the Island Government of the day did so on the distinct understanding that this action should not prejudice our case, should any award be made against the American Government or whatever course might be adopted, because at that time it was not certain whether an award would be made or not. On 1st July, 1873, Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, and on the same day the Washington Treaty was put in force by a proclamation issued by the President of the United States. This has been made the ground-work for refusing our claim to a share of the award. What the real ground-work was I have been unable to ascertain. I do not intend, however, to say anything more on that branch of the subject, because the action of the Government has done away with that contention, whatever it was. It will be remembered that, prior to the election of 1882, the Finance Minister came down with a proposition to give a certain amount of bounty to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. This was in consideration, or partly in consideration of the amount due to the Mari-

time Provinces in respect of this award. Whatever may have been the objection of the Government previous to that year, they receded from it on that occasion, for by giving our fishermen a share of the award in the shape of interest accumulating on it, they gave away their case completely. Such being the fact, I fail to see what objection the Government can have under the present circumstances to granting us our fair share of the award. I hope it is not in consequence of Prince Edward Island being the smallest and weakest of the Provinces. I do not believe it is so; but at the same time I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that this idea is gaining ground on the Island very rapidly, not only in regard to this matter, but in regard to nearly every other measure respecting the Island. Our terms of Union are no more fulfilled to-day, than we are receiving our share of the fishery award. Last year our Province received in the shape of bounty some $16,000. Now it appears to me that is a very small amount, and if we are to receive anything like the interests on our share of the award, it should be something much larger than that. I do not see why the balance of the interest which should accrue on our share should not be handed to the Local Government, after the fishery bounty has been paid out of it. Newfoundland receives without any trouble her share, amounting to a million of dollars, and it seems to me that if Newfoundland has a right to that amount, we have at least the right to an equal share, for the reason that the most profitable fish, the mackerel, have been taken by the Americans on our shores, while, on the other hand, on the shores of Newfoundland the fish which have been caught have been mainly herring, which have been used for the purpose of bait. The mackerel fisheries are not prosecuted there, because there are none of that kind of fish, or very few, on the shores of Newfoundland, and the cod fisheries are altogether beyond the three-mile limit. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution has so thoroughly advanced everything in connection with the subject, that I find it is unnecessary for me to say anything more than that I hope the Government will take whatever steps they see fit, to do justice to Prince Edward Island, not only in regard to this award, but in every other respect.

Mr. TUPPER. I regret very much that I cannot on this occasion give a hearty concurrence with the efforts made by the gentlemen who have just addressed the House, from the Maritime Provinces, in reference to this alleged claim. It always affords me, naturally, the very greatest pleasure to be able to add what little weight I can in securing what I believe the Maritime Provinces, or any of them, may be entitled to at the hands of this country. But in the case which has been laid before the House by the three gentlemen, who are well able to advocate their claims, I have failed to discover any fair or equitable reasons for the conclusions to which they have arrived. It is admitted, I conceive, that there is no absolute legal right on the part of Prince Edward Island to receive the amount claimed by this resolution from the revenues of the Dominion of Canada, in addition to the treatment received and the rights already granted that Island by the legislation which took place after the discussion in 1880, to which allusion has been made to-day. They claim that in all fairness, upon certain facts which they say existed in the Island previous to its entrance into Confederation, they are entitled to certain treatment, which has not been accorded to them. I do not hear to-day any mention made of many other matters which are most important in the consideration of this question; I did not hear to-day any allusion made to what had preceded this treaty, in the older Provinces, or in Canada as she stood at the entrance of the Island into the Union. I heard allusion made to certain legislation passed in Prince Edward Island, but I heard no reference made to the enormous expense to which the older Provinces up to the year 1873 had contributed, in protecting those rights which were secured under the Washington Treaty.

Mr. DAVIES. They never spent a dollar in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. TUPPER. I heard no allusion to the fact—and I think in connection with this matter, the all-important fact—that the Provinces of Canada, before the entrance of the Island into the Union, took upon themselves the responsibility, and incurred the expense of setting up the right which under the treaty has been admitted to exist. We know that for years the rights of British subjects in these colonies had been invaded; these rights had been denied by the citizens of the United States, by the fishermen of the United States and by the American Government. Under the old treaty their fishermen had invaded these waters, and they claimed and exercised the right of fishing in our waters for many years. The Government of Canada fitted out cruisers and maintained them, in order to protect the rights and claim the rights of the Canadian fishermen—they claimed that if the Americans wished to participate in those fisheries they must give some compensation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard reference to the fact that nothing was mentioned in the terms of Union between the Island and the older Provinces, in 1871 as to the surrender of their rights, or of the rights which they supposed to exist in connection with the claims under the clause of the treaty in question. But I contend that as the whole course of events, and even the terms of the Union, show that when this Federal Government was seized with the responsibility of protecting the fisheries in the Island when the responsibilities of protecting those fisheries was placed on the shoulders of the Federal Government, and when the expense in obtaining the treaty was incurred, and the treaty itself was signed and ratified, no word was mentioned in the arrangement between the Island and the Federal Government, we have every reason to believe, when treating this question in a general and broad way, that the Government and the people of the Island had no idea that when they entered into the Union they should ask that treatment should be accorded to them which none of the other Maritime Provinces obtained. We know to-day that this question is approached from a Prince Edward Island point of view, notwithstanding the general question of whatever rights the Maritime Provinces had, was thoroughly discussed, and was decided, and decided in a manner, I must say, which has created considerable satisfaction and approval in the Maritime Provinces generally. In the benefits of that settlement the Island has shared, though she never contributed one dollar towards the immense expense to which the Federal Government went in securing her rights under the treaty. The Federal Government out of this money has not only granted this bounty, which is an advantage to the fishermen of the Island to the same extent as in the Maritime Provinces, but has spent the same amount of money, in proportion to the necessities of the case, in protecting the fisheries of the Island, and in the development of the river fisheries of the Island, in the same way and with the same expense and care as in the older Provinces, which bore the heat and burthen of the day before the Island came into the Union at all. I would not have opposed the treatment accorded to the Island in the settlement of this question, but I think that treatment was fair and generous on the part of the other Provinces, and that the Island has very little to complain of in regard to that treatment. I think if we turn back to what happened previous to the settlement of this question, previous to the Washington Treaty, we will find that the Island, perhaps governed by the views of the hon. gentleman, who has just stated that they do not want to barter these rights for filthy lucre—but at any rate

for some reason or other they did not place a monetary value on the fisheries of the Island. They never acquiesced in the steps that were taken by the Government of Canada in regard to this matter before the treaty; and I think that it is too late in the day for them, after the expenses have been shouldered by the older Provinces, to come here and say that, although they did not approve of the course taken previous to the treaty, in asserting those rights, still they want now to receive more than any of the older Provinces, or more than the rest of the Maritime Provinces, receive. I have taken the liberty of addressing these views to the House, mainly because, as a representative of one of the Maritime Provinces, I believe that pushing forward claims, such as this, that cannot be supported, and that have no hope of ultimate success after the settlement of the general question, injures the *bonâ fide* claims that may come from the different Provinces, and in reference to which it is desirable to show a unanimous feeling, and to back that feeling with such arguments as will convince the other Provinces of their propriety. I therefore regret that this question should again have been brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. HACKETT. Before this resolution is submitted to a vote, I want to make a few remarks in regard to it. The question is one of very great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island. It is not a new question. It has been debated here for several Sessions, and I think hon. members are now pretty conversant with the details of the question. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has made a very good speech from the standpoint perhaps of his Province; but it must be remembered that we do not base our claim for this money on the fact that Prince Edward Island is a Maritime Province, but on the fact that the Government of the Island were called upon by the Imperial Government to ratify the Treaty of Washington, so far as the fishery clauses were concerned. At that time Prince Edward Island was a separate colony, and had no connection whatever with the Dominion of Canada. We ratified that treaty at the urgent request of the Imperial Government and we come here claiming that, having done so, the island is entitled to a portion of the award, and should be treated in the same way as Newfoundland had been treated by the Imperial Government. We all know that, when the question was before the Halifax Commission, the claim of Newfoundland was regarded as distinct from that of the Dominion of Canada; and in apportioning the award, the sum of $1,000,000 was allowed to Newfoundland for the privileges she conceded under the Washington Treaty. We base our claim upon the fact that when we were asked to assent to that Treaty, we were outside of the Dominion of Canada, and that the concessions granted to the Americans on our behalf were not granted by the Dominion of Canada, but by the peovince of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, has referred to the fact that the Dominion of Canada has undertaken the protection of the fisheries. We all know that when a colony, under the British North America Act, becomes a part of the Confederation, under section 91 of that Act, the Dominion assumes the protection of its fisheries; that is conceded; but, while the Dominion assumes the protection of the fisheries, that does not give the Dominion the right to lease or sell those fisheries. All the colonies of British North America, before Confederation, had territorial rights; those rights were guaranteed to them by the Imperial Government; they held those rights almost from time immemorial; and when they came into the Dominion of Canada, they of course surrendered those rights to the Dominion, and the Dominion undertook to protect the fisheries of the several Provinces; but that fact did not give the Dominion any rights of territory, or any claims for compensation that those colonies might have had in those fisheries previous to Confederation. Now, Prince Edward Island had a right, there can be no doubt about that—it is not disputed—to certain moneys which were to be granted as compensation under the Washington Treaty. By no word or implication has that right been surrendered, and I maintain that the Island is justified in claiming a portion of this money on that ground. We are very thankful that the Dominion Government have given us a share of the fishery bounty, but I submit that that is altogether distinct from this award. The bounty is given to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces to encourage them in their industry. If we are to surrender our claims to this bounty, on the simple ground that we are to receive a portion of the award, I should be very sorry, because I think it is a right principle that the fishermen should receive the benefit of their fisheries. Now, I have something to say with regard to the fact that Prince Edward Island was not represented before the Halifax Commission. I think we had a perfect right to be represented there, and to press our claims for a portion of this money. I think that was the proper time to press our claims. It is indeed a matter of regret that this question should now come up before the Dominion Parliament; because the right of Prince Edward Island having existed since the Province ratified the Treaty, that right could have been put before the Halifax Commission, and we should not be obliged to come here now, as it were, supplicating the people of this Dominion to grant us a right that could have been obtained under the terms of the Treaty. Now who is to blame in this matter? There must have been neglect on the part of somebody in regard to presenting the claims of the Island before the Halifax Commission. I will not say that the hon. gentlemen who represented Prince Edward Island in this House, from 1874 to 1879, were delinquent in their duty; but I think it was equally necessary at that time, when the matter was still unsettled, that the hon. gentlemen who represented the Province in this House, should have pressed its claims. But, Sir, I have gone through *Hansard* from 1874 to 1879, and I have been unable to find that the hon. gentlemen who represented the Island at that time said one word with regard to this matter. They sat here silently watching the progress of business in this House, and never said a word in advocacy of the claims of the Island they represented. Now, I do not want to charge these gentlemen with neglect of duty. They probably considered that the matter was not worth attending to, then. But I do charge them with this fact, that they want to blame the representatives of the Island supporting the Government, at this time, and the Government itself, for not giving to the Island a portion of this money; and it comes with bad grace from these gentlemen who sat here silent, not saying one word in favour of the Province from which they came, now to charge us with any neglect of duty in this matter. In 1880, when this matter was discussed in this House, the hon. gentleman then representing a constituency in the Island, intended to submit the following Resolution. We know the House decided this money properly belongs to the Dominion of Canada, by a vote given in 1880, and several hon. gentlemen who now sit in this House then gave their vote in that direction; but that was on the general principle. We asserted that the claim of Prince Edward Island was separate and distinct from the claim before the House, and a gentleman who, I regret very much, is not in the House now, was prepard to move this Resolution in amendment to the motion that the money belonged properly and by right to the Dominion:

"1st. That before the 1st July, 1873, the Treaty of Washington was in full force and effect as respects Prince Edward Island.

"2nd. That there was no express or implied surrender of the interests of the Island in the fishery award, at the time of the Island entering Confederation.

"3rd. That the British North America Act does not apply to the case where an interest in the fisheries had been sold and conveyed away and the right to the purchase money had accrued to the Island before Confed-

eration and the said Act does not authorize the general Government to appropriate the proceeds of the sale of the Island fisheries for the general purposes of the Dominion."

Mr. WOODWORTH. Who was the hon. gentleman who was going to propose that Resolution?

Mr. HACKETT. Dr. Muttart, who then represented King's county in this House. His contention, and it is the correct one, is that before the 1st of July, 1873, the Treaty of Washington was in force and effect as regards the Island, and that the Island, on going into the Union, did not surrender, in writing or in any way, any right or claim she had with respect to this matter. Now, it may be said that by the fact of the Island going into the Union at that time and subsequent to the ratification of this Treaty, she conveyed to the Dominion Parliament the right to deal with this question. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in 1875 a correspondence took place between this Government, then led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and the Imperial Government, with regard to the rights of British Columbia; and in that correspondence I find the following dispatch on this subject. I want to show this House that the effect of any enlargement of the boundaries of the Dominion by the admission to Confederation of any Provinces subsequent to the ratification of the Treaty, did not affect the right of any Province with regard to this Treaty, and this is the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. This dispatch of Lord Carnarvon, dated the 12th of August, 1875, is as follows:—

"Her Majesty's Government have been in communication with the law officers of the Crown, with regard to including British Columbia, under the operation of the Treaty of Washington, and they are advised that the words 'Dominion of Canada' existing in the Treaty of Washington, article 21, must be governed by the state of things in May, 1871, and cannot now receive a wider construction from the fact that additional territory has since been added to the Dominion. The article 33 provides the means by which the several articles named are to be carried into operation, but does not provide in any way for extending the meaning or operation of those articles, and Her Majesty's Government are advised that the Act of the first of March, 1872, and the Act of Parliament of Canada, 14th June, 1873, must both be construed with reference to the Dominion of Canada, as that Dominion was on the 8th of May, 1871."

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

After Recess.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HAGGART, in moving the second reading of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 46) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company, said: No material changes have been made. The first change is in the fifth line, second page, to specify the indenture of sale; there were two sales, one from the North-Western Railway to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, and the other, that portion of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Perth and Smith's Falls; the change is to specify that. In the second clause, there is an addition made so that the Company can carry out the conditions of the indenture of sale and so that the stockholders, at a meeting, can change the chief place of business to Montreal. In the 8th clause, there is a change which enables the Company to issue sterling bonds instead of currency, if they choose. Then there is a clause added, the 10th, which extends the time for constructing the road and bridge to four years.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

St. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in moving second readings of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the St. Clair Tunnel Company, said: The amendments are all merely in the wording and not material. I think the attention of the Senate should be called to the fact that amendments are made by them in Bills sent from this House which simply alter the phraseology without any apparent object, and without affecting the objects of the Bills at all. There are four pages of amendments to this Bill, all of a purely grammatical construction, and my own opinion is that some of them make the Bill worse than it was in the shape it passed this House.

Amendments read the second time and concurred on.

ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the second reading of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 56) to empower the bondholders of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company, to vote at meetings of the Company and for other purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. Are these of the same improved character?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They are of the same character, and some of them are of a very extraordinary character. For instance, in the words "bonds outstanding and unpaid," we are asked to leave out the words "and unpaid." There is another amendment where, for the purpose of the Act, $5 is declared to be a pound; we are asked to put in "for the purpose of voting under the Act." The amendments are all of that character, and I really think we ought not to be put to the trouble, in this House, of altering the phraseology of our Bills in this way.

Mr. BLAKE. Who is it "finds some business still for idle hands to do?"

Mr. WHITE. I am afraid it is a very busy hand that does this.

Mr. BOWELL. He is an unknown character in this House.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP COMPANY BILL.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 131) to amend an Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company.

Mr. ORTON. Explain.

Mr. CAMERON. I have already explained to the House and I think specially for the information of my hon. friend what the purpose of this Bill is.

Mr. ORTON. I have not got this Bill before me just now, but I have understood that the object of the Bill is not only to extend the former charter, but to give power to construct a road to which a charter has already been given this Session. I have no objection to any Bill passing this House which will ensure the rapid construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, but this Bill has been brought in a very unusual way into this House, and one of the clauses of the Bill proposes, I understand, to give the projectors of the original Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company a paid up capital of $400,000 of stock. Now, although I believe it is right the projectors of any railway in the public interest, and especially such a railway, should be paid for their expenditure in explorations and any expenditure they may have incurred in a scheme of such importance, I still think that the giving power to a company to have paid-up stock to such a large amount is a serious drawback to the work it proposes to carry out.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the amount?

Mr. ORTON. $400,000 of paid-up stock to the projectors of this road. I am happy to see they have taken power to construct that road from Selkirk and some point east of

Winnipeg on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which leads me to believe they are likely to take the route proposed in the Bill which I had the honour of bringing up in the Railway Committee in the absence of Mr. Royal, who had charge of it; and I hope that they will still see that, in the public interest, it is advisable to construct a road from the present Canadian Pacific Railway, the present railway system of that country, by the shortest possible route to Hudson Bay. It is well known that, on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and on the east of the Nelson River up to Fort Nelson, a road can be constructed probably 150 miles shorter than on the west, and to Churchill it is still nearer. I shall not offer any opposition to this Bill, except to draw attention to this extraordinary clause, which proposes to give a paid-up stock to the extent of $400,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I may state, in answer to the point my hon. friend has mentioned, that that particular provision is copied from the provision which the House and Parliament thought fit last Session to pass and to include in the Bill, in reference to the companies then proposed to be amalgamated. It is transcribed verbatim from the Bill of last Session, and Parliament has already given its sanction, under the circumstances of this case, to the provision. However, that or any other point which my hon. friend wishes to discuss in the details of the Bill will be fully considered by the Railway Committee when it has the Bill before it, which I believe will be on Friday next, under the Order of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I very much sympathize with the general objection the hon. gentleman has taken as to the allotting of paid-up stock without cash representing that amount, but the hon. gentleman and others have thought it all right to allow $30,000,000 of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to be issued without consideration—for, out of the $55,000,000, there is only $25,000,000 paid up—and I really do not see why, when we swallow such camels, we should strain at such gnats.

Bill read the second time.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill (from the Senate) was considered in Committee, amended, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 122) to amend the Acts 40 Victoria, chapter 49, and 45 Victoria, chapter 24, being Acts relating to Permanent Building Societies, carrying on business in Ontario.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Shakespeare's proposed motion, that in the opinion of this House it is expedient to enact a law prohibiting the incoming of Chinese to that portion of Canada known as British Columbia."

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) In rising to speak to the motion of my hon. colleague on this important subject, I desire to take this opportunity of thanking hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for affording us an opportunity that we otherwise might have been deprived of, through a little slip of my own. It shows me that there is a very kindly feeling evinced towards the members of British Columbia, and I trust that we shall find another exhibition of it by a unanimous vote in favour of the Resolution before the House. I may say that so far back as 1865, legislation was enacted in the colony of Victoria, in New South Wales, under an Act entitled: "An Act to amend the laws affecting Chinese immigration to, or residence in Victoria." Now, a peculiarity struck me in connection with this Act; it does not use the word "Chinese," but it uses the word "immigrant," in one of its clauses, and it defines what immigrants under the Act shall mean. In that clause it says:

"The word 'immigrant' shall mean any male adult native of China or its dependencies, or of any islands in the Chinese seas, not born of British parents or any person born of Chinese parents."

This Act goes on to say:

"The master of every ship, upon arrival at any port in Victoria, having passengers on board, shall distinctly specify and state in the list of passengers required by any Act now or hereafter in force relating to passengers arriving in Victoria, to be exhibited or delivered to the Collector or other chief officer of Customs at the port of arrival, whether any and which of such passengers are immigrants within the meaning of this Act, and in default of his delivering such list without so specifying, as aforesaid, such master shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £200."

Now, this law was in force in the year 1865, and remained in force until the year 1881, when it was amended by an Act entitled: "An Act to amend the Chinese Immigration Statute of 1865," and in that amendment I find in clause 2:

"If any vessel having on board a greater number of immigrants within the meaning of the Act (No. 259) than in the proportion of one such immigrant to every hundred tons of the tonnage of such vessel shall arrive at any time in any port in Victoria, the owner, master, or charterer of such vessel shall be liable, on conviction, to a penalty of one hundred pounds for each immigrant so carried in excess of the foregoing limitation."

It also goes on to say:

"For the purposes of this Act, the tonnage of a vessel shall be ascertained in the manner prescribed by "The Passengers, Harbours and Navigation Statute, 1865."

Clause 3 says:

"Before any immigrant arriving from parts beyond Victoria shall be permitted to land from any vessel at any port or place in Victoria, and before making any entry at Customs, the master of the vessel by which such immigrant shall so arrive, shall pay to the Collector or other principal officer of Customs, the sum of £10 for every such immigrant, and no entry shall be deemed to have any legal effect until such payment shall have been made and such immigrant for whom such sum has been paid, shall receive from the said Collector, or other principal officer, a certificate to that effect. If any master shall neglect to pay any such sum, or shall land, or permit to land, or suffer to land or escape from such vessel, at any port or place in Victoria, any immigrant, before such sum shall have been paid by such master or his agent, or before such list shall have been delivered, such master shall be liable for every such offence to a penalty of £50 for each immigrant so landed or permitted or suffered to land or to escape; and in addition to such penalty, shall also pay the sum hereby required to be paid for each such immigrant."

The Act goes on further to say:

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, any immigrant arriving in Victoria who produces evidence to the satisfaction of the Collector or other principal officer of Customs or other duly authorized officer, that he is a British subject, shall be wholly exempt from the operation of this Act, and a certificate of the Governor of any British colony shall, on being verified to the satisfaction of such Collector or other officer, be sufficient evidence of the claim of such immigrant to exemption under this section."

It also says:

"The aforesaid sum of £10 sterling shall not be payable by or for any immigrant duly accredited to this colony by the Government of China or by or under the authority of the Imperial Government on any special mission.

"The penalties and restrictions imposed by this Act shall not nor shall any of them be held to be applicable in the case of any immigrant being one of the crew of any vessel arriving in any port in Victoria and no such immigrant being one of such crew shall be discharged and landed from such vessel within Victoria, or shall at any time go on shore, except in the performance of his duties in connection with such vessel, and every such immigrant so discharged or landed or so going on shore shall be liable to a penalty of £20 sterling.

"Any vessel on board which immigrants shall be transhipped from another vessel and brought to any port or place in this colony shall be deemed to be a vessel bringing immigrants into the said colony from parts beyond the said colony, and shall be subject to all the requirements and provisions of this Act, and all immigrants so transhipped and brought to such port or place shall be deemed to be immigrants arriving from parts beyond Victoria."

This Act clearly shows the intention of the people of Victoria, New South Wales. By the Act of 1865, re-enacted in 1881, they restrict the influx of Chinese immigrants to their shores, as it is a detriment to the colony to have such a stream of immigrants of that class flowing steadily into

it. We find that Queensland, another of the Australian colonies, passed an Act, in 1877, entitled: "An Act to amend the Gold Fields Act, 1874," so far as relates to Asiatic and African aliens, and in other respects. By the title of this Act the framers did not make it apply exclusively to Chinese; nevertheless, it was to prevent the importation of that class particularly also Asiatic and African aliens. The Act goes on to say:

"The sum payable by an Asiatic or African alien for a miner's right shall be £3, and for a business license shall be £10 for each year during which the same is to be in force, instead of 10s. and £4 respectively, as by the said recited Act is provided.

"Any person who shall be found mining, or carrying on business on any gold field, not having in his possession a miner's right or business license lawfully issued to him, shall be subject to the penalties provided.

"In any prosecution or any offence against the provisions of this Act, the averment in the information that any person named therein had not in his possession at the time of the alleged offence a miner's right or business license lawfully issued to him shall be sufficient proof that such person had not such miner's right or business license unless the defendant shall prove the contrary."

That appears to be rather a peculiar clause, and at variance with our ideas of English law; the course of procedure is something like that of a naval court-martial. The accused is held to be guilty, and is called upon to prove his innocence. In this case the unfortunate immigrant has to prove that he has the right to mine under license—the onus of proof resting on him instead of the prosecutor. Coming nearer home, we find an Act for the restriction of the Chinese, passed by the State of California, called the United States Chinese Restriction Act, which was passed in 1882. This Act, I dare say, is more generally known to the House, and I only mention it to show that in California legislation has been enacted to restrict the immigration of that most undesirable class, the heathen Chinese. That Act, although not perfect—very few Acts are—is sufficient to show that the intention of the people of California is to restrict, if not to prohibit, the influx of Chinese into that fair State. This matter having been taken up and represented at Washington, the Act above referred to was passed by the House of Representatives, and is at the present moment the law in the United States. As regards our own Province: We find that the people of British Columbia, through their representatives in the Local House, have passed a series of Acts on this question, some of which have been disallowed. I will not refer to the Act passed in a previous year—the prohibitory Act which has been disallowed for reasons patent to every hon. member; but I will refer to the Acts passed in the last Session of the Local Legislature. These Acts were three in number. One is to prevent the immigration of Chinese. Another is to prevent Chinese acquiring Crown lands. The third, and the one which I think most applicable to our case, and the one which certainly will meet with the approbation of this House, is one to regulate the Chinese population of British Columbia. I doubt whether the first Act, to prevent the immigration of Chinese, will altogether stand the constitutional test when submitted to the Minister of Justice. Nor do I think the Act to prevent the Chinese from acquiring Crown lands should be passed, because I think it would be unfair, after a person is once in the Province, to pass legislation which would touch one and not all. But the Act which covers this case, or rather leads up to its consideration, is the Act to regulate the influx of the Chinese population of British Columbia. In that Act it states:

"The term Chinese in this Act shall mean any native of the Chinese Empire or its dependencies, and shall include any person of the Chinese race."

The Act goes on to say:

"Chinese having lands shall forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding $40."

I maintain that there is sufficient matter before the House to show that in other parts of the British Empire, namely, in the colonies of Victoria and Queensland; and also in the State of California, legislation has been enacted to restrict this undesirable class; and I think we should take up the clauses that are embodied in the Act of our Local Legislature, and give an expression of opinion in regard to them. I have in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Board of Immigration of the Hawaiian Islands. They, strange to say, are anxious to get the Chinese there. They say:

"There are no authentic returns of the Chinese population, but it is estimated at 13,500. The immigrants bring no women with them, as a rule. Statistics recently furnished by planters show that about 5,000 are employed on sugar plantations. A very large number are occupied in cultivating rice, which is a profitable business. Others are engaged in garden vegetable cultivation, and in domestic services. An examination of the Directory for the Kingdom (George Bowsers) shows that out of about 692 firms and persons engaged in business in Honolulu, 219 are Chinese, 40 are Hawaians, and the rest are of other nationalities.

"Lately the cultivation of taro has engaged the attention of the Chinese, while the natives are disposed to cultivate it less It appears from the returns made by the planters that the Chinese are generally preferred as labourers. The situation of the Chinese in the Kingdom, their disinclination to bring women with them, their intermarriage with native women, or alliances with them; their great thrift, their aptitude for every kind of business, raise a number of social and political questions which cannot be discussed here. If more Chinese labour is needed it can probably be obtained. It is possible that labour contracts may be made with them, by which they can be kept in the country for a period of five years, and then be returned to China, at the option of the Hawaiian Government. This course has been adopted in several countries, where the permanent settlement of a large number of Chinese is feared. Owing to misrepresentations from this Kingdom, the Viceroy of Canton has forbidden the immigration of Chinese from that port. It is hoped that measures will be taken to correct the misunderstanding of the Viceroy, so that if it is deemed best to encourage further Chinese immigration, it may not be obstructed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, if a Chinese Viceroy can take steps to prevent the Chinese going to the Sandwich Islands, surely, irrespective of this Resolution altogether, if proper steps are taken here, the immigration of the Chinese into British Columbia can be restricted, if not entirely prevented. Again, in the Report of the Attorney-General of Hawaii it is said:

"The large number of Chinese in the Kingdom make it necessary for the Government to inform itself carefully as to the condition and thought of these people. In numbers they are nearly as large as the Hawaiians, while they are distributed throughout the Kingdom, improving the land, cultivating rice, taro and vegetables, and in every direction, and in every place showing themselves to be the most industrious labourers in the Kingdom. In addition to this, they are rapidly acquiring wealth, and with that wealth will come, in some shape, political power. This body of men, so powerful and increasing so fast, is unknown to us. No attempts have been made to study them, or discover their ideas motives or movements. The Law Department is informed from time to time of the organization of secret societies, but what their purpose is, it is difficult to discover, nor is it an easy matter to investigate their social condition. Europeans who speak the Chinese are not readily obtained, and as a rule, they command very high salaries Excellent Chinese interpreters can be obtained, but there is a disposition to believe that their race prejudices will control their honesty. The difficulty of securing a good and reliable method of knowing more about the Chinese must be met. It is not only impossible to ignore these people, but it is mere foolishness to do so."

Now, Sir, if in a place where at one time the immigration of the Chinese into the country was agitated, so as to add to the population, and provide for what was considered at that time to be a necessary addition to the labour market, they now set their faces against the immigration of those Chinese for the reasons I have stated, surely the same rule might be applied to Canada in the interests of one of her Provinces. I find also, according to the immigration statistics, that even as recently as 1882, about 8,000 Chinese flocked into British Columbia. I know that as many as 450 arrived on board one vessel, and that eight vessels arrived in rapid succession within three and a-half months, making a total of a little over 4,000 into that Province in that short space of time, and out of the whole number of Chinese added to our present unfortunately small population, there were not five women. Taking a still more recent time, taking the immigration of last year, according to the statistics furnished by the immigration agents to the Depart-

ment of Agriculture and Statistics for the Dominion, I find that there were no less than 1,335 arrived in the first six months, and 1,622 arriving subsequently, making the total arrival about 3,000. Now, when we consider that in the Province of British Columbia, although it is no fault of our own, but may be caused perhaps by the insurmountable barrier of the Rocky Mountains—we have not that steady influx of desirable population which would give us as large a population as we might wish—owing to these facts, I say, we have not as large a population as we might desire, and certainly not as large as many of the members of this House would I am sure equally desire we should have. I have no doubt that every member of this House is particulary desirous of seeing the representation of British Columbia in this House augmented. I know that they are equally desirous of seeing the representation of Manitoba increased, as well as that of the North-West Territories, as was recently expressed in a discussion in this House at the present Session. Now the sooner we have a desirable class of immigrants coming into British Columbia, the sooner we shall receive that representation in this House which will be to the satisfaction of every hon. gentleman here. My colleague in moving the Resolution referred to the Orders in Council. I have already referred to them, as well as to the Acts passed in other parts of the world, which combined clearly show that this is not the only place where legislation has been enacted, or sought to be enacted, for the repression of that most undesirable class of immigrants. My colleague also referred to the petition sent by the people of British Columbia upon the subject. I was present at a large meeting in the city of Victoria, one of the largest ever held in the city which bears Her Majesty's name, and the people with one voice moved a resolution that a petition should be sent on to the Governor General in Council, requesting that measures should be taken by this Parliament to restrict, if not to prohibit, the immigration of Chinese into British Columbia. That petition was sent on, but with what effect we can only imagine, because up to the present moment it has remained, I have no doubt, in one of the pigeon holes of some office in the Departments of the Government. I hope yet to see that petition come to light, and that it will result in some action being taken to meet the wishes of the people of British Columbia. My colleague also mentioned the question of the competition of Chinese with white labour. Now, the Chinese work for $1 or $1.25 per day; and it must be remembered that they can live on from 10 to 15 cents per day, according to their mode of living, and they think they live most sumptuously. With white people it is different. Most of them have wives and families, and they can only expect to get the current wages of the place, which are $2 $2.50 per day. Now, it takes nearly the whole of that amount for a married man to keep himself and his family as they should be kept; and the point I wish to make is, that the white man is placed at great disadvantage when he enters the field of labour and toil in competition with heathens, who are able to live upon so small an amount. Now it is all very well for people to say that the white men should go ahead, until they starve out that class of people, and that employers of labour should not employ Chinese. That is all very well in theory, but it will not work in practice, because it stands to reason that when an employer has the option of getting a man for $2.50 a day, or $1.25, he is going to take the man who touches his pocket least; although I can state most conscientiously that I believe that the work done by one white man is equal, if not superior, to that done by two Chinese. They are not physicially equal to the performance of the same amount of work as are those who live on three good square meals a day. As I stated before, the Chinamen come without any wives or families. It is not necessary, nor would it be proper or politic, for me to give here an infinitude of reasons why their immorality, of all things, renders the Chinese the most undesirable class to have in the Province. The experience of California and Australia, as well as of the Hawaiian Islands, goes to show that the morals of this class of immigrants are decidedly low. I could state many things in proof of that, if it would be proper to do so; but I would simply intimate that their depravity is certainly beyond description. When we see people flocking into a country, we naturally expect that they are going to stop there, and establish their homes. But it is not so with the Chinese. They come for a brief period; they live on a very small amount of money; and after passing two or three years, they go back to China, taking with them from $750 to $1,000 each, and remain there for the rest of their lives. But they send back "my cousin." Every Chinaman has about fifty "cousins," and he sends his "cousins" to the country where he made his fortune, and they are everlastingly coming, without intending to stop, and they are of no advantage to the country when they do come. Another reason that makes them undesirable is, that they will not marry with any of the women in the country. If they did, I have no doubt a very desirable race would spring up. Now, I think sufficient has been said, not only by myself, but by my colleague, and by other hon. gentlemen interested in this question, to show that British Columbia does smart under the lash of a very great grievance in this regard. In the other Provinces of the Dominion you scarcely ever see ten Chinamen together. I question if there are in the whole of this House ten gentlemen who have ever seen ten Chinamen together; and I know that there are many in this House who have never seen a Chinaman at all. I have been frequently twitted about the Chinese since I have arrived in this part of the world, and many fond enquiries have been made of the hon. gentleman who, a few years ago, represented Vancouver district in this House, in language possibly more forcible than polite, but sufficiently conclusive from his standpoint, to show that that class of immigrants was a most undesirable one. Now, I am aware that the Treaty with China, signed in 1842, would possibly, although I would not say probably, bring about some interference on the part of the Imperial Government, if Canada undertook to exclude the Chinese. But by that Treaty, I find, Hong Kong was ceded to Great Britain in perpetuity; the ports of Canton, Amoy, Foo-choo-foo and Shanghai were thrown open to trade and commerce; British subjects were released from all ports, and the Islands of Chusacg and Ku-lang-su were held until the specie indemnity had been paid by the Government of China to the Government of Great Britain. As four ports by that Treaty were thrown open to the trade and commerce of the world, I think, as an equivalent to that, we should throw open the ports of Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal for a brief period, and let the Chinamen flow in there as steadily and continuously as the people of these Provinces would allow them to do. I think, if that were done, we should very soon find the whole country up in arms against that kind of immigration. We should also find that, like other immigrants landing at the ports of Halifax, St. John and Quebec, they would take a very long time to filter not only through Canada, but the United States, and until the railway was finished, at any rate, we should find very few John Chinamen coming across the Rocky Mountains to our Province. Now, it has been said that the Chinamen are no good. I say so too, but in a qualified way. They are good in some respects when wanted, but their day of usefulness has gone by. Last year we were not in the same position in British Columbia as we are this year. The railway from Port Moody to Emory is nearly constructed; the line from Emory and Yale to Savona's Ferry is very nearly constructed; and I am sure that the contractor for those sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway can find as many Chinamen and other labourers in the Province

now as he is likely to require for the completion of that portion of the railway, with the exception of a few skilled mechanics, which Chinamen certainly are not. Consequently the arguments which were urged last year against the Dominion taking any steps to regulate the influx of Chinamen into British Columbia, on account of the prosecution of public works, cannot at this time hold good. Now, if there is one thing above another which should induce every loyal and British heart, and every Canadian heart, too, to oppose the introduction of the Chinese, it is their utter disrespect to women. We all know and feel that none of us in this world can get on without women. The Chinamen, if they do not themselves understand, should be taught, that they must do what all civilized people in the world do, that is, respect the fair sex. In conclusion, I may say that I have been frequently asked in conversation: "What are you going to do with the Chinese that you have already got?" Well, I would say, let them go back to—

"Their land of pimentos and chillies,
Which are emblems of tempers as hot as their clime,
Where the blaze of the sun quite bewilders the senses,
And bleaches the roses of youth in its prime.

Where the mutton too oft manufactured from goat,
Is killed the same day it is crammed down your throat,
And every man English, be he who he may,
Can never eat less than two breakfasts a day.

Where the breath of the sea breeze comes o'er the 'senses,'
Like the blast from the mouth of some furnace 'intenses,'
Where oysters, like cabbages, grow on the 'treeses,'
And cows even browse in the depths of the 'seases.'

Where the *coup de soleil* is a true *coup de grace*,
And the fever called yellow is a knocker of brass;
On the door of the tomb one enters to-day,
And to-morrow, forgotten, is left to decay."

That is the fate the Chinaman will come to; and I hope the views I have expressed will be endorsed by every hon. member of this House by voting for a measure to restrict and regulate the influx of Chinese into the Dominion of Canada, or in any case into that portion of it known as British Columbia.

Mr. ALLEN. My remarks will be very short, because, knowing the amount of business that is yet before this House, I do not care to take any greater portion of its time than is absolutely necessary. We find that the people of British Columbia are to-day as anxious, if not more anxious than ever, that Chinese immigration should be put a stop to. I am one of those who have had a good deal of experience with those people, and my experience is that of every civilized person who has had occasion to reside in their neighbourhood, their habits cannot even be hinted at and their immorality is such that no white people raising a family would desire to have Chinese anywhere near their houses. The interests of British Columbia are at stake in this question; if we allow the Chinese to continue coming into our country, the experience of British Columbia will be the same as that of Australia and California, and there can be no doubt the concensus of opinion on all sides will be that means will have to be taken to prevent Chinese labour coming into competition with the white labour we wish to have in this country. As I said a year ago, we want immigrants who will remain here, who will spend here the money they earn, and who will do their share in building up our country; and the day will come when we will be obliged to adopt some restrictive measures in reference to this Chinese immigration; but, as Australia and California, and other countries, have not gone so far as is proposed in the Resolution of the hon. member for Victoria, I think we should amend it by inserting the word "restricting" instead of "prohibiting." An absolute prohibitive measure might be a high-handed proceeding for a country like ours to adopt, which requires so many people, especially as other countries have not gone that far; and I would move, therefore:

That all the words after "law" be left out and the following inserted instead thereof: "restricting or regulating the incoming of Chinese into the Dominion of Canada."

Mr. HOMER. When this Chinese question was before the House last Session, I stated that as soon as there was a certain prospect of obtaining a sufficient supply of white labour to replace Chinese labour in British Columbia, I would give my support to a measure restricting the further importation of Chinese into the Dominion. Since that time, the Northern Pacific Railway has been built to a point on Puget Sound, within a short distance of the ports of British Columbia, and a large flow of immigration has gone into the State of Oregon and Washington Territories, adjoining British Columbia, over that road, and a comparatively large immigration has also been brought by that road to British Columbia. By the addition of this immigration, and that which will come in during next season, to the Chinese population now in British Columbia, we will be enabled to obtain all the labour required to carry on railway construction and the various industries of the country; and I am therefore prepared to support a measure introduced into this House for the purpose of restricting the importation of Chinese into the Dominion.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). This question is one of very great importance, and I feel that at this late period of the Session it will be impossible to give it that consideration which it demands at the hands of this House and the Government. I think the Government will have to take the matter into consideration at some early day, and I hope they will. I know that at the last elections in the different constituencies where there are large bodies of mechanics and labourers—in the cities and towns for instance—this question was pressed upon the candidates with a considerable amount of vigour. In Ontario we are very much interested in it at present, and the time is coming, I apprehend, when we will feel, with our friends in the extreme west, that it is a question which must be taken into account; but in view of the fact that we have very little time now before us, and that there are some important measures yet to be considered which must really receive some attention at the hands of the House this evening, I think we had better postpone the consideration of this question. I beg, therefore, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BAKER. I would only state, in a few words, what I think every member for British Columbia is desirous this House should do, and that is that we should take a vote upon this question, so as to obtain the sense of the House on it, in order that at some near period a restrictive law should be enacted. It is simply in this view that we wish to obtain the sense of the House on the Resolution moved by my hon. colleague.

Mr. GORDON. I am sorry indeed that the hon. member for Hamilton has thought fit to propose this amendment, and I am sure the people of Hamilton, a city not far from Toronto, will also be sorry to hear of it. We have had petitions presented to this House, no latter than yesterday, asking Parliament to introduce a measure restricting Chinese immigration, and another one has been presented from that city to-day to the same effect. That is evidence, to my mind, that a portion, at least, of the people of Canada, are beginning now to anticipate the near approach to themselves of the evils they have been heaping on the people of British Columbia, and I am satisfid there is not an hon. member from British Columbia, where every constituency is flooded with these Chinese, who would dare go before the people and advocate their admission to the Dominion. I think it is wrong to the people of British Columbia, after the long discussion which has been had on this subject, to endeavour now to avert a vote on a question which is not only of importance to British Columbia but of future importance to every part of Canada. I hope the hon. gentle-

man will withdraw his motion, and allow a direct vote to be taken on the principle of the Resolution before the House.

Mr. BARNARD. I will not occupy the attention of this House more than a few moments. I am pleased with the present appearance of things. Formerly, we could not get a hearing on this subject. Now, fully one-half of the House are satisfied that the question is coming up. It is a question that affects us seriously in British Columbia. It is weighing upon us heavily, a small and poor population, such as we have, to have to support these Chinese. More than that, these Chinese will creep across your borders before you are aware. They will take advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will cross the mountains into the North-West Territories, and when they come down to this Province of Ontario, you will understand someting about Chinamen.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Mr. Speaker, I seconded the amendment before you. It may seem strange that an Ontario member should take any interest in this question, but it occurs to me that, when a matter is brought before the House from Session to Session as repeatedly as this has been, and with almost unanimity on the part of the representatives of that section, and is concurred in by the people of that section, we are entitled to give it fair consideration, and although it is late in the Session, I believe it is a question of sufficient importance to that distant Province to demand a fair, reasonable consideration at our hands, and an expression from us. I believe it is a question of very great importance, perhaps of vital importance to the future of that Province. Surely it is reasonable to suppose that the gentlemen from that Province, who have spent almost their lives there, should be more familiar with the effect of the Chinese immigration than we are. Still, we can bring experience in other matters somewhat to bear on that question. It is not, as I understand it, a question of settling, so far as the Chinese are concerned. They do not become settlers, but they take, I believe, the place of those who would become settlers. It is a principle in settling a country, as well as in nature, that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time; and I believe it to be the fact that, where these Chinese are in great numbers, our people will not go. It has been stated time and time again, and every person who knows anything of it understands that these people do not come into British Columbia or any other portion of America for the purpose of settling. They do not take root. They come there to perform a certain amount of labour, earn a certain amount of wages, and go back to their own land. Much has been said in relation to the habits of these people. I shall not dwell either upon their vices or their virtues. We are informed that the parliamentary vocabulary would hardly be sufficient to describe them. Of virtues they have some, no doubt—one of economy—but I believe they carry that to an extent where it ceases to be a virtue. My reason for urging the consideration of this is based upon the fact that its tendency is to exclude our own people from that Province; I believe it tends to exclude our own settlers. The proposition is not to expel the Chinese who are there, it is not to absolutely prohibit their coming there, but it is to regulate it to that extent which experience shows to be to the advantage of the Province. I believe that the unrestricted influx of Chinese immigration can have no other effect there than the general degradation of labour, and I believe no greater calamity can befall any class of community or any community itself than anything which tends to degrade labour. Among the objections to slavery as it existed in the neighbouring Republic, among the great objections to it, was the degrading influence which it had upon the whites. Many opposed it on account of its injustice to the slave; others on account of its degrading influences upon the white. Perhaps, at the time when slavery existed, there was not a more unfortunate class of persons than the poor whites, classed by the slaves themselves as "white trash." The habits of these Chinamen are such that I believe our white labour will not compete against them, and if they prevail to any extent, they can have no other tendency than to degrade labour. If the importation into that Province is to continue as it did during last year, it will soon become a question whether it shall be a Chinese colony or a colony of our own people. I believe, in the settlement of a new country like this, the quality of immigration is a matter of very great importance, of the first importance—what class of people the soil shall be "seeded down with." It would not be well, I think, that the people of British Columbia should feel that they labour under any special disadvantage from having joined this Confederacy. If they had not, they would have been responsible only to the Imperial authorities. Other colonies in the position in which they would have been had they not joined the Dominion, have passed restrictive measures against Chinese immigration which have not been disallowed by the Imperial Government. Hence, if we continue to refuse to give this question proper consideration, they may feel placed at a disadvantage in that respect. British Columbia is being rapidly brought nearer to us. Soon the railway will be completed, and the distance will be materially decreased. When we then extend our hand across the Rocky Mountains, it is our wish to grasp the hand of our own countrymen and not that of a settlement of Chinese. I shall have much pleasure in supporting the Resolution with the proposed amendment.

Mr. FOSTER Before the vote is taken, I desire to say a word or two. In the first place, I desire to say that I think it is fair to the Province of British Columbia, and to this question as well, that we should express our opinion upon it, and should not adjourn this debate and so shelve the question. I am in favour of having the question voted upon, as a matter due, I think of right, to British Columbia and to the delegation which has so earnestly pressed for a vote upon this question. In the second place, I desire to say, as having spoken on this question last year, and not being in favour of a prohibition of Chinese as Chinese, that I occupy the same position this year, and yet I am going to vote for the amendment, reserving the right to say in what way and to what extent restriction should be applied. I do not believe that Chinese should be prohibited simply because they are Chinese. If a Chinaman is a good, decent, industrious man, he has as good a right here as any other man; but if there are classes that do not come under that category, then I believe that class of them should be restricted, and therefore I intend to vote, if it be allowed to come to a vote, for the amendment.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I quite agree with the remarks of the last speaker, as to the position of the representatives of British Columbia in this House on this question. When there is such a unanimous opinion on the subject in that Province we can scarcely disregard it. I have heard no sufficient reason advanced by the hon. member who moved the adjournment of the debate, why this question ought not to be voted upon at the present time. We are beginning to hear the question raised by labour councils in different parts of Ontario, and I think the question is assuming that importance that we cannot now reject the principle of the Resolution. I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for North Grey.

Mr. HESSON. I quite sympathize with the efforts of the representatives of British Columbia to regulate in some way the immigration of Chinese into their Province. I am disposed to support the amendment of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allen). I think it is desirable to restrict

that class of immigrants, from the fact that our friends from the Pacific coast complain so bitterly of the evils resulting from it. There must be something wrong in it when they so unitedly and so repeatedly express their disapprobation of that immigration, and I think it is but fair that there should be an honest expression of opinion by the members of this House upon that question; therefore, I do not think it desirable to adjourn the debate. We observe that in the United States restrictive, and in some instances prohibitive, laws have been passed against Chinese immigration, and I think it is time for us to move in the same direction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion to adjourn the debate. As I have already stated upon several occasions, I consider there is a great deal in the objection that is taken to the unrestricted immigration into British Columbia, and especially to the Pacific Coast, of Chinese. They are not of our people, they are not of our race, they do not kindly mix with us, and they do not even become settlers. They come over and work a little while and after making a little money they take it away home with them, though leaving the results of their labour. Then there are moral reasons which we need not discuss, which, perhaps, render a contact between the whites and the Mongolians inadvisable and unpropitious. But there are some considerations we must not lose sight of. In the first place, I do not know, at this moment, what the Treaties are between England and China on the subject of intercourse, commercial and otherwise. I presume, however, that England would not interfere with any legislation of ours, as she has permitted legislation in the Australian colonies. There is another point that should be very carefully considered. We are just finishing the Pacific Railway, and one of the objects of that enterprise is to enable Canada to compete with the United States for the Chinese and Japanese trade. I am glad to learn that our great Canadian steamship companies have it seriously in contemplation, as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway is finished to Port Moody, to establish a line of first-class steamers running from Victoria, or some other point in British Columbia, to Hong Kong and on to the Sandwich Islands. Now, this steamship company will have to make arrangements in Hong Kong and other Chinese ports, and I suppose they would like to go on to Canton, but I don't know about that. They will have to make arrangements to get a trade, and it might seriously impede the success of that line if we legislated in a manner to offend the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government is well informed on everything that goes on in the outer world; they are not the Chinese of fifty years ago. Like their neighbours in Japan, they are now embraced within the number of civilized nations, in every way civilized—I mean in modern ideas, as they have an ancient civilization of their own. But they have the same commercial ideas as the European nations and the nations of North America. Now, it might greatly impede the initiation of any trade between Canada and China if the Chinese Government found that when we approached them to make commercial arrangements we had shut down the gate and said: "We want to trade with you, but we won't allow any of you to come to us." This is a matter for grave consideration. Then, Mr. Speaker, there are certain contracts connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway which are to be finished, I suppose, next year; and I do not think the Government could have made such satisfactory contracts if it had been supposed that they could not get Chinese labour. The Government, however, are fully alive to the importance of the question. I believe that when our Pacific Railway is finished and trade begins to flow into British Columbia, not only by San Francisco and by Panama but across the continent by the Canadian Pacific Railway, there will be a flow into that Province of our own race, of people from England, Ireland and Scotland, and Europe generally; and then there will be no difficulty in supplying the wants of the labour market. Therefore, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman who has this motion in hand do not press it just now. Government will pledge themselves to issue a Commission to look into the whole subject during the present summer, to consider its trade relations, its social relations, and all those moral considerations which make Chinese immigration inadvisable; and we will be prepared to come down with the conclusions thus arrived at, at the next Session. I hope my hon. friend will accept that suggestion. We will issue the Commission and have it sit this summer. It will examine the whole question exhaustively, and will submit the whole case to Parliament at its next Session, and the results of that report will be laid before Parliament. I hope and believe, I am certain, that then we will be in a better position to deal with the subject, and I am satisfied, also, that the legislation which will be the result of such Commission will be in the nature of a restrictive regulation of Chinese immigrants. Under these circumstances, I hope the hon. gentleman will either be satisfied with my statement or allow it to stand over until he considers my proposition. I am sincerely anxious that the question should be dealt with; but we should not deal with it on this discussion, but when the whole subject, as well as the evidence submitted in Australia, California and Washington, has been condensed, collated and submitted to the Canadian Parliament, so that we may be able to have before us the same full information which those bodies had, before we take any action. That is my suggestion. I hope the hon. gentleman will either accept my suggestion at once and withdraw his motion, or allow the motion to prevail that the debate be adjourned for a day or two; and if he does so, I will give him an opportunity to bring it up again.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I am sure it is very gratifying to the members from British Columbia to hear the very favourable expressions from the leader of the Government. With respect to the Treaty between China and England, I do not think there is any difficulty about it. The Australian colonies took hold of this question some years ago. They passed restrictive measures, and the Home Government have allowed them, and they are in force in those colonies at the present time. We are on the same footing with the Home Government as the Australian colonies are; hence, what they are in a position to do, we are equally in a position to do in that regard. So, there is no difficulty on that score. With respect to the steamer between China and British Columbia, if it is a condition that we are to have a Chinese population in British Columbia for the sake of the steamer running between those countries, I say the people of British Columbia do not want any steamer. That is the voice of the people there. What we want is to get rid of, or to prevent any further immigration of Chinese to the Province. There are steamers running between San Francisco and ports of China; yet the Americans have a measure prohibiting Chinese immigration. That restriction does not prevent the steamers doing trade between the two countries, and they are doing a large trade, too. I do not anticipate for a moment that any restrictive measure which might be passed by this Parliament would prevent a Treaty or business relations between the Dominion of Canada and China—not the slightest. If there is any money in it, they are on hand all the time. With respect to the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway: I presume it is well known to every hon. member that not one Chinaman has been employed on the road this side of the Rocky Mountains, and the Chinese question only affects the road on the western side of the Mountains. We have had a large portion of that work completed, I am sorry to say, by Chinamen. Before I left British Columbia to attend to my parliamentary duties this

Session, I made it my business to see Mr. Onderdonk. I put to him this question: Is it necessary to induce any more white people to come to British Columbia to work on your contract? He said: No; I have all the men I want, with the exception of first-class mechanics. I can give employment to quite a number of first-class mechanics, but as to other labour, I have all I want. I say we have enough labour in British Columbia to build all the railways we shall require for the next twenty years. Moreover, as I stated in the House the other day, I received a letter only a few days ago from one of the largest employers of labour in the Province, and he said this: I am sorry to say there are a large number of men walking about without being able to find employment. That is a very sad state of affairs; and yet we are told that it is necessary to allow those Chinese to come into the country—those slaves who are bought in China and consigned to Chinese companies in British Columbia, just the same as you consign a piece of merchandise, and after they arrive in the Province they are sold to the highest bidder. We are told that it is absolutely necessary still to allow those slaves to come into British Columbia, and shut out the white men, who have their wives and children to feed, and clothe, and educate, and public and religious institutions to support. These slaves have no wives, they have no children and no churches to support. Every dollar they make, with the exception of a few cents required to maintain their miserable existence, they take back with them to China; and it is only a matter of a short time before they accumulate a certain sum of money; they then leave British Columbia, and in their place comes another batch of slaves to do the same thing. It is no wonder that the Executive Council of the Provincial Government have constantly passed Orders in Council requesting the Dominion Government to pass some restrictive measure to relieve the people of that Province from the monstrous evils to which they are subjected. In view of these facts, it is a serious question, and one which cannot any longer be overlooked, and I sincerely trust that every hon. member will look at the question fairly and honestly and deal with it apart from all party politics, and vote on it on its merits, just as though the question affected their own Province and their own constituency. Let every hon. member consider how he would act if the Chinese were taking the positions which should be filled by their boys and girls, their sons and daughters, being meanwhile compelled to walk about unable to secure employment in order to enable them to sustain life This, I repeat, is a very serious question. With respect to the flow of immigration, I am happy to say there are large numbers of people going to that Province at the present time and we do not require ships to come from China bringing 300, 400 or 600 Chinamen at a time to British Columbia, as was done two years ago. Just imagine, in one summer bringing 8,000 Chinamen into that Province where there is such a small population of white people, and last summer 3,000 more came. For aught we know next summer we will have 3,000 more, or possibly 6,000, especially in view of another railway being commenced there, when no doubt an effort will be made to bring in a much larger number of this class of people. Hence the greater necessity, I may say, for this Parliament to pass a restrictive measure, or at all events to affirm the principle, so that at an early day we may pass a measure to prevent these people coming in. Now, with regard to appointing a Commission, I would say that that has already been done, for in 1879 this House appointed a Committee which met and took evidence, which is now on record, and is a matter of history. It was proven to that Committee that to allow those people to continue to go into that Province was very injurious and undesirable. Now, Sir, in addition to the Committee which was appointed in 1879, we have the experience of three colonies in Australia; we have the experience in the United States, which have passed a prohibitory measure, and we have also the local Acts which have been passed by our Province, and which have been disallowed. I think at the present time there are two Acts which were passed by our Provincial Parliament during last Session. Whether the Government will allow them or not, of course I cannot say, but I should hope that they would allow one of them; and at all events it seems to me that there is sufficient evidence to enable every member of this House to vote intelligently upon a question of this magnitude. Surely it is a Provincial question, and if the Province has unitedly, without a dissenting voice, in the Provincial Parliament passed and voted in favour of some restrictive measure, surely they are the best judges of the situation, and the requirements of that Province. I maintain, Sir, that some respect should be shown to such an expression of opinion given in that Parliament. In addition to that, we have the representatives of British Columbia in this House, who I believe are unitedly in favour of a restrictive measure, and I think in view of all these facts some positive action should be taken. What does this motion to adjourn the debate mean? It means to burke the question; and I think the hon. gentleman when he made it—well, I was going to say that it was an ungrateful act, but I will not say that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I really am in favour of having a vote on this question. I think it would be far better to do that, and have the question settle than to adjourn the debate and leave it hanging fire, not knowing what we are going to do upon a question of this kind. For my own part, I would sooner have it voted down, if hon. gentlemen do not feel like voting in its favour, than that it should be left hanging, as though we did not care about it. I am in earnest about this matter; the people in my Province are in earnest about it, and are desirous of having some measure passed. Besides we had a petition sent to this Parliament, and presented yesterdey, from Toronto, and another to-day, signed by so three hundred persons, asking that some prohibitory or restrictive measure should be passed by this Parliament. In view of these facts, in view of the evidence we have before us, I think if we were not to vote on a question of this kind we would be neglecting our duty, we would not be true to the interests of the people who have sent us here.

Mr. GORDON. As the seconder of the Resolution, I think it is right and proper that I should also state that I should object to the withdrawal of this Resolution. I am sure my right hon. friend, the Leader of the Government, would not wish to see supporters of his, coming from the Pacific Province, going back to their constituents and being charged with bringing forward buncombe Resolutions, or that after putting them forward earnestly, we agree to withdraw them simply because we are told to wait a little longer. That would be placing us in a false position. I am certain that the railway works do not now demand that this class of labour should be employed. There are thousands to-day lying idle; hundreds of men are applying to me, asking on what conditions they could get employment in British Columbia, and I always tell them, that until the Chinese are restricted from going there, I would not advise them to go into British Columbia and place themselves in the low, degraded level on which these people stand. I think, therefore, without prejudice to the Government, we should deal with the question before the House, and if the Resolutions are adopted, the Government will be able to take such steps as may seem right and proper to them, having in view the interests of Canada as a whole, and the interests of British Columbia—I say that knowing the opinion of the House on the question whether they should be restricted or prohibited from entering into Canada. No harm at least can come from voting on the Resolution. I hope, therefore, the right hon. gentleman will allow the motion to pass, and that he will not consider

in any way that the representatives of British Columbia wish, under any circumstances, to interfere in any degree with any policy which would be conducive to the best interests of Canada, no matter in what part of Canada that policy may be applied.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I ask leave of the House to withdraw my motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After the strong appeal made by the hon. gentleman, and as I do not want to put them in the position of appearing to make a buncombe motion, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the words "restrict or regulate" to be inserted in the amendment of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Allen), and instead of the words "into British Columbia," insert "into Canada," because we could not prevent them from coming into British Columbia while we allowed them to come into any other part of the Dominion. If these amendments are made, I would not object.

Mr. ALLEN. I am willing that the amendment suggested should be made.

Amendment agreed to; and main motion, as amended, agreed to.

SUPERANNUATION OF JAMES HEARN.

The House resumed the adjourned Debate on Mr. Kirk's proposed motion for copies of all correspondence, papers and telegrams between the Government or any member thereof, and any person or persons relating to the superannuation of James Hearn, late Preventive Officer at Arichat, N.S., and also all correspondence and telegrams relating to the appointment of his successor and the continuance of the latter in office.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the House rose on Wednesday last, I was offering some remarks in regard to the operation of the superannuation system. I had drawn the attention of the House to the fact that a very large amount of money had been expended during the last year on superannuation, and urged that some consideration should be given to the question with the view of reducing that expenditure. I find that a number of years have been added to the time of service of those who were superannuated last year, and those additions have been made, in my opinion, in violation of the Statute. The third clause of the Superannuation Act says:

"The Governor in Council may, in the case of any person who entered the Civil Service after the age of thirty years, as being possessed of some peculiar professional or other qualifications or attainments required for the office to which he was appointed, and not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service, add to the actual number of years service of such persons, such further number not exceeding ten, as may be considered equitable, for reasons stated in the Order in Council made in the case; and such additional number of years shall be taken as part of the term of service on which the superannuation allowance of such person shall be computed—the Order in Council in any such case being laid before Parliament, at its then or next Session."

I find, among the number superannuated last year, two who do not come within the limits of that clause. Mr. F. B. Austin, who entered the Service when he was twenty-seven years old, and laboured for twenty-six years, was superannuated last year at the age of fifty-three; and four years were added to his time of service—and added, I contend, in violation of the Act. The Act also provides that when any person is superannuated, and a number of years are added to his time of service, the Order in Council adding them shall accompany the Annual Report submitted to the House. This has not been done in the case of the person I have just named. I find also that Mr. E. C. Barber, who entered the Service when he was twenty-four years of age, was superannuated last year, and the number of years added to his time was seven. These additions are made to the time of service, in order to increase the amount of annuity Civil Servants are permitted to draw after their superannuation, but I contend that the Act has been violated in the both of these cases, because neither of these gentlemen was over thirty years old when they entered the service. Now, the reason urged why the superannuation system is kept in force is, that it is desirable in the interest of the country, and in order to provide for servants who have been a long time in the employment of the country, after they grow old or incapacitated. But, in the case of those who were superannuated last year, there are grave doubts in my mind whether or not that was the moving cause of their superannuation. As I stated before, there were nineteen superannuated when they were only forty-eight years of age. I hold that that argument in favour of this system is not good. I do not think it is right, after a man has been in the receipt of a reasonable amount of wages annually for a great number of years, that the country should provide for him from the time that he retires to the time of his death. I hold that these people are liberally paid while in the service of the country, and that they should be required, out of the sums they receive, to lay by sufficient annually to provide for themselves and their families when they come to old age. I think the system leads to extravagance and recklessness on the part of Civil Servants. I think if they were led to understand that out of the very liberal salaries they receive, they would have to provide for themselves and their families, they would be more economical. These people also have many advantages that other people have not. Bank clerks and clerks in other establishments, and people engaged in other occupations in life, have to pay taxes on their incomes, while these people have not. This circumstance gives them a great many educational and other advantages over other people. I say it is unfair that the country should be called upon, in the face of all these facts, to sacrifice the very large amount we are called upon to sacrifice annually, in order to add so many to the superannuated list. I admit that in some cases men have been superannuated while drawing very large salaries, and others have been appointed in their places at very low salaries. I notice that one man who was drawing $1,700 was superannuated, and another person was engaged to fill his position for $400. Well, that would undoubtedly be a case of saving, but I think it proves either one or two things—either that the man drawing $1,700 was getting more for the duties he was discharging than they were worth, or that the man engaged to fill the position at $400 is getting much less than he deserves for the labour he is performing. I believe the first contention is the true one, for I have no doubt that the man recently hired for $400 is getting a salary equal to the duties he has to perform. But I believe the Act is being abused. I believe that in many cases men not at all incapable have been superannuated, in order to make room for others who are anxious to get places in which they may draw comfortable salaries, and live at ease. I believe that has been the case in the past. It will be said, I presume, that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were parties to the inauguration of this measure as well as those on the opposite side of the House; but I do not care who put it on the Statute Book, or who is responsible for it, I hold that it has worked detrimental to the interests of the country, and that a very large amount of money has been annually expended under the operation of this system. I hold that it is our duty to seriously consider the whole question and to abolish the system, as I contend it is not in the interest of this country that it should be continued. It has been abused in the past, and I believe it will be abused as long as it is allowed to remain on the Statute Book; and in

order to relieve the country of the increased amount we will be called upon to pay annually, owing to the manner in which the Act will be administered, judging from its administration in the past, it is better we should abolish it altogether. There are other ways whereby those people can lay up something for their old age; there are insurance companies quite willing to take risks on their lives, and they can insure their lives the same as other men. I think, therefore, they should be put upon their own responsibility in this matter, in place of their being made a charge upon the country as long as they live. I know such a system has been in existence in England for many years, but there are many things in existence in England which we do not want out here, and I am sorry that, in this case, the English precedent has been followed. I believe the whole system is a mistake and should not be continued; I have shown by figures that it has been a drag on the Government resources, and no one can doubt that it will continue to be a drag as long as it is in existence. In introducing this Act, the Hon. Sir Francis Hinks declared that after a very few years it would be self-sustaining; that although at the commencement, owing to the fact that a number of aged servants then in the employ of the country would cause a draw to be made on the resources of the country somewhat in excess of what it would be after the Act was in operation for a number of years, the payment would be in excess. He held that eventually the percentage deducted from the salaries of Civil Servants would accumulate into a fund sufficient to meet the demands on the Dominion Treasury for superannuation pensions. In place of this being the case, in place of the fund increasing, the sum annually paid out is fast increasing, while the amount contributed by the Civil Service is a mere fraction of the amount paid out annually. I do not whish to detain the House longer with this question. I have already submitted all the figures I have to offer on it to the House, and as it is late in the Session and I know that hon. gentlemen are anxious to proceed with other business, I will restrict myself to these remarks, calling the attention of the House to the fact that in adding those years to the time of service of the men who have been superannated, the Act has been violated, and that these men were not in a position to claim these additional years. Not only has the Act been administered to the fullest extent, but the Government have gone beyond the powers given them in the Act by adding years to the time of service of some of those who have been superannuated, thereby giving them more than the law says they should receive, and they will continue to receive this sum as long as they live. I simply wish to call the attention of the Government to this fact and I hope there will be some alteration made in the system.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting the Election of Members for the House of Commons, being read,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This is a very important and lengthy Bill, and had we reached it at an earlier period of Sessions I intended moving the second reading and having the Bill properly discussed. At this late period, however, it is useless to expect that it will receive the consideration it deserves; therefore, I move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to; and order discharged.

TRAFFIC IN INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

On the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 102) to amend the Act 41 Victoria, chapter 16, intituled: An Act respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, being read,

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). This is an important Bill, but it is impossible for me, as a private member, to have it carried through this Session. I would ask the hon. Preimer, however, if he will give us the assurance that the Bill introduced by the Government in the Senate will be carried through this Session; it has been adjourned, from day to day, in the Senate, and it is for the hon. gentleman to decide whether there is any possibility of its being reached, and I may say it is a most important amendment. As the hon. gentleman may know, the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia has declared that the Scott Act is not in force in counties where no licenses existed at the time, and unless this amendment is carried, the Scott Act will not be in force in those counties. All that is necessary to carry it in both Houses is the influence of the Government, and if the hon. gentleman will give that influence, it will no doubt become law. I want to know if he means business, and if he will give that assurance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot give any such assurance to the hon. gentleman. The Bill was introduced in the other House with a *bonâ fide* desire to have it become law, to have it passed there and come down here. I have not watched the proceedings in the other House, but I am sure, if any delay has taken place, it has not been caused by the Government.

Order allowed to stand.

PETITION FOR LEAVE TO PRESENT A PETITION FOR A PRIVATE BILL.

Mr. BEATY. I ask leave of the House to present a petition for leave to present a petition from the London Life Insurance Company, and if the business of the House will not prevent it going through, I would press it to night. It only affects internal arrangements, being a matter referring to an increase of the capital and matters of that kind. I ask for leave to present the petition and move that it be referred to the Standing Orders Committee at once.

Mr. BLAKE. The first step is to ask for leave to present a petition.

Mr. BEATY moved that leave be granted to introduce a petition from the London Life Insurance Company.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BEATY moved that the petition be received and read, and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders forthwith, and that the rules of the House be suspended for the purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that to be the course. The course is, that the hon. member should ask leave of the House, because the hour is not the proper hour for receiving petitions, to bring up a petition for leave to present a petition. Then that petition is presented; that is, a petition which states the grounds upon which the House is asked the indulgence that the other petition may be presented. Then the House determines whether that will be granted or not, and then, having determined to grant it, the regular petition is presented. The hon. gentleman seems to proceed *per saltem*.

Mr. BEATY. That is exactly the course pursued. The petition is for leave to present a petition.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a petition for leave to present a petition.

Mr. BEATY. Then the motion is that that petition be sent to the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood it was the second petition.

Mr. BEATY. No; the second petition is not presented yet.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 10:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. GIROUARD moved that the First Report (page 1270) of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be concurred in.

Mr. BLAKE. Some time ago, when this question first came before the House, I ventured to state the reasons which led me to a conclusion adverse to that which the Committee had arrived at, namely, that the seat for Cumberland is now vacant. I have not heard subsequently, either in this House or in the room of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, nor do I observe in the recent report the hon. gentleman has presented, any such arguments as lead me to alter the opinion which I had already formed. Adhering to that opinion, I do not think it would be useful, at this stage of the Session, under the circumstances of the case, to detain the House with a reiteration of the arguments, but, adhering to it, I desire to divide the House.

Report concurred in on the following division :—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Allison (Hants),	Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Amyot,	Dundas,	McCallum,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McDougald,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	McGreevy,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	McLelan,
Beaty,	Foster,	McNeill,
Bell,	Gault,	Massue,
Belleau,	Gigault,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Girouard,	Moffat,
Benson,	Gordon,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Reid,
Bolduc,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bossé,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Brecken,	Hesson,	Small,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Smyth,
Burns,	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Stairs,
Cameron (Victoria),	Houde,	Taylor,
Carling,	Ives,	Tilley,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Tupper (Pictou),
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Tyrwhitt,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Kinney,	Wallace (Albert),
Costigan,	Kranz,	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	White (Renfrew),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Wigle,
Daly,	Lesage,	Williams,
Daoust,	Macdonald (King),	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wright.—107.
Desjardins,	Mackintosh,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Davies,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox),	De St. Georges,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mills,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchard,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bernier,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Innes,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce).
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Casey,	Laurier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Vail,
Catudal,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Charlton,	McCraney,	Wells,
Cockburn,	McIntyre,	Wilson.—55.
Cook,		

DEATH OF PRINCE LEOPOLD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise for the purpose of moving that this House do concur in the Address of the Senate (page 1273) to Her Most Gracious Majesty, of condolence on the death of His Royal Highness Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany, by filling up the blank with the words "and House of Commons." I am sure this House will have a melancholy pleasure in joining with the other branch of the Legislature in conveying the sympathies of Parliament to our beloved sovereign in her late great bereavement. Some of us have had the honour of becoming personally acquainted with Prince Leopold during his short visit to this country, and of observing his gracious manner and the great intelligence of his conversation. He, Sir, like all the rest of Her Majesty's sons, had devoted himself to the public interest. The heir apparent, as it was his duty to do, has most sedulously attended to relieve his Royal Mother from the heavy duties of sovereignty by performing all those great ceremonial duties which are cast upon the Crown. Of the other sons, one has sailed on every sea as an efficient officer of Her Majesty's navy; and another, the Duke of Connaught, who many of us also met when he visited this country, is now showing that he is no *diletanti* soldier, but he is performing active military duty on the plains of India. Prince Leopold, whose early death we now deplore, was obliged, in some degree, to take a different course in his public life. From a congenital delicacy of constitution he was not so able as his more robust brothers to enter into the active pursuits of manhood; but he was not deterred by feebleness of constitution from making himself useful, eminently useful—and remember that he was only thirty years old, or thereabouts, when he died. He had already devoted himself to the study of the arts, to the promotion of science, and to assisting by his presence, by his counsel and precepts, the various benevolent institutions which attracted his attention, and to which he rendered eminent service, in the name, and, as it were, as the representative of his august mother. To some of us, who are not so well acquainted with his character and career, owing to distance from the scene of his usefulness, and who are not so thoroughly acquainted with all he has done within his sphere during the short period of his life, I would call attention to a little *brochure* which has been placed in my hands, which speaks of the Duke of Albany, and I think the House will be interested if I read to them a few passages showing how a person of his high rank, notwithstanding the delicacy of his constitution, applied himself earnestly to the duties of his high position, and showing with what fine tastes he was endowed. This little *brochure* has been published as a biographical sketch, and I am sure the House will be interested if I read a few quotations from it. So long ago as 1871, when his name was brought up in the House of Lords, the Duke of Richmond said:

"Although the Prince had not, on acount of his youth, the advantages of the personal example of his illustrious father, he had been brought up in a manner in every way to imitate and follow his noble example. The assiduity Prince Leopold had shown in all the departments of study in which he had been occupied, gave grounds for believing that he would fit himself for taking the important position in the country to which his birth entitled him."

Lord Granville, following, said:

"From some personal acquaintance with the illustrious Prince, I am able to say that there are few young men of his years who have cultivated their natural abilities with greater assiduity and success than Prince Leopold has done."

Now, Sir, in order to show you how various and versatile were his talents, and how sedulously he applied himself to

doing good on every occasion that presented itself, whether to art, science or morals, or to the development of England, or in assisting benevolent institutions, here is a short synopsis of what he has done:

"On February 19th, 1879, he delivered an address on university teaching at the Mansion House. On the 25th of the same month he presided and spoke at the Birkbeck Literary and Scientific Institution. On May 19th, 1879, at Grosvenor House, he presided and delivered a remarkable address on the education of the deaf and dumb. On October 20th, 1879, he formally opened the fifth college at Sheffield. On April 14th, 1880, he laid the foundation stone of the High School at Oxford. On the 30th of June, 1881, he opened the Nottingham University building. At the Manchester Athenæum Soirée on December 12th, 1881, he spoke on the culture of music. And on the 17th of December, 1881, he laid the foundation stone of the Princess Helena College at Ealing."

From that day up to the time of his death he was constantly employed in forwarding all such worthy enterprises, and in assisting and promoting all that is calculated to benefit the people of England. I shall, Sir, endeavour to show by a few short quotations that not only were his intentions good, but his intentions were ably carried out. While his exertions in all these various good causes were unremitting, the House will see that his style was most effective—so effective, indeed, Sir, that he received a most remarkable testimony from the *Times*. On the great question of university education, when there was a great meeting at the Mansion House in London, he made a remarkable address, so remarkable that the *Times* referred to it in the following manner:—

"The meeting at the Mansion House has revealed powers of expression in a member of the Royal Family which rivalled those of a great English orator on a field peculiarly his own. The crowd which thronged the Egyptian Hall came to see a Prince and to hear Mr. Gladstone. As it listened to the former in his turn, it must have felt that it had before it not merely a thinker, but a thinker with the gift of thinking aloud. No two better representatives of the cause of university teaching could have been selected than Prince Leopold and Mr. Gladstone."

No testimony could be greater than that given by the *Times*. Let me now read some few sentences from his addresses, showing not only a careful style, but the earnestness and originality with which he applied himself to various subjects. Speaking about foreign languages and their cultivation he says:

"Sometimes perhaps, as the proverb says, we take what is unknown to be magnificent; but oftener I think we take it to be something unfriendly and distasteful to us. But we find that with every real increase of understanding of our fellow men of different races, some unkindly illusion disappears; we learn to realize their likenesses to ourselves, to sympathize with their national character, and to co-operate in their efforts after the common good."

Speaking of a great man and a great genius, Mr. Ruskin, he said:

"We have seen a man in whom the highest gifts of refinement and of genius reside, who yet has not grudged to give his best to others; who has made it his main effort—by gifts, by teaching, by sympathies—to spread among the artisans of villages and the labourers of our English fields the power of knowing a full measure of instruction and happiness from this wonderful world which rich and poor gain alike from. We have seen such a man in Professor Ruskin; and among all the lessons with which those who have had the privilege of his teaching and his friendship must have carried with them for life, none I think can have sunk deeper than the last;—that the highest wisdom and the highest treasure need not be costly or exclusive; that the greatness of a nation must be measured, not alone by its wealth and apparent power, but by the degree in which its people have learned to gather in the great world of books, of art, and of nature, pure and enobling joys. I cannot think then that we need feel that this society is providing teachers who are too good for the work which they are to do. It may be long before her students can follow them as far as they can lead; but the work which they have to teach will be taught all the better, the methods will be sounder, and the personal influence of the teacher will stimulate them the more."

Speaking of the great benefits which Mr. Firth had accomplished, in establishing a college and otherwise engaging in philanthropic subjects, the Prince said:

"We must all welcome this new proof of Mr. Firth's wise munificence with pleasure, but now with surprise. We cannot wonder that when a man has tasted the happiness of great and generous actions he is eager to enjoy the high delight again, and finds other triumphs and satisfactions insipid as compared with the triumphs and satisfaction of conferring on others a real and lasting good."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

So again, and it is the last quotation I shall read, speaking of the noble work on laying the foundation of the University College, Nottingham, the Prince said:

"And the happiness of our lives depends much less on the actual value of the work which we do, than on the spirit in which we do it. If a man tries to do the very simplest and humblest work as well as he possibly can, it will be interesting to him, and he will be proud of it. But if he is only thinking of what he can get by his work, then even the highest work will become a weariness to him I trust that your college will send forth many men trained to do good and honest work, so that to do work which is bad or dishonest shall be simply impossible to them. Men like those may be proud of their trade, proud of their town; and I do not believe that we become better citizens of the world by being indifferent to the interests and honour of our town, or our own nation. I believe that the narrower patriotism is often the best way of leading us to the broader; and that the better a citizen a man is of Nottingham the better citizen will he be of England; and that the truest sons of England will make the best citizens of the world. Then it is, when a man has lived for others, has worked for public ends, that the good which he has done is not interred with his bones No! It lives after him; so that in the words which form the proud motto of your ancient corporation *Vivit Post Funera Virtus.*"

After reading these paragraphs so noble in sentiment, so graceful in expression, one can feel what a loss England has sustained, and especially what a loss Her Majesty has suffered in her last bereavement in losing her youngest son. I will say no more, but will content myself by moving the Resolutions.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion of which the hon. gentleman has given notice. I think that if ever there was a sovereign in the history of Constitutional Government, I will not say in our own country, but in any country, who might fairly claim the sympathy of her subjects in her joys and her sorrows, that sovereign is the reigning Queen of this Empire. I do not believe that we of this generation do as yet realize what we owe to the long reign of the Queen. During that reign there has been a wonderful advance in the material prosperity and progress of the vast domains of which the British Empire is composed. That material progress and prosperity is palpable, and we all perceive and observe it. But there has been in various parts of the Empire a progress in other regards of a still higher and greater moment, not so palpable to see, which I believe cannot be fully realized except by succeeding generations. It has been the good fortune of Her Majesty as a constitutional monarch to inaugurate, under the advice of her Ministers, a series of reforms and changes in accordance with the modern spirit of the times, under which the material, the intellectual, the educational and the constitutional progress of her people has been really equally, although not so palpably and perceptibly from the nature of the subject, marked as the material progress. It is not many years now since in that very domain which the hon. gentleman's observations indicated to us, the lamented Prince, to whose untimely death we are referring, to some extent devoted himself, the great stride was taken by the Act of 1870 which practically gave a universal education to the British people. And we know in the constitutional advance which has been made in the Kingdom itself it has been Her Majesty's privilege in the language of her poet laureate:

"To set the bounds of freedom clearer yet."

And while that is so in the Kingdom it has been so even more markedly in the colonies, and most markedly of any of the colonies, in the colony, or rather the Dominion in which we are the people's representatives. Here, more than elsewhere, we can realize the progress that has been made. Here, more than elsewhere, we can realize that, almost insensibly, a revolution has been effected, and we have approached to an extent wonderful to contemplate the idea of popular Government as understood in this day. And, therefore, under her peculiarly monarchical attributes as a constitutional sovereign, I maintain it to be established, that there has not existed any sovereign in past times, and none exists to-day, who can more confidently challenge the

sympathy of her subjects on an occasion like the present. But that is not the only claim the Queen has to our sympathy and affection. In her domestic character as a wife, as a mother, as a widow, she has been an example of the domestic virtues always dear to the British heart. And as a sovereign, she has endeavoured to preserve, and with great success, a pure court, and to set an example, in the most exalted stations, calculated not merely to maintain, but to elevate the standard of virtue among her subjects and curb that licentiousness which has too often appeared inseparable from great material luxury and prosperity. And, therefore, in every capacity in which we can look upon her, I repeat, she is entitled to demand not merely a nominal and formal, but a real and substantial sympathy with her in her joys and in her sorrows. And this occasion, as the hon. gentleman has observed, is one particularly calculated to elicit that sympathy. The loss is great. The loss is great of a young life such as that of the Prince's—a young life of great promise. I will not enlarge upon the different vocations in which in the course of his high functions the Prince evidenced that promise. I will only say with the hon. gentleman that he has proved that we may not inaptly apply to the son the language which the poet laureate addressed to the sovereign, on the death of the father:

"Sweet nature gilded by the gracious gleam,
Of letters, dear to science, dear to art."

His position, like the position of any prince of the blood in these modern days, was a trying one; but, though he recognized the difficulties that beset the position, he recognized also the possibilities of usefulness which belong to it. And, as the hon. gentleman has said, he was not content with recognizing those possibilities, but he exerted himself manfully, effectually and successfully to develop those possibilities, and to be, in his position, a useful man to the generation in which he lived. His position was especially trying, living, as he was, all his short life under the shadow of that doom which has at length overtaken him, and which, however much it may have borne on his secret spirit, never seemed to have overborne him in those exertions which he made for the public good. That delicacy to which reference has been made, would naturally make him all the dearer to his mother's heart, and make this loss of him over whom she must have watched so anxiously, all this time, even severer than if he had been of that more robust constitution which, happily, is enjoyed by the other members of the royal family. We may address her then from the bottom of our hearts in the language of the same poet whom I have already quoted:

"Break not, O woman's heart, but still endure."

We may say to her, speaking in the name of the Canadian people, that we do indeed mourn the early extinguishment of that young life, and we respectfully lay at her feet our tribute of sympathy with the sorrow of her who survives to mourn that loss.

Motion agreed to; and an Address was voted to His Exellency the Governor-General, praying him to transmit the joint Address to Her Majesty, in such a manner as His Excellency may see fit.

ENQUIRIES INTO SHIPWRECKS.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend the Act respecting enquiries and investigations into shipwrecks and other matters, as to the powers of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.

Mr. DAVIES. Has the hon. gentleman looked at the second section of the last Bill, as it was printed, to see whether a mistake was not made. I think it never was intended to form part of the Bill, as it simply declares the position of certain English Acts on the subject, and I think there was no occasion for expressing that in our Statute. It is simply a statement that a certain English law repealed a certain other English law.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will find that this is very much in the words of the English Act. The Imperial Shipping Act of 1854 required the finding of the court to be confirmed by the Governor in Council. In 1862 a new Imperial Act was passed which left it in doubt whether the confirmation was required or not. In our Act, which was passed in 1869, we provided that there should be a confirmation by the Governor in Council, passing over the Act of 1862, and taking as our authority the original Act of 1854. In 1882 a new Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament, and as there appeared to be a doubt whether the Act of 1862 repealed the Act of 1854 or not, the Act of 1882 expressly declared that it had, and that from 1862 no confirmation was required. The words used in that were very much the same as those which the Law Clerk has put in this Bill. They were:

"The confirmation of the report required by the said Act shall be deemed no longer necessary after the passing of the Merchant Shipping Amendment Act of 1862, as a condition precedent to the suspension or cancellation of the certificate of any master or mate."

So that the language employed in this clause is very much the same as that employed in the Imperial Act, setting aside any doubts that existed after the passing of the Act of 1862.

Mr. MILLS. This seems to me to be a very extraordinary provision. The words used are:

"No confirmation by the Governor or person administering the Government of Canada, of any report under the Act hereby amended is or has been required since the passing of the Merchant Shipping Amendment Act, 1862."

We might just as well assert any other fact. The clause enacts nothing. It is simply a statement as to the effect of a particular Act, and that an English Act. It is wholly unnecessary, and ought not to be included.

Mr. WELDON. A Statute must either be an enacting Statute or a declaratory Statute. This neither enacts nor declares nor repeals.

Mr. McLELAN. The provision in the Act of 1869 is a quotation from the Imperial Act of 1854, and that quotation is held by the Imperial Act of 1862 to be repealed; and this clause, in making the declaration that confirmation is not necessary, states the authority on which that declaration is made. It would, perhaps, have been better had the authority been first stated, and the declaration made afterwards.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know upon what this clause is founded, but I concur in the view that it is wholly unnecessary, and ought not to be inserted here. Even if you call it —as I heard an hon. gentleman opposite say it might be called—a declaratory clause, I think we cannot effectually declare the meaning of an Imperial Statute. We can effectually declare the meaning of one of our own Statutes, because we can either repeal or amend it, and we may amend it in the declaratory form, but this is declaring what the effect of Imperial legislation is, and it does not appear to me to be fitting that we should attempt to do that. I admit that this provision possesses negatively one good quality which I wish a good deal of the legislation from the other side did posses—I do not think it will do any harm.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, on the contrary, it will do a great deal of good, because it is a declaratory Act. A doubt has been raised whether, under the Merchant Shipping Act, confirmation by the Government or person administering the Government of Canada of any report is or has been required since the passing of the Merchant Shipping Amendment Act of 1862; the provision in the Merchant

Shipping Act of 1854, referring to such confirmation, having been expressly repealed by the Merchant Shipping Declaratory Act of 1882. The hon. gentleman says we cannot declare what the meaning of an Imperial Statute is. Well, I think we have pretty good authority for it. I think there was an Act passed in Ontario, declaring what was the meaning of the Statute of Frauds, which was an Imperial Act.

Mr. BLAKE. It had been incorporated in our own law, and of course we could declare its meaning.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We could not declare what the Parliament of England meant 200 years ago. However, the hon. gentleman says the clause can do no harm, and I think it had better remain. It might commence, "It is hereby declared and enacted;" and we could enact, as we have power to deal with the subject, that the confirmation of the Government is not required. But the draftsmen, I see, followed the form of the Imperial Act of 1882, which simply stated that "the confirmation required by the said Act shall be deemed no longer necessary." I think we had better leave it as it is.

Bill read the third time and passed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 120) to amend the Weights and Measures Act of 1869, be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to; and the House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. I simply propose to provide that the section that was added to the Bill at the last meeting of the Committee regarding the labelling of cans shall not go into force until the first day of January next. I am informed by telegraph that several manufacturing firms have on hand a supply of cans for the year's operations, and it might be inconvenient to put this clause into operation at once. Another question has arisen with regard to the interpretation of the labelling or marking and I think the word "permanently" should be struck out so that manufacturers can either stamp the cans or label them.

The word "permanently" was struck out.

Mr. DAVIES. Does this clause embrace canned meats?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The intention is to cover all goods hermetically sealed.

Mr. DAVIES. My opinion of the section is it does not cover that.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on Resolution to provide for remuneration of analysts to be appointed under the Bill for the prevention of Adulteration of Food and Drugs be received.

Motion agreed to, and Resolution read the second and third times, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 114).

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 114) for the prevention of the Adulteration of Food and Drugs.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Is it to be understood that what is to be done is to appoint a chief analyst at a salary from $2,000 to $2,400, that he is to reside at Ottawa and shall not receive any fees, and that there will be no alteration in the system in reference to other analysts except the possible reduction in the fees they charge for their work, and that there shall be no large increase in their number during the coming financial year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The salary of the chief analyst will not exceed $2,400, and there will be no change in the other arrangements. The public burdens will be increased only by $2,400 at the utmost.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

171.

Pay of force, including staff	$160,000 00
Subsistence	80,000 00
Forage	73,000 00
Fuel and light	15,000 00
Clothing	37,000 00
Repairs, renewals, replacement of horses, arms and ammunition	47,000 00
Medicine, medical comforts and hospital expenses	7,000 00
Books and stationery	2,000 00
Transport and freight charges, guides and mail carriers	45,000 00
Contingencies	4,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, we shall be glad to have from the First Minister—I think this is under his special supervision, he retains it——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—Full information as to the cause of this considerable increase, and I may remark that, in the Supplementary Estimates, a further sum of $70,000 is wanted. Before the explanations are given, I do not want to comment too much on the demand, but I may remark that we used to be criticised exceedingly severely for the amount which, under very difficult circumstances, my hon. friend the member for West Durham had to expend for maintaining this force, and I think, in asking more money, the least the First Minister can do is to recant the hard things which were said about this force in 1876 and 1878.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As Lord Beaconsfield said once, a great many things have happened since then. With respect to the first item, pay of force, including staff, there is an increase of $5,000. In consequence of the many demands on the force, it is found necessary to keep it up to the maximum authorized by law, 520 non-commissioned officers and men.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this increase to go to the whole force, or to the officers alone?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To the whole force, non-commissioned officers and men. The force is now kept up to its full strength, 520.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many officers has the hon. gentleman got just now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I forget the number of officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a force, no doubt, which ought to be officered well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are three vacancies in the force at this moment, in the ordinary staff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the hon gentleman passes to the next item, I would call his attention again to what I have called the attention of some of his colleagues to, and that is that I think a certain number of the commissions at his disposal ought, in all reason, to be given to cadets of the Military College, say two perhaps per annum, to those who have done best and who do not choose to accept commissions in the royal service. Here we are educating these men at very considerable cost to the country, and up to the present time, if I remember aright, none except Inspector Perry has been appointed to the force. I do not propose that they should have a monopoly of it by any means, but I think that in that service, in which it is desirable for many reasons that young men properly trained should be placed, and just such young men the Minister might very properly, especially remembering that some of his colleagues at Kingston on several occasions have alluded to the intention of the Government to employ these cadets in just that service, say that a couple in future would be given to them. He will get very good officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should be very glad to say so because I think with the hon. gentleman that that ought to be done, and it has been done so far as we were able to do it. Mr. Perry was appointed. Then, on the very first next vacancy, Mr. Prevost was appointed, and I think he was a graduate. The difficulty has been that we have offered several commissions to graduates of the Military College and they have not accepted the position. The hon. gentleman from L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) had a son who passed with honours, and I was very anxious to get him for the force, for he really distinguished himself in the Military College. I offered him a commission, which, after consideration, he refused. I do not remember the other names, but there were two or three others.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What rank?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Inspector, with the rank of Lieutenant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sub-inspector, I suppose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, we have no sub-inspectors. The inspector is the subaltern officer, the superintendent is the captain, and then there is the commissioner and assistant commissioner. There are two or three vacancies at this moment. There is a gentleman, I may say, to whom I should like to give a commission, who, I am told by Col. Hewitt, will graduate certainly in June with very high honours. I think there should be not only two, but there should be a very considerable sprinkling in the force of these young gentlemen, and we should also have reference to the best young officers of the embodied force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quite satisfied with that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite alive to it, and very anxious to carry it out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is his intention practically to offer these commissions to those who pass best? The English commissions, as he knows, are offered according to the merits of the graduates. I have never myself at all pressed upon the Government to give every man who passes through with a mere graduate's certificate a commission. I thought that half a dozen prizes might be given among the best, and that would be quite sufficient, in addition at any rate to what the Home Government does.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it would be well in all cases to state that the young man having the highest honours should have a right to claim the commission. He might, from physical or other reasons, not be so well suited, though his scientific and professional acquirements would be very good. But no man should get a commission as being a mere graduate; he should pass with honours.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be quite sufficient.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And I think other elements should be considered. It is a force belonging to the whole Dominion, and I have been anxious to get young men from the different Provinces. There should be a representation of the different Provinces in that force, if we can get the right men. At present there is only one French Canadian in the force, Mr. Gagnon, and a very good officer he is. Mr. Prevost was appointed, but he left the service, and I am sorry to say he did not do it much credit. I propose to supply his place with a gentleman from Lower Canada. Then we appointed the other day, as inspector, an officer of the highest testimonials who was employed here in the Governor General's Office, Captain Deane, who belonged to the English marines. Commissioner Irvine was exceedingly anxious to get a man of his description. There has been no man appointed without possessing scientific attainments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is an assurance which I am sure will be received with great satisfaction on both sides of the House, that the hon. gentleman is making his selections from among those who have passed with honours. I would like to know if the statement is true, that we have seen with some regret, that Col. Irvine had been superseded as commandant of the force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has not been superseded. He has been down on leave, and left last week to resume command.

Mr. MILLS. I notice the amount asked by the hon. gentleman is about $130,000 or $140,000 larger than the amount required in 1878, and is much larger than the amount of last year. Of course, the force is more numerous now than it was then; but I remember well that in 1878 the hon. gentleman and those who supported him called attention to the very high prices that were paid for hay, oats, and supplies of various sorts, and to the cost of keeping the horses of the Mounted Police. Although the expense was very large, as the hon. gentleman complained, at that time, it was nearly $140,000 less than the amount he asks now. It will be interesting to the Committee and the country to learn why this very large sum is required. We want to know if the hon. gentleman has succeeded in carrying out those plans of economy of which he was at that time such an ardent advocate? There is no doubt the facilities for obtaining supplies are much greater now than they were six years ago. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues told us more than once since this Session began that at that time the whole country was a howling wilderness, that there were hardly any inhabitants in the country except Indians and the Mounted Police, and that the latter were cut off from the outside world by the want of railway facilities and the immense cost of transportation. Now, those reasons as to the cost of transportation and the difficulty of obtaining supplies, were also the justification of the Government in 1878, when the cost of transportation was so great that it added immensely to the cost of maintaining the force in that country. But now though the facilities are greater and the cost of transportation has been diminished, the amount required by the hon. gentleman for keeping up the force has been greatly increased. It would be interesting to know precisely how this sum is to be applied; what are the hon. gentleman's estimates, how much is going towards the supply of horses to the force, and how much for keeping them; and what are the expenses for the men, and how much of this goes

towards the wages and salaries of the men and how much towards payment and maintenance?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say my hon. friend with his usual diligence has looked over the Report of the Commissioner of Police, and he will find a great many of those questions which he speaks about solved there. The hon. gentleman says that the force has cost many thousand dollars more than it did in 1878. Well, there are 500 men now and there were only 300 then. That is one reason; I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will accept that as a sufficient reason.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would call the attention of the hon. member for West Huron, who takes an interest in this subject, to a sort of consecutive statement which has been placed in my hand and which will apply to the various items forming this Resolution These estimates amount to $470,300. The Estimates for the current year are:—Vote of last Session, $416,000; Supplementary, $70,000; total, $486,000; decrease in 1884-85, $16,000. Whilst the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway will ultimately reduce the cost of maintenance in the North-West, the expenses during the period of construction have largely increased. To efficiently perform the duties required of the force, and to adapt the service to the altered condition of the North-West, increased expenditure will be unavoidable. The following are a few of the causes of increased expenditure:—1. The immense demand for waggon transport, labour and the produce of the North-West for which hitherto the police were the principal customers. 2. The necessity for numerous small detachments of police along the line of construction, and the various trails leading to the railway, to suppress the introduction of liquor, smuggling and gambling 3. The removal of Indians from the plains south of the railway to the reserves in the north, and keeping them on their reserves. At the request of the Lieutenant-Governor, twenty-five men were sent to Fort Pitt, in September last, to keep "Big Bear" and his followers in order. During the present year it will be necessary to keep 150 men in the Northern or Saskatchewan River District, and the larger portion of this force will be constantly patrolling the country between the various Indian Reserves A large force will also be required in Treaty No. 4 (the Qu'Appelle District) to prevent the Indians gathering in numbers off their reserves. 4. The preservation of peace among the construction parties of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Rocky Mountains will require a detachment of fifty men. 5. Until recently the horses of the force were allowed to pasture "in herd" when not required for duty. During the past season this was impossible. The pasture near the posts was, in some cases, poor, and in others eaten off by the large number of horses in the vicinity; and the country being infested with horse thieves it was necessary to keep the police horses ready for service at a moment's notice, 6. Beef, which is the largest item of expense in a man's rations, has more than doubled in price owing to the excessive demand consequent upon the construction of the railway and general development of the country. 7. The demolition of Fort Walsh, which was necessary to effect the breaking up of the large bands of Indians who for years were camped in that vicinity, was the cause of much indirect expenditure. 8. Fuel at Fort Walsh cost, for years, from 50 cents to $1.00 per cord, being merely the expense of chopping. Coal on the line of railway cost last winter $20.50 per ton, and this winter, with the exception of Medicine Hat, $9.50 and $10.00 per ton. 9. The mortality among the horses of the force has been unusually heavy owing to the prevalence of glanders and influenza. At one post the stables were destroyed by fire to prevent the spread of the disease.

Pay of force, $160,000. In consequence of the many demands upon the force, it will be necessary in future to keep the strength up to the maximum authorized by law, viz, 520 non-commissioned officers and men. Subsistence, $80,300. This estimate is for 550 officers and men at 40 cents per day. The estimated average cost of a daily ration is 35 cents, but the force will be much scattered during next fiscal year, and it is more expensive to ration small detachments than large ones. The estimates, as printed, show an increase of $29,200 over the current year. This is caused by the estimates for the current year showing a decrease of $18,000 compared with the previous year. This decrease was made to enable the surplus provisions in the police stores to be consumed. Now that new buildings and commodious warehouses have been erected, it is desirable that the surplus should be restored, to be in readiness for any emergency. Forage $73,000—this estimate is at the rate of 50 cents per day for 400 horses. Oats will be cheaper, but hay is becoming dearer every year. Hay is, as a rule, obtainable only in small patches, frequently fifteen to twenty miles from the barracks, and the cost is more that of hauling than of cutting and curing. At Maple Creek this year the hay cost for cutting and curing $3.75 per ton, and for hauling to the barracks $14 per ton, in all $17.75 per ton. At Fort MacLeod the hay cost $22 per ton, delivered at the barracks. It will be necessary in future to keep the police horses constantly stabled and ready for duty. It is impossible for the police, with the many and sudden calls upon them, to cut or haul their own hay. The stock of forage on hand at the various posts is larger than any previous year, and we hope to be able to save $10,000 of the estimate of $73,000 with which to purchase oats in Manitoba next winter for the following fiscal year. Fuel and light, $15,000. This item will barely meet the requirements. Clothing, $37,000; no increase. It is satisfactory to be able to state that we are gradually accumulating a surplus stock of clothing. That in store at the present time is valued at $30,000, and in the course of a couple of years we should have in stock a full year's supply of clothing in advance of requirements. Repairs and renewals, replacement of horses, arms and ammunition, $47,000; horses, 50 at $150, $7,500; tents, $1,000; arms and ammunition, $4,000; saddlery, $6,500; harness and repairs, $2,000; waggons and buckboards, $3,000; general stores, $23,000. Total, $47,000. The force is armed with the Winchester repeating carabine. Fifty carabines and 100 revolvers are required to complete the arming of the force and to provide spare arms to replace those rendered temporarily unserviceable by wear and tear. The old Snider carabines with which the force was armed when first organized, are being returned into store at headquarters, and repaired by the armourer of the force. 180 of these carabines, with a good supply of ammunition, are now in store at Regina. The adopted saddle is the "California;" about 170 are now in use, and it is proposed to purchase 150 more this year. The "universal" saddles issued to the force in 1874 have, to a large extent, become unserviceable from wear and tear. The shorter prairie journeys since the construction of the railway will, in many cases, enable the service to be performed with buckboards or light waggons, drawn by one or two horses, instead of four, as in the past. The demands upon the item for general stores will be very heavy during the coming fiscal year in consequence of the furnishing of the new barracks at several places. Medicine—medical comforts and hospital supplies, $7,000. There is an increase of $2,000 in this item, being the amount required for furnishing the new hospitals, five in number. Transport and freight charges, guides, etc., $45,000. I had hoped that it would have been possible to reduce this item, but I now fear it will not be practicable at present. The members of the

force will be constantly on the move on the line of railway and between the Indian reserves and settlements. The expense of travelling part by rail, and part by stage or waggon, is frequently greater than if the whole journey were made by waggon. Men sent on special duty frequently have to hire waggon transport from the station at which they leave the train to the settlement or camp where their duties call them. Rate of pay—Commissioner, $2,600 per annum; Assistant Commissioner, $1,600; Superintendents (7), $1,400; Inspectors, (13), $1,000; Surgeon, $1,400; Assistant Surgeons, $1,200; Staff-Sergeants, $1 to $1.50 per day; duty Sergeants, 75 cents to $1; Corporals, 60 cents to 85 cents; Constables, 50 cents to 75 cents. Constables commence at 50 cents per day, and receive an addition of 5 cents per day for each year's service until the maximum of 75 cents per day is reached. Working pay to artizans and others is paid as follows: Shoemakers, tailors, etc., 15 cents per day; blacksmiths, according to qualifications as shoeing smiths, 50 cents per day.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What price was paid for beef?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We used to give 7 cents per pound. Now it is 15 to 20 cents.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We gave 3½ cents per pound.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was live weight.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What parties have had the contract?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Different parties.

Mr. CHARLTON. I observe that Baker & Co., of Montana, had a contract amounting to $105,000. Did they tender?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; and they obtained it on the lowest tender. When the railway is finished cattle dealers and butchers in Ontario will be able to tender. Hitherto they have been unable to do so, as they could not get their cattle out there. Some cattle dealers in Ontario went to the North-West and settled, and when they sent in the lowest tenders they obtained contracts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was T. Howard one of the contractors this year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. To what extent are the members of the force or their horses employed in carrying this hay to the barracks?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not done at all now.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be cheaper to get a few draught horses for the purpose of transporting this hay, rather than pay $14 a day for teams.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It might be; but I hope the situation of the country in a year or two will be such that we will avoid paying these high prices, and at the same time there will be a market for what the people produce.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the Minister why the Indians to a large extent are also armed with Winchester rifles, and whether measures have been taken by the Government to prevent the importation of that kind of arms for the use of the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indians, I am sorry to say, have too many repeating rifles and too much fixed ammunition. Formerly, the Mounted Police had a check upon the introduction of repeating arms and fixed ammunition from across the lines; but with the numerous trails that are now opened along the line of the Pacific Railway, it is almost impossible to check that. The Bill I hope to move provides for that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman last year said he could exchange fowling pieces with the Indians for those rifles. What progress has he made with that trade?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that we did not make any progress.

Mr. MILLS. I observe that the number of horses that the force now have are 400, only 70 more than the number they had in 1878, when the force was very much smaller; so that, in case of difficulty, the efficiency of the force, which largely depends on the number of horses, would not be any greater, although the number of men is about 200 more than formerly. The hon. gentleman also informs us that he is paying over $1 a ton a mile for the drawing of hay to the stations of the police. A large portion of the men must sometimes be unemployed, and it seems to me they might properly be employed in conveying the hay from the place where it is grown to the place where it is consumed. In fact, the practice seems to be based on the theory I heard put forward a few years ago, that the burning of Chicago was an excellent thing, because it gave employment to a large number of people engaged in industrial pursuits. The hon. gentleman seems to be acting on the same principle—that paying $1 a ton a mile for carrying this hay is a good thing, because it gives employment to the people who draw it, and that if the policemen were employed in carrying it, it might reduce the expenses. He has applied to the police force the same principle that he has applied to the penitentiaries with regard to convict labour.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that my hon. friend is like Mr. Dick in David Copperfield, who saw the head of Charles the First in everything. Whatever it is, the management of the Mounted Police or of the penitentiaries, the National Policy and Free Trade must come in. The hon. gentleman says there are only 400 horses to 500 men. He must know that there must always be a garrison at the different stations. There is no necessity for keeping too many horses. Then, a great deal of the service is better done by the use of the buckboard. Besides, there is the railway to carry the men from one point to another. The hon. gentleman says we should employ the horses and policemen in carrying their own hay. Being a police force, the men must be always ready to be sent off at a moment's notice in case of disturbance, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that the police are very much harassed, and that additional work has been thrown upon them by the additional number of whites in the country, as well as the Indians, and it would be bad economy to scatter the men. As a police force, we want them to be always at their post. The cost of hay is very large now, but it will be less very shortly; and then I hope the hon. gentleman will let the head of Charles the First and Free Trade rest in peace.

Mr. MILLS. It was the hon. gentleman who introduced the King's head into this discussion, not I. The hon. gentleman said that the sale of this hay to the police gave the people of the North-West a market, and I pointed out the extraordinary character of the economic views which the hon. gentleman has put forward on this as on every other occasion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be quite proper to keep the police ready, and that a certain number should be at headquarters; but the point that I made, and that my hon. friend from West Durham made, does bear on the question. The great expense in our time was the forage of horses. We had to pay an enormous sum for oats. Now, it appears that the actual number of horses has only increased by 70, and that puts in still stronger light the statement I made that the relative expenses are almost identical, in spite of the better means of transport afforded by the railway than existed in our time, and, consequently,

the charges of extravagance made against us were utterly unwarranted and unfounded; and the hon. gentleman now in his own experience sees that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What supply of artillery have the force got?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two 9-pounders and four 7-pounders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not that a very small brigade of artillery? I think in the early times it was considered by all parties that the very sight of a few pieces of artillery had a considerable effect on the minds of the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so. The Indians pay a great deal of respect to a cannon, and think there is a mysterious influence about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think there were some steel guns sent up at the very first.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 9-pounders, I think, are steel.

Mr. MILLS. They were sent to Rat Portage, were they not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; you do not catch rats with a cannon.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We have had some caught in traps in this neighbourhood.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not all; some of the little ones.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say the police force do not use waggons themselves for transport purposes at all?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For drawing ammunition not for drawing hay by contract.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are supplied with waggons?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Were they also bought in California?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; in Markham, East York, the county of my hon. friend.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They cost me something, I believe; my impression is that the hon. Minister gave the order at a very critical period during the election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A pure mind would never suggest such a thing. I gave no order for waggons.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest the propriety of purchasing a few small mountain howitzers which could in case of emergency be carried on the backs of mules. I recollect an instance of the effect of this weapon in dispersing Indians in the United States. A small party of troops transporting mountain howitzers, on going though a pass in the mountains, were unexpectedly attacked by Indians; the emergency was great, they had not time to dismount the howitzers but pointed them and fired from the mules, creating great consternation among the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And among the mules.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Indians, on being asked, afterwards, why they fled so precipitously, said they were accustomed to all kinds of arms but never had mules fired at them before.

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS.

Mail Subsidies.

125. Steam communication on Lakes Huron and Superior $12,000 00

Mr. CARLING. This is the same vote as last year, no increase.

126. Steam service between the United States and Victoria, British Columbia $17,640 00

Mr. CHARLTON. How many steamers are employed in the service?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say the number of vessels; we have a contract until 1885 for carrying the mails between San Francisco and Victoria.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) This contract has been running about six years. There are three steamers, at least, performing said service, and in winter run not less than three times a month, although the "Terms of Union" only call for a fortnightly service—formerly the sum of $54 was paid for the same kind of service; during the summer months they run every six days or so without increased subsidy at present.

127. Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands $7,800 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is more than used to be voted.

Mr. CARLING. I think it is a fortnightly service.

128. Steam communication between Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland $4,000 00

Mr. BURPEE. How is this service done?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. By an international boat, and by a boat from St. Stephen's and St. Andrew's. That arrangement expires this year, and new arrangements will be carried out, by which we will have a more satisfactory boat.

Steamship Subventions.

129. Steam communication between Halifax and St. John *viâ* Yarmouth $10,000 00

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Under what arrangement is this?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The same arrangements which have been in existence for three or four years; it is an annual arrangement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Has the Government tenders from any other lines to perform that work? What is the reason it is given year after year to the same line?

Sir LEONADD TILLEY. I am not aware of any new offer being made, as far as my Department is concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are tenders advertised for?

Mr. CARLING. No, I think not.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no arrangement made for next year at all, and the arrangement is made yearly with the same line. The International line receives $4,000 for the connection between Yarmouth and St. John, and then for the connection between Halifax and Yarmouth, $6,000 a year are paid. That has been running for a number of years.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). What I want to ascertain is whether the Government have received tenders from any other company to do the business between Halifax and Yarmouth. For some years past the Fishwick Steamship Company have performed that work, receiving $6,000, and $1,000 has been given to the Nova Scotia Steamship Company between Yarmouth and St. John. I am informed that the latter have offered to run other boats between Yarmouth and Halifax and to give better communication on the south shore. I want to know if the Government have received these offers, and if so whether they have considered them, and whether they have decided to give the $6,000 to the Fishwick Company again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No such proposals have reached the Post Office Department or the Finance Department, as far as we know. I will enquire of the Secretary of State, as they may have been sent there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the intention of the Government to advertise for tenders for the performance of this work?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is difficult. There are very few boats. Perhaps the arrangement could not be made as economically, but I will note the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). The Local Government have advertised for tenders over the same route, and the subsidy has been paid by them, up to last year, to the same line, but a great deal of dissatisfaction is felt with that line along that shore, and I am informed that strong influence is being brought to bear on the Government—strong influence in the city of Halifax—to induce them to continue the grant to the same Company. I think the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) will bear me out in the statement that there is dissatisfaction on the south shore with that line. I think it would be well, as the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has suggested, if tenders were asked for, and I believe the people generally would receive better satisfaction. I know the Nova Scotia Steamship Company, if the Government give them the opportunity, are prepared to put on a better class of boats, drawing less water, which would serve the south shore better than the work is now being performed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What time in the year does that contract expire? As I understand from the Postmaster General, the contract is from year to year.

Mr. CARLING. At the close of navigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do these run all the year?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that every spring the arrangement is made, and they carry the mail until the close of the season.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But there is no reason to close. The sea is open all the winter.

Mr. CARLING. But the arrangement is made every spring.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is made, I suppose, for a year, or from some date in the year to some other date. The close of the season, according to our ideas, would be somewhere in November or December.

Mr. CARLING. I understand it is made in the spring of the year until the next spring.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has it been made for the ensuing year?

Mr. CARLING. No, it has not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the Minister could get tenders if he pleased.

Mr. CARLING. I suppose so, but I understand there is only one line of boats.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend beside me says there are other lines.

Mr. CARLING. I am sure the Department would be glad to receive an offer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, if it be really as my hon. friend was saying, the fact that the public are indifferently served by this line, the Department should ask for tenders and see what offers would come.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Do I understand the Postmaster General to say that no agreement now exists with any steamship line, and that they will receive tenders for the service for the present year.

Mr. CARLING. There is no arrangement for the coming year. It will be looked into, and if it can be done it will be done.

120. To provide for one year's subsidy, to be granted at the rate of $50,000 per annum, to line of Steamers to trade between Canada and the West Indies and Brazil, provided a like amount be paid by the Brazilian Government.....$50,000 00

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Was that spent last year? Was there any service done?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, some services have been rendered, but there has been no money paid. Mr. Bentley proposed to perform the service by means of a Company, under a vote for Brazil of $50,000, and there was a vote also for a line between France and Canada. The original arrangement with Brazil expired, the Company broke down, and the whole thing fell through. Mr. Bentley came to the Government a year ago, and proposed that, if we would give to a Company he was about organizing $25,000 for a monthly trip from France to Canada, added to the $50,000 for the service to Brazil, he would organize the Company and perform the service for the $75,000. The Government received favourably the proposition, but declined to enter into a contract until he could give all the information as to the character of the steamers, their size and speed, and everything connected with it. In July or August, he came to Canada after having been in negotiation with some German house, I think it was, and the German house agreed, pending a contract with the Government of Canada, to send out three steamers, as they did send them in the autumn, to Canada, and send them on to Brazil, but with the understanding that they were not to receive any pay unless a contract was entered into by Mr. Bentley with the Government this spring, in which case they would receive compensation for these three trips that were made. If a contract was not made this spring for the service, then he and the Company arranged that they were not to receive anything. Mr. Bentley did not succeed finally, although the steamers came out and made the three trips. He is now in England and I had a communication with him; having other communications as to the service between France and Canada, I cabled him to say other proposals were in, and not to make any arrangements, because he might make them and then say we had not treated him fairly. He cabled me in return that the proposals were on the way out for the performance of this work, and there are some alterations suggested in the original contract. For instance, they were required to have provision for forty cabin passengers to Brazil. It is proposed in the new arrangement, as I understand, that that is to be reduced to twenty-five. Then there are two ports in Brazil that the Brazilian Government required they should visit. They were not of any importance to Canada, and Mr. Bentley was negotiating with the Brazilian Government to have those two struck out, because they were expensive to enter, and very little business could be done there. His proposition to us was that we should accede to these concessions if the Brazilian Government agreed to them. There is no contract entered into; we are under no engagement to him whatever, and, though I do not know the exact nature of the proposition that is now on its way out, the original proposition was for a monthly trip between France and Canada, the steamer going on to Brazil, for which he was to receive $75,000. We take this vote because it may drop through with him as far as the arrangement with France is concerned, and we would be open to enter into any other arrangements.

Mr. MILLS. What advantages does the hon. gentleman expect the country is to gain by this arrangement, supposing it is accepted?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The advantage is that, while the trade with Brazil, when that contract was in existence, was not as great as we expected, still, like every new enterprise of the kind, it requires some time to establish it, and this proposition with reference to a steamer between France and Canada will be of great advantage to us. For instance last autumn, goods sent by that steamer were entered at a lower rate of duty than they would have been, if they had passed through England or any port in England. So we have a direct and an indirect advantage from the establishment of a direct line of steamers between France and Canada. With reference to Brazil, the Government consider it of sufficient importance to continue that vote because, though there has not been so large a trade as was expected, the imports have been very considerable during the last two years from Brazil, large quantities of sugar and of coffee have been imported, and our exports have increased; and, though it has not quite realized our expectations, we do not consider it desirable to drop the vote in case such arrangements could be made.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was any additional subsidy granted by the Brazilian Government to this Company?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, they had appropriated $50,000 a year, the same as we did.

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS. I understood the hon. Minister of Finance was to give some explanation about this vote as to what purposes are supposed to be achieved by it. I think the hon. gentleman knows that his distinguished predecessor in office, Sir Francis Hincks, has over and over again pointed out the inutility of this bonus. He has pointed out that our relations with Brazil were such that an extensive trade could never grow up between the two countries. I think he has established that fact pretty conclusively, and it seems to me that the Minister of Finance, in asking a continuance of this vote, is bound to show some of the advantages that he expects to gain by it—in fact he is bound to show that he is appropriating money in the public interest. I do not think he has done that; and I am certain that the Trade and Navigation Returns, during the short period in which this appropriation has been made, shows that if the trade in the future is to be at all like what it has been in the past, there is nothing to warrant this appropriation.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have only had in the past year a very partial service. During the past year there has been only three trips, and nothing has been paid. The Trade Returns, therefore, cannot be expected to show the results, as the work has not been performed, and the Government were not called upon to pay for the service. However, the trade has been increased by the vessels that have made these trips, and though it is not as large as we desired, still it is perhaps as large as we could expect; if the original contract had been carried out according to agreement and had been continued for five years, I think it is very probable the results would have been such as to justify the payment for five years. But they did not perform the service for the five years, and but a small portion of the money appropriated has been paid. If the service has been running regularly once a month and continued over two or three years we might have such results as would be satisfactory. The Government think that if the service was continued regularly once a month, and the public understood it, and could depend upon shipping by one of the steamers, then we would have a larger amount of business, no doubt; but with the limited sum we paid and the limited service performed we could not expect any great result.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. VAIL. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say, that the intended $75,000 of this money is for a line from France to Halifax and thence to Brazil?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a vote for the current year of $50,000 for a line to France as well. The arrangement was made, but it was not carried out last year. We did not think we could give $75,000 for the two services, that is, once a month from France; because this vote is $50,000 for once a fortnight—once a month from France and once a month from Brazil; that is, half of the $50,000 for Brazil and half the amount for France.

Mr. VAIL. An offer was made by Mr. Senecal, and a paper was laid on the Table a short time ago, which outlined a route, and I think he proposed applying for a subsidy. I would like to ask whether this is to come in with his proposed arrangement?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is before the Government at the present time. When that proposition was made, thinking it was just possible that Mr. Bentley might enter into some arrangement, we cabled him to say that another offer was before the Government, and not to make any arrangement without communicating with us. Mr. Senecal's proposition is now before the Government.

Mr. MILLS. Then if that offer is accepted, I suppose that this $75,000 will all go to that gentleman—giving effect to this arrangement.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, Mr. Senecal's proposition has nothing to do with the proposal; it is a separate and distinct proposal between France and Canada, and it stands upon its merits in this appropriation.

131. For subsidy to line of steamers to run fortnightly between France and Quebec, provided the French Government appropriates a sum equal to the amount contributed by the Dominion of Canada for the same service..... $50,000

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The French Government gives a bounty to their vessels, and the calculation has been made in the communication of Mr. Senecal, and it is correct, that the bounty that would be given to the French vessel to sail between Canada and France would be practically about $75,000 in lieu of $50,000. For the $50,000 we would give, they would receive in bounty under their law, about $75,000, and that would be accepted as equivalent to a direct vote of $50,000.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is evident from the explanations the hon. the Finance Minister made this afternoon on the preceding item, that the contract Mr. Bentley has undertaken——

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. He has no contract.

Mr. DESJARDINS. To run a line between Brazil, Canada, and France had not worked satisfactorily, and that three distinct trips only have resulted from the two votes we have passed since 1881. I think, therefore, that the idea of combining the two lines ought to be abandoned, and that a direct line from Canada to Brazil, and from Canada to France, ought to be established with more regular and more frequent communication. It is evident that with communication only once a month, it is impossible to create such a current of trade as would make such a line a success. I know personally, that, in 1881, several offers were made to the Government by influential capitalists in France, who were ready to invest a large capital in the establishment of a line of steamers to perform a fortnightly service. The only point in regard to which those gentlemen could not agree with the Canadian Government was this, that while they were ready to undertake the establishment of such a line on receiving a guarantee of a subsidy for ten years, the Canadian Government refused to guarantee a subsidy of $50,000 for more than three years, and therefore the nego-

tiations failed. That fact is to be regretted, because those gentlemen from their position and influence occupied a strong position in France, and we could have obtained from them all necessary guarantees for the successful accomplishment of their object. But that has failed, and we are, I understand, now face to face with another offer, if I can judge from the memorandum which has been distributed, and I do not know to what extent the Government will be ready to meet the demands of the new Company. But one thing I am aware of and it is this, that the Government should meet French capitalists liberally who wish to invest their capital in the establishment of a regular line of steamers, and guarantee them a subsidy for at least ten years; and by this means we will succeed in obtaining a line of steamers which will accomplish the object we have in view, namely, the establishment of direct trade with France. We know that the economic conditions of France have become quite changed, and we have as much chance to successfully export large quantities of our goods to the French market as we have to any other country. So that I think this question is a very important one, and I hope the Government will succeed this time in carrying out the object we have had in view in voting every year a subsidy of $50,000, which unhappily we have so far been unable to apply.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I object to any term so long as ten years. The contracts given to the Allan Line have never exceeded five years. Is not the bounty referred to confined to French bottoms?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the bounty could only be obtained by the vessels being built in France.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If they were built here and sold to France a sum would be obtained, but a smaller one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. About one-third.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Besides the bounty given on ships built in France, there is another bounty granted to ships running under the French flag. For instance: If there were four steamers of 2,500 tons each, the bounty of construction would be $128,000, while the bounty for navigation would, supposing there was a fortnightly service, reach $101,000 or 505,000 francs besides.

132	For subsidy to a line of steamers to run between Liverpool or London, or both, and of St. John, and Halifax, N.S., a port in the Dominion to be the terminal port	$25,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Under this arrangement, the steamers have made six trips; they may make three more during the year. There are two proposals before the Government at the present time for the performance of this service, monthly or fifteen trips in the year. These proposals are now under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. How much of last year's vote has been paid?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Only three trips have been paid for, but five or six have been performed altogether.

Mr. WELDON. What steamers have done the work?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The *Juliet* was one. The Furness Line proposes to make fifteen trips, making either St. John or Halifax the terminal port in the Dominion. We refuse to give any money useless the terminal port is in the Dominion.

133	Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton and Gaspé, and intermediate ports	$12,500 00
134	For steam communication from port Mulgrave, at the terminus of the Eastern Extension Railway, to East Bay, Cape Breton	6,000 00
135	For steam communication between Cape Canso and Port Hood, daily, touching at railway terminus, Port Mulgrave, and such other places within above limits as may be agreed upon	3,000 00
136	For steam communication between Halifax and St. Pierre	2,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. What steamer performs the service?

Mr. DALY. The *George Shattuck*. A new steamer is being built.

137	To provide for a subsidy of $1,000 a voyage, for five voyages, of steamers from Prince Edward Island to Great Britain or continental ports	$7,500 00
138	For steam communication from Halifax to Murray Harbor and Charlottatown alternately	3,000 00
139	For steam communication between Canada and Antwerp	24,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is an arrangement made with a line of steamers to sail between Antwerp and Canada, once a month, $2,000 for the round trip. The Company made five or six trips last summer. The object of granting the money is to encourage, if possible, German immigration. We provide that the vessels shall be of certain size, and speed, and have accommodation for steerage passengers. The next vote, $24,000, is for steam communication between Canada and Germany, to carry out a similar arrangement made with a company to run a vessel monthly, either from Bremen or Hamburgh. The arrangement made with respect to the Hamburg service is, that they shall perform not less than ten trips during the year. One of the steamers was lost on the way out, having some passengers on board That is the arrangement made with these two companies

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the port in Canada?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Montreal in summer and Halifax in winter.

140	For steam communication between Canada and Germany	24,000 00
141	For steam communication between Port Mulgrave railway terminus and Cheticamp, touching semi-weekly at Port Hood, Mabou, Broad Cove, Mayane and Cheticamp, the Local Government having granted a similar amount, conditionally on a Dominion vote for the same service	2,000 00

MISCELLANEOUS.

172	Canada Gazette	4,500 00
173	Miscellaneous printing	12,000 00
174	Unforeseen expenses, expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council, and a detailed statement to be laid before Parliament during the first fifteen days of next Session	50,000 00
175	Commutation in lieu of remission of duties on articles imported for the use of the Army and Navy	3,000 00
176	For the expenses of Government in the North-West Territories, including printing, roads, bridges, ferries, and aid to schools	32,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. What ferries have been established?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I could hardly say, but this is for ferry purposes generally.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A speculative sum?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To a certain extent. The increase is $5,000 for the establishment of additional schools. There are ten Protestant and nine Roman Catholic schools, and the teachers' salaries are paid out of this vote. It is improbable that this sum will be sufficient, and a further amount may be asked in the Supplementary Estimates. The

remainder of the vote is for roads, bridges, school houses, and for mail service, which is largely increasing in the Territories. Part of it is also for the conveyance of lunatics to the Manitoba Penitentiary.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are no schools aided except those in connection with the denominational missions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not at all. The schools there are generally denominational Indian schools. The Indians are happily under the rule of either some Protestant or Catholic clergyman, who are the best guardians and teachers of these people.

177 For the expense of Government in the District of Keewatin $5,000 00

Mr. MILLS. Where is this money expended? I believe all the old-settled portion of Keewatin is now included either absolutely or conventionally within either the Province of Manitoba or the Province of Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Part of it is intended to cover the conveyance of lunatics from the districts to the Manitoba Penitentiary; and among other items is the payment of the Lieutenant-Governor's Private Secretary.

Mr. MILLS. The Icelandic settlement is now included in the Province of Manitoba, and the settlements in the neighbourhood of the Lake of the Woods are included either in that Province or the Province of Ontario, so that the settled portion of the district is now included in either one or the other of these two Provinces. The Council itself is no longer in existence and can have no expense. It is perfectly obvious that the hon. gentleman has not considered the changes that have taken place, because this appropriation is really unnecessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that six years have elapsed since 1878, and I dare say a good many people have gone in there since.

Mr. MILLS. Where?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say in what particular part.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, because he will find that there is no settled portion in the district, except in parts included in either Manitoba or Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure the present Lieutenant-Governor of Keewatin would not expend the money unless he wanted it.

Mr. MILLS. That is not at all the question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, we will look at the Report of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. MILLS. It is perfectly clear that there is no district of Keewaydin for which to make provision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Has the hon. gentlemen ever looked at the map?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I have looked at the map, and it is a district around the North Pole.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must correct the hon. gentlemen's geography; the North Pole is not in Keewaydin.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say it was; but there is as much propriety in providing for the one as for the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. MILLS. No; I think this is a monstrous proposition, if the hon. gentleman will persist in providing for the Government of a district which contains no people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. According to last year's accounts, the vote was mostly spent for the maintenance of lunatics.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the hon. gentleman knows that all the lunatics found in the Keewaydin or the North-West are sent to the Manitoba Penitentiary and, of course, we cannot throw the expense of keeping them upon the Government of Manitoba. They receive them and take care of them, and we pay for their care. We know that there is a certain percentage of lunatics to the population, and if it required $5,000 to take care of lunatics last year, there must have been a considerable population to draw them from.

Mr. MILLS. There is an unsettled district lying north of Ontario and Manitoba and the North-West Territories in which there is a certain roving Indian population. There was a district marked out, called Keewaydin, which embraced the Icelandic settlements north of Manitoba and the settlement along Rainy River; but the boundary of Manitoba has been extended eastward to the boundary of Ontario, and northward sufficiently to include the Icelandic district; so that there is no district of Keewaydin at present, and there is no more propriety in providing for the Government of that district than there would be for the copper mine on Mackenzie River.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I observe that last year nearly $600 of this amount was paid to some person styled Secretary of the Government of Keewaydin. It is impossible that he could have had any duties to perform.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume he performed the duties of Secretary of the Governor of Manitoba.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is not right, for he is paid otherwise for that. It is impossible that this secretary could have had anything to do. I would ask the hon. gentleman to look into that, at any rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are just two items—$600, which went for the secretary and the rest for the lunatic. The bulk is for the lunatic, and the balance for the secretary.

Mr. DAWSON. This little place, for which the grant is made, is a portion of my constituency, and very active disputes have been going on there for some time past; at least, they were exceedingly active last summer, and I think it right that the Government of the Dominion should continue to maintain order there until those disputes are settled.

178 To meet expenditure to be required to put into force the Act respecting the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors 5,000 00

179 To meet expenses connected with Consolidated Statutes. The authority required by 45 Victoria, Chapter 4, Section 49, is hereby given for paying out of this vote such sums as the Governor in Council, shall allow to Mr. Burbidge, as one of the Commissioners, and to Mr. Chamberlain for reading proofs $20,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not this vote largely in access of what is likely to be wanted. I observe that there is a considerable increase, with no apparent necessity for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It must be largely for printing. We hope to have the consolidation all printed for the use of members at the beginning of next Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who has taken Mr. Cockburn's place?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. O'Connor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is he doing this, in addition to preparing those elaborate and voluminous reports for which we paid $8,500? I think the hon. gentleman is taxing him too much. Has he got $8,000 for looking after the boundary, and $3,000 for looking after the Statutes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; he has made two reports on the boundary question, which are now being prepared, and the case will be argued in England this summer.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the beginning of one employment coincident with the end of the other, or was there any interval?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell. One succeeded the other.

Mr. BLAKE. How long was the poor fellow without employment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell without notice.

Mr. MILLS. Will his report be printed for distribution?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It certainly will not. We are not going to print our brief.

180 To compensate members of the North-West Mounted Police for injuries received in the discharge of duty..... $2,000 00
181 For erection of Mounted Police Barracks... $20,000 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is necessary to build the new barracks at Fort MacLeod, Maple Creek and Medicine Hat.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was expended besides for Fort MacLeod, $45,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is to finish the erection of the three. At Fort MacLeod, in consequence of the change in the river course the old barracks were falling into the river, and new barracks are being erected in a more suitable place. In their vicinity, there will be lands sold at a very considerable profit, which will recoup for this expenditure.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not if you sell to middlemen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The middlemen pay very well.

182 On account of expenditure in connection with surveys of Lakes Superior and Huron $10,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. This is to make a survey of Georgian Bay, which was decided on last year. Commander Boulton, who is conducting the survey, commenced operations in the autumn, and during the coming season will make a chart of the whole Bay, showing where the shoals and rocks are. He has one assistant, a gold medalist of Kingston College, a young gentleman whom he was anxious to obtain, and he will have several men with him besides the crew.

Mr. DAVIES. Has the assistant any experience in coast surveying.

Mr. McLELAN. No; he has no experience, but will soon acquire that.

Mr. DAVIES. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of what the survey will cost?

Mr. McLELAN. $10,000 will cover the expenses this year, and in the course of the year we will be able to see what time it will take to complete the service, and what it will cost. Of the $6,000 voted last year, a considerable portion went to purchase the instruments.

Mr. DAVIES. Has Captain Boulton made any report giving any idea of the probable length of time it will take to make this survey?

Mr. McLELAN. He said he supposed it would take two or three years. This year he takes one assistant, and after the year he will take others if necessary.

Mr. DAVIES. A large grant will be required each subsequent year?

Mr. McLELAN. No; because a considerable portion expended in the purchase of instruments will not be required another year.

Mr. DAVIES. From all the information I can gather from the officers in charge of the survey of the coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the hon. gentleman will find it will be cheaper in the long run to have a much larger staff. With one assistant, Captain Boulton will take nearer twenty years than three to do the work, if it is done with the same care as the survey of the Gulf coast.

Mr. McLELAN. We have given him all that he asked for, and will give him all the assistance he requires.

Mr. DAWSON. With regard to these surveys in the great lakes, they are absolutely necessary, as the shipping on the Canadian side of these lakes is increasing very fast. The Americans have had a very careful hydrographical survey made of their side of the lake, all the shoals and rocks being marked out most carefully; while on our side we have nothing but Capt. Bayfield's charts, which are perfectly wonderful, considering the time they were made, and the information he was able to obtain; and since his day, a good many shoals and rocks have been discovered, on which vessels have been wrecked, exceeding in value, to a large amount, what the survey will cost from first to last. These surveys are absolutely necessary, and I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has at last taken the matter in hand.

Mr. DAVIES. I was raising no objection to the vote.

183 Niagara Falls Commission—Revote..... $683 65

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is anything likely to be done on ours or the American side, or has the thing practically lapsed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it has not; the State of New York has taken it up and has made an appropriation for an American park, paid for and maintained by the State of New York. It failed last year, and the year before the vote failed from some political reason or other, but they have changed their mind, and the vote has been granted in New York. So I presume we will have to take up the question, and do our part on this side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know how large that park was to be, how many miles of the Niagara River frontage it would have?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I do not. I read the account with some interest in the New York papers some time ago, but I cannot speak with any recollection of the area, but I believe it is to be very extensive; and they are going to hide or obscure in some way all the buildings on the American side, by some mode of planting the bank with the same species of timber that was supposed to be found there when Father Hennepin first discovered the Falls.

184 To provide for the payment of Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies of his office..... $2,500 00

Mr. LAURIER. I understood, some time ago, that Mr. Fabre was not to be continued in office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He was appointed for three years. The arrangement made with him was for three years, and now, I think, two years have passed away.

Mr. LAURIER. Am I in error, or was not the statement made some time ago, that he was not to be continued any more?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. LAURIER. I thought so

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was not to be renewed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The answer was that the arrangement was for three years, that two years had elapsed now, and that next year was the last year.

Mr. LAURIER. The impression conveyed, I think, was that he was not to be continued any longer. Has Mr. Fabre made any report?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where is it? Is it in print?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report has been sent to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the use of its lying there, unless members of Parliament have an opportunity of seeing it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It has not been asked for.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Government ought to send it to Parliament. It is not fair or reasonable to ask us to continue a vote of that kind without having the report before us. My hon. friend should not shelter himself behind the statement that there was no request. There was a request; I requested it myself when there was some conversation upon it last year. It was asked and promised. I do not think it is treating Parliament fairly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the reports made up to that time were made known to the House, but the reports since have not been brought down, I suppose because there was no notice given; but, of course, if the hon. gentleman wishes these reports, I have no doubt it would be easy to bring them down.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the report is in proportion to the work done, it would be very easily read and very easily brought down. It might be brought down to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not always the longest reports which are the most effective or the best.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not the length of the report that I refer to, but the paucity of the results.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow the reports to be brought down and read before he passes an opinion upon that subject.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the reports be brought down before Concurrence?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know. We will bring them down.

Mr. MILLS. Is it a fact that during the two years, Mr. Fabre has succeeded in inducing one emigrant to come to Canada?

Mr. BLAKE. I think there was one mentioned.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentlemen are asking what has been the result of the mission of Mr. Fabre to Paris. The hon. gentlemen have been asking whether there are any reports, and it is the first time the demand has been made for those reports. Mr. Fabre was appointed, as has been already explained here, as Agent for the Province of Quebec in Paris. The Government of Canada took advantage of this appointment having been made by the Government of Quebec, and thought that they could avail themselves of his services in the interests of the Government of Canada. There is a great misapprehension about the utility of having a representative, either official or unofficial, on the continent for the Government of Canada. I heard the hon. gentleman who has just sat down asking whether it was true that one emigrant, during the course of two years, had been brought from France to Canada, and had been induced to come by the Agent of the Province of Quebec, acting, in a certain measure for the Government of Canada in Paris. The hon. gentleman, if he wants to be informed, will learn that there are at the present moment in the Province of Quebec gentlemen of means, who came from France, and who have already acquired property to a large extent; that a number of people have not only been applying, but have left the continent to come to Canada under the advice and with the information supplied by Mr. Fabre. Mr. Fabre is not a Commissioner of Canada; he is not clothed with the authority that might put him in a position to do still better work or more useful work than has been done; but I, for one, can bear witness to the number of people obtaining information at Paris, at the office there of the Province of Quebec, and from the gentleman who is representing the interests of the Government of Canada. Mr. Fabre is under direction of the High Commissioner in London. On the continent it is not only French emigration which requires information; there is a large emigration from Switzerland, from Germany, from all parts of the continent, passing through Paris to take passage for America. Out of 94,000 emigrants that left the harbour of Havre in the four years, between 1878 and 1882, only 12,000, I think, came from France, and the others passed through Paris going to Havre and thence to America. I must say that, owing to the deficiency of a direct line of steamers from France to Canada—and it is to be regretted that the efforts which have been made since 1880 have not proved fruitful to the present moment—emigration from the continent of Europe to Canada has not been as large as it could be. This, I hope in the future, will be remedied, because I hope that such a line of steamers will be established. I hope that the Government of Canada will find their way of meeting the efforts of those who have been working and trying to have such a line of steamers, so that their efforts may be crowned with success. There has already been great progress in sending emigrants, and especially in directing trade from the continent to Canada. The Trade and Commerce Reports show to what extent trade has increased between Canada and France during the last three or four years. As I said before, the result has not been very great, but, Mr. Chairman, with this small appropriation of $2,000 and another appropriation of $500 for expenses, this Parliament must not expect great results from the agency in Paris. Emigrants from Italy, passing through France and asking for information, are directed to Liverpool by the Agent in Paris. They cannot be sent directly, and nobody need be surprised that before they reach Liverpool a large portion of them should come under the influence of the numerous agents of the various lines of steamers running to Boston and New York. I think, therefore, instead of grudging this small amount, the Parliament of Canada ought in future to increase the appropriation made for the agency in Paris, and that our representative there might be vested with some authority from the Government of Canada. Is it not reasonable to expect that a large and profitable trade could be established between Canada and a nation of 37,000,000 of people, especially when it is remembered that a large portion of the people of Canada are one in language, religion and national affinities with the people of France. I think that the appropriation made for Mr. Fabre, in Paris, small as it is, has produced good results; and I think that when better trade relations are established between the two countries, this agency will produce more fruitful results even than it has done yet. Only a week ago a young gentleman, possessing large means and representing French capitalists, was directed to Canada by the Paris agency, and has gone to Manitoba to make investments in farming lands. Statistics might be furnished showing the extent of our trade relations with France, and if the reports of Mr. Fabre are not before the House it is the fault of those who did not wish to ask for such information. I have not heard any one yet asking for such information, but I am sure my hon. friend, whom I saw smiling a moment ago, when

I was speaking about the Paris agency, will be much interested in reading the information contained in those reports.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. Fabre is under charge of the High Commissioner, and of the Department of Agriculture in respect of the emigration work in Paris. It seems under these circumstances, we might have expected that the report of the Minister of Agriculture would have contained the report of this officer, but I do not perceive that it does contain any report from Mr. Fabre. The hon. gentleman has started a theory which may be applicable to the proceedings of the Legislature of which he has been more familiar during his political life, but which is certainly novel to this Chamber, namely, that if public information obtained by public officers and for which the public pays is not communicated to the public, it is the fault, not of those who have gathered the information, not of those who are responsible for the official being employed, not of those who are responsible for his seeing that his reports are sent in, but of somebody or other who has not asked for them. We ought not to have had any reports of Immigration Agents because we did not ask for them! The proposition is, with respect to the hon. gentleman, preposterous. I say it is the duty of the Government which asks Parliament to vote this money to produce the reports which are in the archives of the Government, so that we may consider them and thereby be enabled intelligently to act upon them. Now, then, not merely is there no report from Mr. Fabre directly, but there does not appear to have been any communication notified to the public between him and the High Commissioner. The High Commissioner makes report upon the general subject of emigration, which is brought down to the Minister of Agriculture; and he also makes report on continental emigration in which he says:

"Sir, I have much pleasure in sending you the following report respecting my recent visit to Holland, Germany and France, in connection with the important subject of continental emigration."

And he narrates that he left London on the evening of the 20th with Mr. Dyke, the Agent; arriving at Rotterdam he called on the agent of the Allan Line; at Amsterdam he called on the agents of the line of steamers running to New York. He also visited the Amsterdam exhibition. At Frankfort-on-the-Maine he learned some information about Manitoba. At Berlin he received the hearty co-operation of Sir John Walsham, Secretary of the Embassy. Dr. Otto Hahn, Agent of the Department of Agriculture, met him at Basle. Mr. Hanswirth, Mayor of the Canton of Berne, met him at Basle. He also found that the Cunard agents and other steamship agents at Basle booked emigrants to Manitoba; and he adds his conclusions as to the mode of obtaining a fair share of German emigration. But I have not been able, in my cursory perusal of the remarks of the hon. gentleman on the subject of continental emigration, which he says is a report of his visit to Holland, Germany and France, to find any account of his visit to the latter country, or of his operations in that country; nor have I been able to find that Mr. Fabre had ever communicated important public documents at all. I do not understand, therefore, how it is that so much good has been done and we have never heard of it. I do not see why this rose has been suffered to blush unseen up to this late hour of the Parliamentary season. I am quite sure if it was the fact that so much had been done, as the hon. gentleman supposes has been done, we should have had the reports long before this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I must plead guilty to an important omission in the Report to which the hon. gentleman has just referred. I certainly did have communication with Mr. Fabre in Paris, and I have no hesitation in saying that, although he has been regarded there principally as an officer of the Government of Quebec, yet I think this Government were quite warranted in giving him the very small sum contained in the annual appropriation for services rendered to the Dominion. I had an opportunity of seeing that gentleman on more than one occasion, and I found him very warmly devoted to the interests of this country. I found the tables of his office strewn with Canadian literature, and I am aware that it is the constant resort of all Canadians visiting Paris, as the office I occupy in London is the resort of Canadians who visit the British metropolis. There are very few Canadians who go on the continent and visit Paris who do not find their way to Mr. Fabre's office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I know one who does not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says he knows one who does not. I am quite certain if he had done so, he would have met with a very cordial reception as every Canadian meets with who visits that gentleman's office and asks advice and assistance. I have great pleasure in bearing my testimony not only to the zeal and devotion which Mr. Fabre evinces in the public service of Canada, but I have no hesitation in saying from personal knowledge that that gentleman has succeeded in gaining the confidence and esteem of gentlemen of great influence in Paris and France. I had the pleasure of meeting, at Mr. Fabre's house, gentlemen of the highest position in both branches of the Parliament of France; and it is within my own personal knowledge that Mr. Fabre loses no opportunity of turning to advantage the acquaintances he has been enabled to form and the confidences he has established, to inspire in the minds of men who influence public opinion to as large an extent as any persons in France do influence public opinion, a desire to promote the interests of Canada. I happen to know that in one of the leading organs of public opinion, edited by a distinguished member of the French Senate, Mr. Fabre has again and again had an opportunity of inspiring that journal, through his acquaintance with that Senator, with sentiments and opinions in regard to the trade and commerce and the general interests of the country, of very great value. I did not consider it necessary to take part in this discussion; but after the references made by the hon. member for West Durham, I could not do less than bear my humble testimony, and my very sincere testimony, to the conscientious and zealous efforts which Mr. Fabre is making to promote the interests of this country and the very considerable success which is attending them. The table of his office is covered with Canadian literature which he places in the hands of parties visiting his office, either residing in France, or, as the Secretary of State observed, foreigners who come to this country through France and obtain from Mr. Fabre further information with regard to the Dominion. I believe that this insignificant sum, so far from being thrown away, has been wisely appropriated, and its appropriation has been attended with very beneficial results.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman who has borne testimony to Mr. Fabre's efforts, state whether he has received any report from that gentleman or not?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will answer the question as Mr. Fabre's reports are made to my Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not asking the hon. gentleman; I am asking the Minister of Railways or the supposed High Commissioner, as it is to him that Mr. Fabre's reports will have to be made. I am asking the responsible adviser of the Government; I called him Minister of Railways, for I sometimes mistake one for the other, but I mean the Lord High Commissioner.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I thank the hon. gentleman for his kindness to me. I was willing to give him information which he did not possess. Mr. Fabre, by an Order

in Council is instructed to send his reports to the Department of the Secretary of State. His correspondence generally takes place with the High Commissioner. His position, I must say, is a very peculiar one in this way: having once sent a report to the Minister of Agriculture direct, the Secretary of the High Commissioner informed him that he had to correspond direct with the office in London, that he was an officer of that office and that his correspondence would have to pass through it. However, by an Order in Council, as I have mentioned, his reports are sent to the Secretary of State's Department. Hon. gentlemen opposite will probably say that the fault lies with the Secretary of State in not having produced those reports. They were not ready for the report of the Secretary of State during this Session, but they will be laid before the House. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that before Concurrence I intend to bring down statistics of the work done, of the results attained and the results that might be attained if something more were done in that direction by the Immigration Department. I must say, and I express the feeling of many hon. members who have a right to speak on this subject, that Parliament might be more liberal towards Mr. Fabre and give more consideration to the importance of the office.

Mr. LAURIER. It matters very little, in my opinion, as to the officer to whom Mr. Fabre was to report, because I do not think his reports can show anything like substantial progress or substantial results. If Mr. Fabre acts in any capacity in Paris it is as immigration agent. My conviction is that, so far as immigration from France to this country is concerned, the money is lost and at least is a useless expenditure. It is a well-known fact that the French do not emigrate, and that the population of France is decreasing instead of increasing. If that be so, it affords conclusive evidence that all attempts to bring emigrants here must prove unavailing. If the population of France is decreasing, how can it be expected that the French people will leave their own country to go to any other country? France has its own colonies. It has had Algeria for forty years, and what are the results achieved? What are the results of the efforts which have been made in this direction? I confess I cannot see what they are; I cannot see that we have had anything like the immigration from France that we have been led to believe, excepting a few individuals coming out now and again. The hon. Secretary of State stated that several capitalists had come, asking for information with a view to investing in this country. It is true that several well-known French capitalists did come to this country, but if they did do so, they have returned to France.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman's statement, and I do not think he will be complimented by his countrymen in trying to decry the immigration which might be had from that country—immigration of the best possible class, and very desirable for the Province of Quebec in particular. I do not speak of the immigration which members of the late Government, and his friends, once brought into this country, socialists and communists, but I speak of such an immigration as Mr. Fabre is directing to this country, good mechanics, good farmers, and men of some means, immigration of the best possible kind. I am exceedingly surprised at his statements; I will take a note of them, and I am sure somebody else will do——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Hon. gentlemen need not be surprised. My hon. friend has shown himself to be perfectly ignorant of what is passing in other countries, and especially of what is passing just on the other side of the 45th parallel. He says there can be no immigration from France, because the population is decreasing. Well, Sir, this is no sound argument; the population of Ireland is decreasing, and does he say there is no immigration from that country? The hon. gentleman has not been studying the movement of European emigration. He says that there is no immigration from France, because the population is decreasing; but I say that if the population is decreasing, it would prove that somebody is leaving the country. He says that there is no immigration from France, because they can hardly supply their own colonies. Does he not know that there are hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen in the United States? He should know these facts from the returns of immigration of the different Consuls in New York, Baltimore, Chicago, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Los Angelos, and other places. The city of Los Angelos where I spent some time myself, has a population of 22,000, an important portion of which is French; of the eight directors of the Merchants and Farmers' Bank of that city, the leading bank in that district, no less than four of them are Frenchmen, commanding capital to the amount of $700,000 or $800,000. If he wants to see how this immigration movements is progressing, he should read *L'Economiste;* let him read the articles of M. Le Roy Beaulieu on the immigration to Buenos Ayres and the Argentine Republic, and he will see that French immigration is going on there by thousands every year. In Lower California alone there have been no less than 10,000 or 15,000 French emigrants who have settled there within the last twenty years. A gentleman whom my hon. friend knows, I believe, M. de Molinari, has written that, with moderate Government assistance, an exceedingly good and profitable immigration of the most desirable class of people could be had. We have had a small number of immigrants of that class into Canada, and the reason we have not had more is that the means have not been sufficient to bring them here. The Government of the Province of Quebec was not rich enough to pay the expenditure of a large emigration organization abroad, but out of the hundreds of thousands of dollars which is being expended by the Dominion Government, a considerable French immigration might be directed to this country. I tell my hon. friend that he might have known, as I stated before, that over 93,000 emigrants have left France by the one harbour of Havre, within the space of three or four years. Large numbers of immigrants are leaving Gascony, the region near Bordeaux and the Bay of Biscay, every year; the very best class of men, good farmers, hard working men, who would make a splendid population for any country—the Basques, who discovered America long before the discoveries which are known to history. From Normandy from Britany, from the old French Flanders, we would have the best possible agricultural immigration. I have been informed on good authority that if proper means were taken to afford encouragement to that class of emigrants, so as to contend successfully with the work of the different ocean steamship companies who are inducing immigrants to settle in the United States, we would have—if we could secure immigration immediately from the French ports to Canada - we would have a large and valuable immigration. I do not want to do more for them than for desirable immigrants in other parts of the world; I do not want to blame the Government of which I am a member, but I say, that for the small means we have had at the disposal of the gentleman who represents the Dominion of Canada, with regard to emigration in France, good results have been obtained, and that better results may be expected. I say that certainly the small paltry sum of $2,000 should not be grudged to the gentleman who in France occupies, in the esteem of the people, a position of which every French Canadian might be proud. Mr. Fabre is highly connected, not only in the literary world, but in the world of business. He has given information to the Legislature in France and the French Government, as well

as to those directing the best business papers, and those who are working for the establishing of just such companies as we would desire to have. It is said that Frenchmen are not usually considered to be a migrating people, but that statement is hardly reliable, when we consider the fact that they were the discoverers of one-half of the new continent.

Mr. COURSOL. In support of the words which have fallen from the Secretary of State, I beg to read an extract from a letter which was lately received from a gentleman in France. I have translated it, and I shall read it to the House, as I believe it has a bearing on this subject:

"France is greatly in need of an outlet of her surplus energies—for want of an opening, they become stagnant.

"Let the working classes in France once find out that labour is well paid and land cheap in Canada, there will be no difficulty in pursuading them to turn their faces towards the Dominion. This season, a thousand good French emigrants, able to pay their way, with some resources left to resume, in better conditions, the struggle for life, are expected to sail for Canada.

"In the wake of the emigrants, the industries and arts of France will follow, so that the whole country, for the loss of her citizens, will find full compensation in the double movement of the balance of trade to and from Canada.

"The French tradesmen and labourers who go out to Canada, as a rule, are sober, industrious, intelligent and skilful in the exercise of their handicrafts—besides they are thrifty and saving.

"When they leave France, they never go empty handed, but take with them small sums varying from $100 to $1,000.

"In short, the emigration from France is supplied by the most active and enterprising members of the working classes, who might have done well at home, but who had the ambition to better their situation in life.

"The emigration from France, small as it is, can now be discerned as an element of progress in the Dominion.

"The French Canadians will gradually be initiated by them with the newest methods and appliances in all scientific and industrial pursuit, whilst French trade and capital will rapidly follow in the footsteps of the pioneers.

"The present troublous times in France are predisposing families of means to forsake their native land and seek shelter in Canada.

"It is not rare for the owners of ancestral chateaux and estates to apply for pamplets at the Canadian agency of Paris. Some feel themselves oppressed in their religious belief, others in their political servitude; some are ruined by change of Government, others by financial disasters, whilst an influential minority are completely estranged by a form of Government to which they cannot reconcile themselves.

"Last year, six titled noblemen, among whom the Duc de Blacas, and the barons de Véréz and de la Rue, have settled themselves in Canada, and a number of young men of good family have settled both in Quebec and Ontario.

"This spring, about forty farmers from Brittany, with means, are expected to go to Winnipeg."

Now, we expend large amounts of money to promote immigration from England, Ireland and Scotland, and we have agents in the chief cities of every one of those countries. We bring immigrants also from Sweden and Germany, and even from Russia, at a large cost to this Dominion. Now I, for one, complain, and I regret exceedingly, that the Government have not thought it proper to have a sufficient amount put in the Estimates, to be placed at the disposal of the agency in Paris. It is only the paltry sum of $2,500 which is in dispute, a sum less than is paid to every agent and sub-agent employed in England or other parts of Europe. Mr. Fabre is known to perform his duties with much ability; but he has no staff, and no assistance whatever; he is provided with no pamphlets for distribution; in fact, nothing has been done by this Government to promote French immigration to this country. Now, I think it is time that some means should be provided for encouraging that immigration. Pamphlets have been issued at the cost of private individuals; but the Government have provided no possible means for instructing the French people as to the trade of this Dominion, and as to the value of our boundless lands and forests. I hope the day is not far distant when we shall seek immigration from France. There are seaports in France from which the immigrants could be sent to Canada at a trifling cost to the Dominion. We encourage the poorest classes of population to come to our shores from other countries; but there are in France people of means who are ready to come, and who would become good and loyal citizens of the Dominion. We have in the factories in Montreal, men of a high class, who have come from France, and who are a credit to themselves and to the parties which brought them here. Why did they bring them out? Because they had a knowledge of the trade. In the glass factories, and in many other factories, these men are employed. We know the value of their services in France, and that value can be enhanced in this country. I hope this is the last Session when we shall not see a proper amount placed in the Estimates to the credit of the immigration agency in Paris. Whether there may be some difficulties in connection with the British Ambassador that I am not aware of, or whether our agent may not be recognized, is not the question. The main thing is for this Dominion to recognize its agent in France, and to provide him with the means of expounding the knowledge of this country, and then the immigration will come.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Secretary of State said he was surprised, because, as he put it, I had decried France, the land of his and of my ancestors. I do not admit that I decried France, or any other country. I maintain that I only spoke the truth, and I would not hesitate to speak the truth on the floor of this House, even if it should be disparaging to my own country. The first duty of a member of this House is to speak the truth, whether it is pleasant or unpleasant. No one would be more pleased than I if I thought we could harbour the hope of inducing French immigration to come to this country. I am of French origin myself, and it is natural to suppose that it would be most pleasant to me if it were possible for me to induce immigration from the land from which my ancestors came. But we have the fact staring us in the face, that at the present moment the population of France is decreasing—not on account of immigration, but from social causes to which I do not care to allude. Under such circumstances, it is vain to attempt to promote immigration from that country. Until the population of France is brought to the healthy state that it will increase from natural causes, I maintain that it is useless to have an immigration agent in that country. The people will not emigrate. I am informed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the immigration from France to the United States has been, in ten years, 73,000, or an average of 7,000 a year. What has been the immigration from France to this country? Where are the proofs of immigration to be found? Where are the agriculturists, the class that we want? Is there a single agriculturist to be found in the country to-day who has come from France?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. There may be one here and there, but that is all. There have been a few mechanics come to the cities, and I am sorry to say that at one time it was thought better to get rid of those mechanics.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When?

Mr. LAURIER. Six or seven years ago. Since then, we have had no mechanics from France. At all events, that is not the class we want. The class of immigrants we want, above all, are agriculturists, who will settle on our North-West lands, and I am sorry to say I do not think we can get them from France. The hon. gentleman told us that we bring poor immigrants from Ireland. Of course, we shall have immigrants from Ireland; but France is differently situated from Ireland. If the Irish emigrate, it is because of the bad land laws; but in France they have that very peasant system which it is thought would prevent immigration from Ireland. I would be only too happy if I thought that any effort to promote immigration from France would be attended with success; but, judging from past experience, it is not, in my opinion proper to spend a single dollar for that purpose.

Mr. HESSON. The report of the hon. Minister of Agriculture shows that there has been some little improvement in that direction; the statement of the hon. Secretary of State is borne out by the fact that in France some work has been done, whether through Mr. Fabre or other causes I am not prepared to say, but in the Report of Immigration of 1881 the number coming from France was 104, while during the past year it amounted to 306. This shows a very marked increase which, of course, may be accounted for by the fact that Mr. Fabre has been doing some service.

Mr. ROYAL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps proper that I should speak on this question in the language of the gentleman whose services are the subject of this debate. I refer to Mr. Fabre, our Commissioner at Paris. Residing, myself, in the North-West, I have been in a position to witness the results accomplished by our Paris agency. We have had in the North-West—and on this point I will take the liberty of contradicting the hon. member of East Quebec (Mr. Laurier)—we have had in the North-West some three years ago, attempts at colonization, which have partly failed because the Paris agency had not been organized on a proper footing; the want of information which was felt at this Paris agency prevented a great number of persons from joining the tide of emigration which was started in France, but which unfortunately failed subsequently. On the other hand, we have cases of individual colonization; and we have seen important settlements created by five or six persons who have come from France. These persons have brought with them large amounts of capital, and the farms which these individuals have improved are now thriving establishments. Most of these new settlers have come to the North-West, after getting information from Mr. Fabre, at Paris. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the establishment of the Paris agency is the work of the supporters of the hon. member for East Quebec; and if, at a certain period, we have had a certain class of immigration to which the hon Secretary of State has refered a moment ago, an undesirable immigration, which we have been obliged to divert on the American continent, it is due to the friends and supporters of the hon. member for East Quebec. This immigration has ceased, because the Hon. Mr. Fabre has not thought proper to encourage the immigration of socialists. Let the proper means of organization be given to Mr. Fabre, by the opening of a proper office, by establishing at Paris an immigration agency, such as there are in other parts of the European continent, and I am certain that we shall have a large immigration, an immigration which will be important not only as regards the number of immigrants, but also as regards the capital which they will bring with them to the North-West. There is certainly, with all due deference to the opinion of my hon. friend, the member for East Quebec, quite a tide of immigration from France, not from the poor class, but among men having capital and exercising an influence on the people. I am in a position to know this by letters which I have received from people with whom I have been corresponding for the last three years, and quite recently a gentleman from France wrote to me that certain capitalists there, were desirous of investing money in these enterprises. Even now, I am having a correspondence with the Department of the Interior, with a view to obtain a land grant for a French settler now residing in Manitoba, and who is in a position to establish a very extensive ranche. He commands sufficient capital to draw here an immigration which will be beneficial both to him and to the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, wonder is expressed at Mr. Fabre not having, with $2,000 a year, sent here 1,000 or 2,000 immigrants every year. Well, for my part, I am astonished that Mr. Fabre should have done as much as he has done, with the limited resources at his disposal. He is acting semi-officially as immigration agent for Canada; he is at the disposal of those who go through Paris, and he endeavours to direct them here. I think, Mr. Speaker, that instead of judging so severely, and so unfairly I must say, the efforts made by Mr. Fabre, hon. gentlemen opposite, who have themselves established this agency when they were in power, should be the first to ask the Government—that which we are unanimous in asking on this side of the House—that this agency should be put on a proper footing, not only as a matter of form, but also as to the result which should be obtained, and these results we will never get them as long as we curtail the appropriation which we are asked to vote to maintain a sham organization of an agency at Paris. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for East Quebec has, I believe, made a statement which is not exactly true, when he said that the French population was decreasing. I think this is a point on which there are differences of opinion. The population has remained more or less stationary, but it has not decreased. After the great European wars, the population remained stationary for a moment, in consequence of these wars and of the large emigration which went to South America and to other parts of this continent. As to the causes which are pointed out, they do not exist on French territory; and as the hon. Secretary of State has said, if the hon. member for East Quebec only took the trouble to read certain essays on economy which are published in scientific reviews, he would find that instead of decreasing, the French population is increasing. It is not increasing in the same proportion as it was wont to increase; it is not increasing in the same proportion as in the Province of Quebec, but it is certainly increasing in a proportion which is perceptible enough to be noted by those who deal with this branch of political economy. My intention is not to add anything more to my remarks, and I shall conclude by saying that the efforts made by Mr. Fabre have been very fruitful; that if we have in the North-West large and thriving establishments managed by men having capital, energy and intelligence, it is due to the efforts of Mr. Fabre. I am certain that if the agency we have in France was better organized, if it was stronger, the results instead of being individual, would become general, and the hon. members opposite would be the first to praise the Government for having asked the House to vote not only $2,000, but $10,000 or $20,000 for this purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentlemen who have just spoken have taken a view of the case which is not, I believe, borne out by the facts. In the first place, the hon. Secretary of State has advocated, as a wise thing, justified by the results, the present arrangements in Paris. The only fault he finds with it is that it is not an adequate arrangement, that larger arrangements ought to be made, but he says great things have been done under the present arrangement. We have not seen them, but he says they have been done. The policy of the Government, however, of which the hon. gentleman is a member, has been disclosed, and that is to discontinue the arrangement, not to renew the contract with the Hon. Mr. Fabre, which was for a period of three years, and it is therefore plain the arrangement is not a satisfactory one to the Government; it is plain, therefore, that the state of things is not such as they are prepared to continue. Whether they propose to enlarge or to diminish or what, Mr. Fabre's engagement is not to be renewed; and from the statement of the hon. gentleman, I should presume there was not any settled policy of enlargement, because he called on my hon. friend opposite him (Mr. Laurier) to join hands in order to put a pressure, and he knows how to put a kindly pressure on the Government, to create, as I believe, a large immigration agency in Paris. I may say that we have been endeavouring to obtain immigrants from all the countries of the continent, and I believe no man has been found on either side of the House to discourage

any well-considered proposal to obtain immigration from any country on the continent. We made special arrangements to obtain Mennonite emigration when we thought such arrangements were likely to be successful; we endeavoured to secure a German emigration, a Scandinavian and Teutonic immigration and, of course, looked for an increase of population from the United Kingdom; and I entirely agree that if there be any reasonable prospect of obtaining emigration from France, we ought to make every effort to obtain that also. I thoroughly sympathize with the views of the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier) and with their natural desire that there should be emigration from that country to Canada, and I see no reason why we should not devote ourselves, if it be proved we can devote ourselves with any reasonable expectation of practical results, to securing emigration from France, as ardently, at any rate, as we do, to secure emigration from Germany or Scandinavia or any of these other quarters. That is the reason I felt it to be necessary, when I saw the report of the High Commissioner and found he had left out France, to call his attention to that omission, and we received from him a short verbal report in the usual flowery language of the hon. gentleman, but which did not contain as much practical information as I would desire as to what had been done or what was contemplated to be done in France. The question is a great one. The hon. gentleman says the population of France remains stationary or diminishes, and that this is due to emigration. He said when he found the population of a country diminishing, he attributed it to emigration. For instance, the population of Ireland diminished, and was there not emigration from Ireland? He put the two things together as cause and effect. We know where the great refuge of immigrants from all nations of the world has been for a long time; we know it has been this continent; we know if there has been a French emigration to a large extent, it has been, unfortunately, not to our side, but to the other side of the line—and we know there has been a larger French emigration to the United States from the little Province of Quebec than from the Empire or Republic of France. Look at the statistics of emigration from France:

"From 1821 to 1830, 8,497, or 850 a year; from 1831 to 1840, 45,575, or 550 a year; from 1841 to 1850, 77,262, or 7,700 a year; from 1851 to 1860, 76 358, or 7,635 a year; from 1861 to 1870, 37,749, or 3,770 a year; from 1871 to 1880, 73,301, or 7,303 a year."

That has been the emigration of France to the United States. Compare that with the emigration from Quebec to the United States, and compare the population from which the emigration from Quebec is drawn and the population from which the emigration from France is drawn, and then tell me whether France is an emigration country or not The statistics are not hard to find; they are at hand, and they have been abstracted, not very long ago, from two important and authentic sources of information, the "Annales Démographiques Internationales" by Cheroin, and the article on mortality in France in the Encyclopædic Dictionary of Medical Science, by Bertillon; and these statistics indicate results which I do not think agree with the view of the hon. Secretary of State, whose view I understood certainly to be, that if the population of France was not increasing rapidly but was stationary, that was due to emigration.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that. I said that the argument which has been drawn by the hon. member for Quebec was not correct, or logical, or conclusive. It was not because the population of a country was decreasing that one was obliged to say, as he did, that there was no emigration. I said the population of Ireland decreased and there is emigration; therefore, because the population decreased, we must not necessarily conclude there is no emigration.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman desired the House to draw the inference that the decrease was due to emigration, and in that lay the strength of his argument. If you find a country in which, compared to the amount of its population, there is a very small emigration, and if you find that notwithstanding that small emigration the condition of the population is stationary or not increasing, then you certainly find, by these two circumstances, that it is not a very fruitful field for an immigration agency. The condition of things in France is this:

"The several territorial changes that have taken place in France during the past half century have very nearly counterbalanced each other. The annexation of Savoy and Nice, in 1861, brought an addition of 1,346,949 to the population, while the annexation to Germany of Alsace and Lorraine entailed a loss of 1,964,143. Making proper allowance for the slight difference in these figures, we find that the average annual increase of population during the present century in France has been 95,039. The rate, moreover, is not increasing, but, on the contrary, is diminishing But when we compare these figures with the statistics of the other large nationalities, we discover that there is a startling difference. For example, during the last five years the annual increase of Great Britain and Ireland has been 340,118, that of the German Empire, 493,360, and that of the United States, 1,155,446. These figures reveal the absolute increment to the nations. But when we analyze them, the result is not less striking. We find that for every 10,000 inhabitants in the United States an addition is annually made of 260; in Germany of 115; in Great Britain and Ireland of 101, while in France the increase is only 26. A similar result is reached by an inspection of the excess of births over deaths. In 1879 this excess in Great Britain and Ireland was 436,780; in Germany 592,098, but in France only 96,647.

"These figures are somewhat modified by making the proper deductions for excess of emigration over immigration, inasmuch as the losses to England and Germany are much greater from this source than to France; but the modification in less than at first thought would be supposed. In 1879 the loss to Great Britain and Ireland from this source was 160,157, and to Germany only 28,004, while that of France was 2,793. Even after making all necessary deductions, we find that the net increase in Germany was 564,094; in Great Britain and Ireland, 276,603, while in France it was only 93,854. In view of these suggestive facts, it is a matter of interest to enquire whether this slowness of increase is owing to a low birth rate or to a high rate of mortality. On this subject the statistics give conclusive evidence. For example, in Austria the average annual death rate is one in 310 of the inhabitants; in Italy, one in 340; in Germany, one in 400; in France, one in 450, and in England, one in 500. Thus we see that the death rate in France is more favourable than in any of the other large European nations, with the single exception of England. The cause of the diminishing rate, therefore, must be sought in the decreasing number of births. If we enquire whether the number of marriages has diminished to any very considerable extent, the answer, perhaps contrary to the general impression, must be in the negative. The statistics show that from 1801 to 1865 the number of marriages per year in every 1,000 of the inhabitants slightly increased; and, although since 1865 there has been a slight diminution, the difference is not enough to be taken into serious account. We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that the chief, if not the only cause of the diminished increase of the population, is to be found in the decreasing average number of births in the French family. This conclusion is strikingly confirmed by the statistics. Bertillon gives a table showing the annual number of births per annum since 1801 for each 1,000 of the inhabitants. The diminution, though not rapid, is very considerable, and what it most remarkable, is so regular that there is no one year in which the rate is not a trifle less than it was in the year that preceded."

Now, in contradiction to what the hon. member from Manitoba said:

"The diminution, moreover, seems to be characteristic of the rural districts as well as of the cities. In the Department of the Pyrénées, for example, the birth rate in the course of the century has fallen from 44 to 32 per 1,000; in Rhône, from 36 to 26; in Tarn, from 34 to 25, and in Indre, from 37 to 27. But while such are the facts in regard to France, what do we find to be the proportional increase in other European States? The answer is at hand. While the average number of births per 1,000 inhabitants in France is only 26, in Switzerland it is 30; in Denmark, 31; in Norway, 31; in Belgium, 32; in England, 35; in Austria, 38; in Prussia, 38 5, in Saxony, 40, and in Russia, 50. While in Germany, the average number of children per marriage is 5·25, and in England, 4·79; in France it is only 3·31."

I think these statistics answer the question.

185. To provide for the painting of an historical picture commemorative of the establishment of Confederation (revote).....$4,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who has got this in hand, pray? This is an important vote. Who is to commemorate the Fathers of the Confederation, and are they being done cheap? There are some 25 or 30 of them at $100 a piece.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member was not here last Session, or he would have known all about it. It was explained very fully, and every member who was here and who is here to-night will remember perfectly well the statement made, on the motion, I think, of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier). The artist who is employed, Mr. Harris, is now engaged in the work at Montreal, and has made considerable progress, but no portion of the money has been paid.

186	To meet cost of litigated matters.....	$5,000 00
187	To assist in defraying the expenses of the meeting in Montreal of the British Association the Advancement of Science	25,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Some explanation about this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This sum, as is stated in the Resolution, is "To assist in defraying the expenses of the meeting in Montreal of the British Association for the Advancement of Science." It is well known that this Association contains among its members not only the first men of science in England, but very many from the continent of Europe. It was proposed a year ago that they should pay a visit to Canada, and should hold a meeting of the Association here. It was resisted very strongly in some quarters, especially by the London *Times*, which for some reason or other has always been unfriendly to Canada. However, the *Times* was beaten, and those who desired to prevent its leaving England were in the minority, and I think Canada gets a great advantage in having a meeting here of these great scientists, including such men as Huxley and Tyndall, and men of that kind, and continental scientists as well—if I may use such an American word as "scientists"—numbers of whom are coming to Canada. We believe it will be of the greatest consequence to Canada to have this great Association come here, not only as a matter of science, as showing that Canada is taking its position and is recognized as such an important part of the British Empire that this great meeting should be held within our bounds, but, also, in a more practical, and perhaps, more commercial sense, we believe the best advertisement that could possibly be given to Canada is the assemblage of these gentlemen here. They propose to come out here this summer, to assemble at Montreal in the end of August or beginning of September. They will visit all the points of interest in Canada. They have, I understand, taken great pains, as this is their first visit out of England, to have all the papers which will be read before the Association, of very great interest, and with some reference to the place of meeting. It is also proposed for them to go across the continent, and the railways of Canada—the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Intercolonial, of course—have offered them the most advantageous terms, so that they can visit various portions of Canada at their ease and comfort, and with as little expense as possible. One of the great objections raised by the *Times* was that these men of science, professors and others, are very few of them men of wealth, and that it would prevent many of them from enjoying the pleasure and the advantage of being present at an annual meeting of the Association. They could not come to Canada, and as there would be no meeting in England, it would be to them, as members of the Association, a lost year. However, the *Times* has been obliged to change its note, as it does to change with the times, because it was found to be a most popular move, and instead of there being a general objection among the members of the Association to come to Canada, when it was known that the Government here, subject to the sanction of Parliament, were anxious to promote this meeting, and assist in it, instead of its being a disappointment to any of the members, there has been a large accession to the numbers of the British Association because they are coming to Canada. Every man who comes to Canada in this capacity will go home, we hope, fully impressed with the country, and will become a good emigration agent. The proposal is to assist the passages of these gentlemen. They will come across at a comparatively small expense. They will be conveyed by the great railway companies through the country, and we hope, that as a body, they will see Canada thoroughly and favourably. We have a right to think so, because all those gentlemen who came out on the invitation of the Department of Agriculture, farmers and agents of farmers in England, were of one mind and sounded one note of praise of Canada when they went home, and they have been acting ever since as gratuitous emigration agents for Canada. I have no doubt the House will vote with great pleasure this sum.

Mr. GAULT. A very large Committe of our foremost citizens has been appointed in Montreal, and a large amount of money has been subscribed by citizens, who are determined to give a right royal welcome to the members of the British Association, and to admit them to their homes. I believe that their visit will be productive of great benefit to Montreal and to Canada. These gentlemen are intending to visit the whole continent, so far as they can, and I believe they will have passes over all the principal railways of Canada; and the American railways are prepared to give them passes as well. They will, therefore, very likely see a very large portion of this continent, and I have no doubt they will return home with a very high opinion of the character and resources of this country. I believe the citizens of Montreal, and the people of Canada generally, will have great pleasure in receiving them, and will endeavour to make their visit agreeable. I understand, also, the city of Ottawa is about taking measures to receive them officially, when they will visit the Capital.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not stated what the expectations are as to the number of those gentlemen who are to visit Canada; nor has he told us how this fund is to be expended. Is any portion of it to be given in entertaining them in particular localities?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. GAULT. We expect there will be between 700 and 800 members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I heard 500, and I thought even that was a large number. If there are 700 competent men coming to this country, they will do us yeoman service when they go back.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any arrangement been made with the Allan Line for reduced passages?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All the leading lines of steamships coming to Canada and New York have given reduced rates of passage to members of the British Association coming to the Montreal meeting. Communications have been made between the Committee in Montreal and the Committee of the British Association, who have been acting in concert; and communications were made through my office in London with the various steamship agents, and the lowest terms of passage were obtained in favour of the members of the Association. By the arrangements, those persons who are officers of the Association have their passages paid; the others receive more or less assistance, according to circumstances. So far as the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are concerned, members of the British Association and their families will be carried free over those lines to any part of Canada which they may wish to visit, even to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. I communicated with Mr. Hickson, Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, what was proposed to be done by the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he said the Grand Trunk Railway Company would willingly co-operate with the other railways in

assisting our distinguished visitors to move through Canada free of charge, so that both themselves and their families will be able to travel gratuitously over our three great lines of railway. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), who is better informed with regard to this matter than any one else, as being Chairman of the Montreal Citizens Committee, will be able to give full information on all these points.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the hon. member for Cardwell is not the Minister in charge of this vote, and although he may make the explanations, I am afraid we shall have to hold the Government responsible for the use of the money. It will be understood that the Government is speaking through his mouth—which is anticipating events a little, perhaps.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may say that the proposal is that $20,000 of the $25,000 are to be appropriated by the Committee of the Association in England for assisted passages. Of these assisted passages fifty will be absolutely free—those of the officers of the Association; and the balance of the money, some $14,000, will be appropriated as assistance to other members of the Association who may come to this country. In order to avoid any abuse of these assisted passages, the Council of the Association in England have adopted the principle that no one will receive assisted passages unless he was a member of the Association at the Southampton meeting, that is the meeting that preceded that at Southport, at which it was decided to come to Canada, by that means excluding persons who may have joined the Association at the Southport meeting merely with a view of getting cheap passages to Canada; so that every protection has been afforded by the Council of the Association in relation to that matter. I believe the Minister of Railways has already explained what has been done with reference to passages on this side. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have agreed that every person who comes here as a member of the Association, himself and his family, shall have free passages over their line, during the whole time they are in Canada. In addition to that, there is to be a special excursion to the end of the line at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. The excursions, which are conducted at meetings of the Association in England, are always limited in numbers. At the Southport meeting, there were several excursions, and they were all limited, some to 200, others 300, the persons desiring to take part in them sending in their names, and if a larger number applied than could be accommodated, the Council selected the persons. The meeting of the Association will take place in Montreal on 27th August, and continue for one week. On the morning of the 4th September a special excursion of 150 persons will leave Montreal bound for the Rocky Mountains, going part of the way by water, the excursionists returning, if desired, by the American lines. These excursionists are to have the trip free in all respects, except as to their meals, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have agreed with the Montreal Committee that they will make arrangements to furnish meals on the route at 50 cents or two shillings per meal. So it is estimated that six shillings a day will be all that is absolutely necessary to be paid by the excursionists on that trip. The time occupied will be probably two weeks, and the general impression is that very great advantage will be derived from the fact that 150 distinguished persons, occupying prominent positions in England, will have an opportunity of visiting in that way the North-West. $5,000 in addition to the $20,000 is to be devoted to the necessary expenses connected with the actual meeting itself. The citizens of Montreal have undertaken to provide all the hospitalities connected with the visit to Montreal itself, without touching one dollar of the amount voted by this Parliament; they ask no assistance from Parliament to enable them to do what Montreal citizens, as well as the citizens of all Canadian centres, are always ready to do on such occasions,—perform the duties of hospitality to the visitors who may be present at that meeting. In the meantime, much correspondence is going on; a permanent Secretary has been appointed; rooms have been taken and a good deal of work is to be done, and $5,000 is intended to be applied in payment of expenses of that kind. I may say, in regard to this matter, that it is very important if possible that the people of other cities as well as those of Montreal should be thoroughly enlisted in the gathering that is to take place. We have undertaken in Montreal that the Association shall lose nothing by coming to Canada. At the meetings in Great Britain the Association has members, associate members, and life members, and out of the fees paid by the various classes of members they are able to pay for the publishing of their proceedings, their secretaries and other expenses connected with the meetings. The largest number of members at any meeting in Great Britain was 3,300 or 3,400, and it is proposed that in Canada we shall secure an equal membership, so that, as I have said, the Association shall lose nothing by its visit here. It is not intended by the Montreal Committee that any part of this money voted by Parliament should go to that object—that is a matter of an entirely voluntary nature, resting with the people of the Dominion. A guarantee fund is now being established in Montreal, which will ensure the Association against any loss of funds from their Canadian visit; but it is most desirable that in all Canadian cities, Committees should be formed and members of the Association secured; so that we will be able not simply to have a Montreal meeting, or a meeting of Montreal people, but a gathering of the leading people of all parts of Canada. In addition to the excursion to which I have just referred, other excursions have been proposed—one to Ottawa, another to Quebec, another covering a day to the neighbourhood of Belle Isle Mountain, which is a district of great geological interest, as well as some others, and in that way it is hoped the members of the association will find in this country abundant sources of interest and that the result of the trip will be of great advantage to them in all respects. I think that Canada will derive great advantage from the presence of so many distinguished people in this country, the latest information from England being that at least 700 or 800 will come here as members of the Association.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has told us of excursions to distant points, in which it is proposed to almost annihilate space. Success in obtaining a very large gathering in Montreal of persons from other parts of the Dominion will largely depend on whether distance is also annihilated to the inhabitants of Canada. I hope the Committee will devote attention to securing even better than usual rates for those who are going to attend the meetings of the Association. I was sorry not to hear that an excursion was proposed to Niagara Falls.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is one proposed to the Falls.

Mr. BLAKE. Because the excursionists will then pass through Toronto.

Mr. ALLEN. It is very important that the distinguished visitors from England should receive special attention in this country. I received a letter a short time ago from the Secretary of the British Association, stating that 150 members were going by way of Owen Sound to the North-West. I sent the letter to our Mayor, and I am happy to say that action was immediately taken, and an official invitation sent to the Association to partake of the hospitalities of Owen Sound. Luncheon and other entertainments will be provided at an expenditure of $1,000. I believe this amount of $1,000 will be expended. No doubt, the reports as to what our country is doing, which will be circulated

in England and elsewhere, will more than compensate any city or town for any outlay. I hope other cities and towns in the country will follow the example furnished by Owen Sound.

188 To make good to those merchants of Prince Edward Island, who were British subjects, the amount of duties paid by them to the United States Customs on fish and fish oil in the year 1871, under the arrangements entered into in advance of the legislation necessary to bring the Treaty of Washington into force, by which arrangement United States fishermen were granted liberty to fish in the territorial waters of Prince Edward Island, on the understanding that the President of the United States would ask Congress to refund these duties, which arrangement the President subsequently declined to carry out, on the ground that the proposal contemplated the united actions of all the British North American colonies, which was not had, and that it would not be practicable to separate the colonies or carry into effect for one what the President was willing to effect for all, it not having been deemed advisable in the general interest of the British case to put forward and press the claim of these merchants before the Halifax Commission.....$30,086 10

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an argument, not a vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then no explanation is required.

Mr. BLAKE. This appeared in the Supplementary Estimates last year. I recollect we discussed it to some extent, and the Minister of Finance said he was not able to give full information on it, and would bring it down later, when full information could be given. I am now asking for the full information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman somewhat forgets the circumstances. I remember the hon. member for King's made a strong speech on the item.

Mr. DAVIES. The First Minister, I am sure, was not present, and the Finance Minister said, that inasmuch as the right hon. gentleman was absent, and he was the only one who knew all about why it was put in the Estimates, he would withdraw it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true.

Mr. BLAKE. And it did not come back.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman did not bring it up again last Session. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to whom this money is to be paid, and in what proportions.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I expect a memorandum on the subject in a few minutes. I think, however, the hon. gentleman has forgotten something in connection with this matter. I think he took exception to the vote and it was intimated that if the hon. gentleman did not wish it to pass we had no objections to drop it; that as he was representative of the Island, we would drop it, at any rate, for that year, and it was dropped accordingly.

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell the whole story of why I took exception to it. He knows that the grounds of my objection were that no explanation whatever was given of why we should vote for it, or of the parties to whom it was to be paid, or the proportions in which it was to be paid: Another ground was, that it was stated that a good many were not to get this money, while others were to be paid. These were the reasons, so that the hon. Finance Minister did not explain all the why. I contended that we should have the reasons given for paying the money, and that it should be paid to all the persons who stood on the same footing.

Mr. ALLEN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be true that I was not here when it was first discussed, but I know that when I heard that the hon. gentleman had taken objection to it, I said to my hon. friend who sits next me: Well, if he chooses, as a representative from Prince Edward Island to object, there is no necessity for the Government to give it. Afterwards the hon. gentleman was told by the Finance Minister, when I was present, that in consequence of the opposition which was made to it, the Government would not press it.

Mr. BLAKE. That seems to be a new notion of responsible Government. I presume that the votes presented to this House are upon the recommendation of the Government, by whom alone they can be presented, the assent of the Crown having been obtained, and they are presented because the Government is of opinion that justice and public policy require that they should be passed. The course the hon. gentleman took last Session was a course which I do not think was worthy of him. We asked for further information; we asked for the names, the amounts to each, and we could not get them; we were told, amongst other things, that it was late, that objection was taken, and that they would drop it for that Session. Now it comes up again, and we want the information which we vainly asked for last Session.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It may be necessary to state briefly the circumstances under which this claim is presented. It is known perfectly well that the Government of the United States submitted a proposition to the different Provinces of Canada, and Prince Edward Island, which was not then a part of Canada, that if we would allow the use of our fisheries to American subjects, they would admit the fish taken and cured by our own people to be received into the United States free. That was the proposition distinctly made. It was declined on the part of Canada, and accepted in good faith on the part of Prince Edward Island—accepted by the men employed in these fisheries and the Government of Prince Edward Island. What was the result? The result was, the American fishermen had the use of the fisheries of Prince Edward Island, the duty was exacted upon the fish taken there by the inhabitants of the Island, notwithstanding what I consider to be as solemn an engagement as one Government could make with another. They demanded the duty, and I may say for myself, as an individual, that I scarcely know of any transaction, between one Government and another, as discreditable as the conduct of the United States Government with reference to this question. That being the case, it was supposed that the Prince Edward Island fishermen had a just and equitable claim upon Canada for the amount of this money—upon this principle, that it was taken into account by the Commissioners sitting at Halifax.

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We enquired into that matter, we enquired if it was taken into account in the award which has been made, and we felt that there would be a just claim, one about which there could be no question. It was considered a desirable and proper thing by the Minister of Justice, who had the matter in hand, to state the whole matter in these Resolutions. It did not form part of the engagement, part of the consideration to Canada. Under these circumstances, after it stood for a number of years, it was considered that these parties now being a portion of Canada, not being able to obtain their just rights from the United States, the Government should come to the House and ask for the amount of money they had expended to reimburse them, or at least those of them who are British subjects. It is not intended to pay those who are not British subjects, because if the United States Government failed to do justice to their own subjects, let them look to their own Government for consideration. We desire simply

to protect our own people, who are now part of the Dominion of Canada, and who feel that they have not been fairly dealt with. I have a list of the names, though, of course, the amounts will be subject to investigation, and I find among the parties, Hall Merrick, Geo. Howell, H. M. Churchill, Carvell Bros., and a number of others.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman does not give the sums.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These claims have not been finally settled or disposed of yet.

Mr. BLAKE. How has the total, including the ten cents, been arrived at?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That covers the gross amount of all claims.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not advisable to state all the amounts, as that would be a sort of admission that the claims are all correct, and the matter has to be investigated. These are the amounts of the claims, by those who are British subjects; but these amounts may not all be allowed.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the gross amount of all those claims $30,086.10?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is the gross amount.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has stated very fairly and very correctly, I think, the circumstances in connection with the breach of faith on the part of the United States Government. There is no doubt that they were guilty of a very great breach of faith. They undertook expressly that if American vessels were permitted to fish in our waters they would recommend to Congress a remission of those duties. Their vessels were permitted to fish, and they refused to recommend the remission of duties. I understand that they claimed that it was a general undertaking between themselves and the Dominion of Canada, and that inasmuch as Canada refused to admit their vessels, they could not recommend the remission of the duties on behalf of Prince Edward Island, although they took advantage of the privilege we allowed them. So far, the facts are correct. But the list the hon gentleman read does not tote up the amount he is taking a vote for. In 1879, for the first time, application was made to this Government for the payment of these duties. Of course this Government had nothing special to do with it. The First Minister said I opposed the vote last Session. I did not oppose the vote. I pointed out several reasons why the mode in which the vote was given was unjust; and I pointed out that some statements made in the vote were not correct. I intend to do that again to-night. A great deal of capital was made of the fact that I brought these matters before the House, and in every paper in Prince Edward Island belonging to the party opposed to me, I was denounced. One paper, under the heading of "Grit Treachery to Prince Edward Island," went on to say:

"They have no legal claim for this amount. It is justly due by the Government of the United States, and refusal by that Government to refund is an act of bad faith, which is worse than the repudiation, by Philadelphia, of its debts, in days gone by. * * * * Our merchants have no claim whatever against the Dominion Government; they have no such legal claim for any portion of the Fishery award as might be enforced in a court of law."

Then follows a column and a-half of abuse of your humble servant, because I ventured to do—what? Because I ventured to call the attention of the Ministry to the fact that the statement they put in this vote was not correct. The statement here is:

"It not having been deemed advisable, in the general interest of the British case, to put forward and press the claim of those merchants before the Halifax Commission."

Now, the hon. gentleman knows very well that it was not in the province of the Halifax Commission to consider this claim at all. They were appointed for a distinct purpose—to decide the sum of money that should be paid to Canada for the use of her fisheries between certain points of time—between 1873 and 1883. This was a transaction which took place in 1871, and if this statement is allowed to go on our record, it will appear that we pressed claims before that Commission which the Commission had no authority to recognize, and which, had they considered them, would have invalidated the award. Now, as one of the counsel, I want to assure the hon. gentleman that nothing of the kind took place. These claims were not pressed, as they did not come within the province of the Commission; and if the Commissioners had included a dollar of that amount in their award, they would have rendered the whole award liable to be set aside, and the United States would have been justified in repudiating it. They were not appointed to consider whether or not the United States was guilty of a breach of faith. I admit that they were guilty of a breach of faith, and to use the language of the First Minister, I cannot understand on what ground the United States can refuse to pay this claim. You may decide to pay this claim as a matter of generosity; if you do, I am not going to oppose it; but I want it to be done in the proper way, and not by putting on record statements which are inconsistent with the facts, and which would militate against my action as one of the counsel and against the action of the arbitrators at the Halifax Commission. The hon. gentleman will see that the amount he proposes to vote here covers only a portion of the claims. He only read a portion of the names of the claimants; I will read the rest of them. The claims which make up this sum are: Hall & Myrick, for themselves, $20,818.69; Hall & Myrick, for British subjects, $9,883; G. W. Howlan, $9,106.60; H. M. Churchill, $4,889.50; Carvell Bros., $1,228.50; Baker & Nickerson, $987 20; A. A. Macdonald & Bros., $2,234; Macdonald & Owen, $492; Samuel Prowse, $386; J. A. Matheson, $262; A. Matheson, $24; J. A. Macdonald, $146; Wise and Russell, $166; John Cairns, $165; Owen Connolly, $146; Reid Bros., $30. In that list there are five Americans, and the hon. gentleman docks off one. I objected to that last year. He happens to be a supporter of your humble servant. I asked on what ground could you pay Churchill, Baker & Nickerson, and Wise & Russell, and refuse to pay Mr. Hall? The hon. Minister could not support his vote at that time, and he withdrew it; and then the public papers turned round and heaped obloquy on my shoulders, because I contended that if you are going to vote this money—and I am not going to oppose it—if you are going to vote it on generous grounds, you should be generous all round, and vote it justly and fairly. Why do you refuse to pay Hall & Myrick's claim? Although an American, Myrick has for a quarter of a century been doing the largest fishing business in Prince Edward Island. He resides there with his family; he has put over $100,000 into his fishing business; he has seven of the principal fishing stations on the Island; he has nearly 400 hands employed during the summer and a very large number in winter; he has from seventy to ninety boats; and he does as much fishing as all the others put together. He is not an American in reality, because he has been living amongst us for a quarter of a century, and has done more to open up the fisheries of Prince Edward Island than any other man, and is essentially a British subject. He invested his money in that business on the assurance given him by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, that if he did so he would have his money refunded. In the Sessional Papers of 1880 is the letter which Mr. Hall wrote to the Lieutenant-Governor, dated in September, 1871, in which he called attention to the fact that, from articles which appeared in the Boston papers, he thought there was going to be a breach of faith on the part of the United States Government, and he wanted the Lieutenant-Governor to give him an assurance that in

that case his money would be refunded. The Lieutenant-Governor writes him a letter the day afterwards acknowledging the receipt of his communication. I will not read the whole letter. He first gives an epitome of Mr. Hall's letter to him, and then goes on to say:

"The Lieutenant-Governor is of the opinion that your apprehensions are unfounded and an arrangement, sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government, has been entered into between the Governments of the United States and Prince Edward Island; and the Lieutenant-Governor does not apprehend that the action of Canada in withholding her assent to a similar arrangement, will be attended with the prejudicial result which you have recently been led to anticipate."

Mr. Hall's letter and the Lieutenant-Governor's reply were forwarded in the dispatch to Earl Kimberley, on the 30th September, 1871, and the Lieutenant-Governor asks that the Home Government shall take steps to ascertain whether there was any truth in the suspicion Mr. Hall had in this matter. A dispatch was sent in reply, on the 30th December, after the fishing season was over, to say that it was only too true; that they had made enquiries on the subject in Washington, and they found the United States refused to carry out the proposal. Application was then made to the British Government, asking them to refund the duties, and the British Government, on the 1st of July, refused to do so. Messrs. Hall & Myrick applied to the Lieutenant-Governor to know if it would be safe for them to invest their money, and he assured them it would be a safe investment, and they invested it so; and so did other gentlemen mentioned in the schedule, British as well as Americans; and having all done so, they are all in the same boat. There is no legitimate reason therefore, why we should pay some and refuse to pay others; and I cannot see sufficient grounds, if the right hon. gentleman determines to vote this money, for drawing the distinction he has drawn between Messrs. Hall & Myrick and the others. He simply has deducted their claims from the $51,000, and is prepared to pay the balance. If the hon. gentleman determines to ask us to vote this money, and inasmuch as we are voting it, not on legal grounds, but simply as a matter of generosity and equity, he should embrace in the sum to be voted the claim of Messrs. Hall & Myrick, for although technically an American, Mr. Myrick is practically a British subject. He is the largest fish dealer we have on the Island; he has been there twenty years; has employed more men and done more to develop the fisheries than anyone else. I think the hon. gentleman must see that my contention as regards this vote is correct.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that Messrs. Hall & Myrick are entitled to their claim. I think the Resolution shows the money is to be divided among British subjects, and if the others are not British subjects they will stand in the same position as Messrs. Hall & Myrick. The hon. gentleman will understand why American subjects are not intended to be included in this vote. They are citizens of the United States; the United States has committed a great wrong on them, and as citizens of the United States they can go to their own Government and get redress. If they do not get redress, they suffer from the wrongful act of their own Government, and certainly there is no reason, either in equity or generosity, why we should save them from an injury inflicted on them by their own Government. The hon. gentleman says that the Arbitrators would have nothing to do with this. I am not so sure of that; I do not want to dispute the hon. gentleman's position, but I say it is not free from doubt. The question submitted to the Arbitrators was the value of the fisheries of British North America for twelve years from the time of ratification of the Treaty; and it could be argued, with a good deal of plausibility, that *quoad* the United States and the Island, the ratification dated from the time of this argument. That might well be held; it would be held in morals, though, perhaps, not strictly according to the law as stated by the hon. gentleman. At all events, it was likely, from the reason the hon. gentleman stated, for fear it might raise a question as to the validity of the award, not thought advisable it should be pressed. I think these gentlemen have in fairness a claim for consideration. The hon. gentleman, as a guardian of the rights of Prince Edward Island, has pressed very strongly the view there should be a specified sum handed over to the Island out of the $5,000,000 that were awarded; we agree with the hon. gentleman as far as this vote is concerned, by giving those people a certain portion of it.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides some namesakes of the hon. gentleman, I find namesakes of other members of branches of the Legislature in the list. I do not know whether there is any connection between them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely they are members; Mr. Howlan is a Prince Edward Island man and so is Mr. Carvell.

Mr. BLAKE. It struck me their names were in the vote. It is important we should understand on what principle we are asking to pass this vote, even if we do not come from the Island, and are, therefore, not called on specially to vindicate its claim to the generosity of the Dominion. The clause, "It not having been deemed advisable in the general interest of the British case to put forward and press the claim of these merchants before the Halifax Commission," is put in as the reason why Canada is called on to vote this money. It is, of course, but right, if there was a valid claim on the part of these individuals which were not prosecuted before the Commission in the general interest—if we sacrificed the interests of certain individuals, whether of the Island or of any other Province, in the general interest—that they should be reimbursed for that sacrifice. That is a correct principle, but I deny the application of the principle in the case in hand, and I want to know whether the hon. gentleman has a report from the Commissioner of Canada, or from the counsel in the case, stating that, as a matter of fact, they believed that there was a claim which could, with propriety, be brought forward by those individuals, but which for some mysterious reason, in the interests of the British case, was not brought forward. Now, why was it thought inadvisable to put it forward in the interests of the British case? Is it because it was an invalid claim? Is it because, if granted, it would have vitiated the award? Then there is no reason. If it was thought inadvisable to put it forward because it was not a claim that could properly be brought forward, because it was not a claim which it would be right to press, because it was not a claim which was within the terms of reference, then of course there is no claim against us, because the reason for not bringing it forward is that it is an invalid claim, and that it is a claim which does not exist; and I quite agree that, if it is not a claim within the terms of the reference, in the opinion of the British Commissioner and the British Consul, it would have been extremely improper to bring it forward, because their first duty was to bring forward only such claims as were valid within the spirit and the letter of the referrnce. But if it is a valid claim within the spirit and the letter of the reference, if it is such a claim as, while having regard to the interests of these individuals, it would be proper to press, they determined it would be inadvisable to press in the interests of the British case, I want to know the reason why. Let us have no secrets about it now. What are the reasons why a claim which was valid within the letter and the spirit of the reference was not put forward in the interests of the British case. This memorandum is a formal opinion, it is a legal argument, it is drawn up by the Minister of Justice as the recorded justification of this vote. What does it mean? If you say it is because it was inadvisable in the interests of

the British case to press an invalid claim, I agree with you; but I say that cuts away your ground for making a present of this money now, because, then under the circumstances, it is a present. But, if it was a valid claim in your opinion, and yet, notwithstanding its validity, there was some reason why it was inadvisable in the interests of the British case to press it, I agree with you, if there was such a reason, but I want to know what that reason was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must allow another proposition to enter into the consideration. The counsel for Canada may have said: "We believe that this is a valid claim, that it fairly comes within the terms of the reference; but there is a doubt about it; it is a small amount, and we are not going to sacrifice the whole of the interests of the award for the sake of this sum" At all events, they did not press it. Then, how does it stand? The hon. gentleman must admit that a great wrong has been done to these people by the United States; Her Majesty's Government would not press it—that the hon. gentleman states; we have no means of pressing it—that the hon. gentleman knows. There being a wrong done to our fellow-subjects by the United States, they having no means of getting redress from the United States, and Canada having got a large award, there is, I think, a fair claim that we should not allow our fellow-subjects in Prince Edward Island to suffer from the wrong inflicted upon them. Under the circumstances, I think it is a fair and equitable claim. Though it is not exactly in point, in circumstance, to this case, yet the doctrine is well understood that, if any subject of any nation suffers a wrong from a foreign Government he has a right to claim redress from that Government through his own Government; but, if his own Government refuse to press that claim from any cause whatever, he then has a fair claim against his own Government. I think that is law. I think it will be found so decided by Lord Cottingham in the famous De Bode case. The law is simply this. He says:

"It is admitted law that, if the subject of a country is spoliated by a foreign Government, he is entitled to obtain redress from the foreign Government through the means of his own Government, but, if from weakness, timidity or any other cause on the part of his own Government, no redress is obtained from the foreigner, then he has a claim against his own country."

Here there is a wrong. There is no chance of their getting any redress from the United States. Then, I think they have a fair claim from their own Government for redress for this wrong. And I put it upon the further ground that we ought not to be niggardly in this matter, and we ought to remedy this wrong, when it is considered that Canada, as a whole, has been the gainer by that arbitration, and perhaps saved the award by not pressing the claim.

Mr. DAVIES. Then, let the hon. gentleman act in a generous spirit, and embrace them all. Mr. Hall was induced to act in this way upon the letter of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province. It is true that technically he is an American citizen, but everybody knows he has no remedy there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He can look to his own Government.

Mr. DAVIES. He cannot look to the Government. He has no remedy at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the American Government acted in a spirit entirely unworthy of that great nation in this matter. But, as I understand their excuse, they do not say, "We will not." They say, as I understand, "We made a proposition through the British Government to all the colonies, to all the various dependencies which were concerned in the negotiation of this Treaty. We proposed to them all to open their ports in anticipation of the Treaty. One did it; others did not; and, as the letter of our proposition was not acceded to, we decline to recognize the claim of that one." That is as I understand it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is it.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, having taken advantage of it as far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, their own fishermen having taken advantage of it, and having obtained the benefit, I say it was a course of conduct entirely unworthy of a great country not to make the compensation, not to refund the duties; but, on the other hand, I suppose in point of law the contention of the United States Government may be correct. I think that is probably the case. They made an offer to all, and that not being accepted by all, it was one and indivisible, and, in the strictly pettifogging spirit of an attorney, it does not lie against them. Then the case does not apply where a Government through timidity and feebleness—and no one who knows how this Government have dealt with important domestic questions this Session can accuse them of timidity or feebleness—or through some other cause not having pressed a claim against a foreign nation, the citizen has a claim against his own Government. That is very reasonable, but I am inclined to think that the Government which has, from weakness or timidity or any other cause, declined to press the claim against the foreign Government, will decline to recognize the claim of the citizen against itself. It will not plead guilty to the causes which gave rise to the claim of the citizen not being pressed. In this case, it is also not to be forgotten that the claim is not the claim of Prince Edward Island as a part of the Dominion. This was before Prince Edward Island became a part of the Dominion. This was a claim to be prosecuted by Prince Edward Island, through Great Britan, through the Empire; not by Canada, on behalf of Prince Edward Island, through the Empire, but by Prince Edward Island direct, through the Empire; and if before she brought forward the claim, she became part of the Dominion, it would be a claim in reference to the rights of the Prince Edward Islanders anterior to Confederation, in which we would be the mere vehicle or official conduct pipe of the Government, and the Government which has behaved ill under these circumstances is not the hon. gentleman's Government, but the Government of Great Britain, which, through feebleness, timidity or some other cause, has declined to bring this forward, if the claim was ever presented to them. But I do not suppose it was ever presented, because I fancy, in the strict letter of the law, it has been recognized that the United States, in this matter, have no quasi-legal liability. Then, if the case is so weak as has been brought forward, if in point of fact, it is an act of generosity, if it is to be bolstered up by the statement that Canada has received a large award and that it is not unreasonable, under the circumstances, that she should make good the loss, I think the hon. gentleman has some difficulty in meeting the argument of my hon. friend behind me, because he finds that the very gentleman who made the application to the Lieutenant-Governor, who received the Lieutenant-Governor's assurance that such and such would be the result, and upon the faith of that assurance invested his money, is to be cut out on account of his technical citizenship of the United States, while he is making a present to all these other worthy gentlemen. It proves, under the circumstances, that it is better to be a Senator of Canada than a citizen of the United States.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the United States have even the poor excuse that they can get out of it by the letter of their agreement. The proposition they made was, that if Great Britain would recommend to Canada and Prince Edward Island to pass the necessary legislation to admit United States fishermen into the waters of these two Provinces, on their part the President would recommend to Congress to admit fish free of duty; in consideration of Great Britain doing a certain thing the President would do

a certain thing also. Great Britain did discharge her part of the compact in recommending such legislation to Prince Edward Island and Canada, who adopted it, but the President refused to discharge his. The consideration the United States asked for was granted, and that country, in neglecting to perform its part of the compact, committed as gross a breach of faith, legally and morally, as could be committed by any country; and I think, under the circumstances, the First Minister ought to see his way clear to close this matter up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot do it by this vote without a new Message.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

CUSTOMS.

Salaries and Contingencies of the several Ports.

	In Province of Ontario	$250,375 00
	do Quebec	202,860 00
	do New Brunswick	90,550 00
	do Nova Scotia	106,430 00
	do Manitoba	40,650 00
	do North-West Territories	8 000 00
	do British Columbia	27,900 00
	do Prince Edward Island	21,050 00
	Provinces generally—To cover any unforseen changes it may appear necessary to make in staff	5,000 00
189	Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports, and travelling expenses of other officers on inspection	18,000 00
	Miscellaneous—Contingencies of head office, covering printing, stationery, advertising, telegraphing, &c., for the several ports of entry	13,000 00
	To meet expenditure in connection with the Board of Customs and Outside Detective Service, including $800 salary of the Commissioner of Customs as Chairman of the Board	15,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. The House will see, on the next page, wherein changes are made and wherein the salaries have been increased or decreased. In many of the ports additional officers are required, and in some cases the salaries have been increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There seems to be tolerably large increases on which some explanation should be given. For instance, at Prince Arthur's Landing the hon. gentleman wants $1,120; at Toronto, he requires $3,450. I see at Ottawa there is a sum of $680 of an increase.

Mr. McLELAN. At Ottawa a new officer, Scott, has been appointed at $800, and the extra pay has been decreased $120, making a net increase of $680.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has there been any increase of trade here?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that this is practically taken out of contingencies?

Mr. McLELAN. No; the $120, I think, was taken out of contingencies. In Toronto there has been a number of new appointments made, aggregating an increase of $8,200; there has been a decrease in the extra pay of $4,750 by transfers to the permanent list, making a net increase of $3,450. These new appointments were largely taken from parties paid by the day. The additional appointments were made over and above those paid by the day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that four or five additional officers have been appointed at Toronto. This is a large increase, and although business has been increasing at that port, yet those additional officers can scarcely be required. Judging from the official returns, it appears that the volume of trade has been diminishing largely within the last few months. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will make a note of it, so that explanations may be given on Concurrence.

Mr. McLELAN. In regard to Montreal, a number of the salaries have been increased, and some officers who were paid by the day have been made permanent. There have been two new appointments, at $1,400 each.

Mr. IRVINE. Why is there a decrease of $250 for the Woodstock, N.B., Custom House?

Mr. McLELAN. It is in consequence of the Collector having been suspended in April last.

Mr. IRVINE. I observe that the Government still persist in having a merchant act as Preventive Officer at Florenceville, at a salary of $200 per annum. If this is not changed, I will make a motion on this question and test the opinion of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the statement of my hon. friend is correct, the appointment is quite contrary to the rules of the Department, which provide that a person actively engaged in trade cannot be employed.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the Government will consider this matter before the Session is over, because the complaint is not a new one. The hon. member mentioned the subject last Session and discussed it fully, and the Minister of Customs said he was not aware that the person so employed was a merchant, and promised to make enquiries into the subject, at the same time conceding the fact, that if the officer was a merchant, the appointment was not in accordance with the rules of the Department.

Mr. IRVINE. The name of the officer is Charles Kearney. I told the Minister twice that all he had to do was to apply to the Minister of Inland Revenue, who knows as well as I do, that this gentleman is a merchant.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give an answer on Concurrence, as there is no use in persisting in a violation of the rules.

EXCISE.

	Salaries of Officers and Inspectors of Excise		$224,795 00
	To provide for increase of pay of chief officers at large distilleries and factories		2,000 00
	Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c		50,000 00
	To provide for the cost of obtaining stamps and for the stamping of imported and Canadian tobacco, &c		20,000 00
	To enable the Department to grant an allowance to excise officers in Manitoba and British Columbia, to compensate for increased cost of living as compared with the older Provinces:		
190	For Manitoba	3,000 00	
	For British Columbia	500 00	
			3,500 00
	To pay Collectors of Customs allowance on duties collected by them		3,500 00
	Preventive service		5,000 00
	Commission to sellers of stamps for Canada twist tobacco		500 00
	Special.		
	To enable the Department to purchase wood naphtha and similar articles, for issue to bonded manufacturers, under provisions of 46 Vic., chap. 15, sec. 225, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom they are supplied		2,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman aware whether any Excise officers are also acting as municipal officers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In one or two cases my attention has been called to the fact that some officers of the Department were otherwise engaged. I have a distinct recollection, in one instance in the Province of Ontario, that an officer of the Department, while receiving a considerable salary, is

also engaged in insurance, I believe, and in several other branches of business, and is besides a municipal officer. Complaint has been made on that ground. The question was submitted to our inspector, and he reported that there is nothing to prevent the officer from engaging in other business, so long as it does not interfere with the duties he is paid by the Department to discharge, and we have taken no step one way or the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be; but it seems to me that the precedent is likely to lead to mischief, if Excise officers engaged in other occupations, or become even municipal officers. The hon. gentleman may be correct in stating that it is not expressly prohibited by law; but it strikes me, and I think I have heard the hon. First Minister express a similar opinion, that it is not advisable that Excise officers should be allowed to engage in other businesses, and on that ground we pay them larger salaries than we otherwise would.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that, in this particular case, I felt some delicacy in taking rigourous action, because the gentleman to whom I refer is supposed to sometimes take an active part in politics, and against the present Government, and I thought any interference might look like retaliation. I agree with the hon. gentleman, however, that it would be advisable if the officers should confine themselves to the work of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak without knowledge or concern whether the parties in question employ their political influence either *pro* or *con*. I am speaking simply in the general interest of the service. Of course, if the matter has been acquiesced in by the hon. gentleman or his inspector for some time, it might be harsh to put a stop to it at an hour's notice. But I think it should be put a stop to within a reasonable time.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The vote of $50,000 for travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., shows an increase of $6,000, which will be easily understood when I say that we are increasing the number of meters and extending the operation of gas inspection every year, and for this purpose we must rent offices and increase the staff; but I think I shall be able to give the House a statement which will show that the increase which has taken place since 1878, in the number of officers and in the expenditure, has not been out of proportion to the increased duties imposed on the Department by the new industries under the regulation of the Department, which have been established in the country. The vote for stamps shows, apparently, an increase of $8,000. Last year $12,000 was voted in the ordinary Estimates, and $13,000 in the Supplementary Estimates, which brought the vote up to $25,000. The year previous there was $37,000 expended for the same purpose. So that this vote has really been reduced in two years by $17,000.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue what became of the $500 voted last year in the Estimates as an allowance to the Excise officers in British Columbia, to compensate for the increased cost of living as compared with the older Provinces. There has been no distribution of that amount, and I believe there is an Order in Council which precludes the possibility of its distribution in the direction in which it was put in the Estimates. What does the hon. gentleman intend to do, both with respect to this amount and the amount now in the Estimates?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that I was unable to expend that last year, on account of an Order in Council, which, I must say, appears to be a very reasonable one. That allowance is based upon the claim of increased cost of living, but an order was passed some two years ago declaring that when a salary of a person in Quebec, Manitoba, the North-West or British Columbia, was based on the scale of salaries applicable to the whole of the Provinces, he would be entitled to this allowance, but if fixed at a higher rate to meet this increased cost of living, it would be unreasonable to expect a further sum for that purpose.

Mr. BAKER. The hon. Minister, although nearly accurate, is not strictly so. When these salaries were arranged for the officers of the Department in British Columbia, 15 per cent. was allowed, not 25 as allowed to Manitoba. I know that the additional amount was not given to the Inspector of Inland Revenue; it may have been given to the Collector, but certainly not to the Inspector, and that officer is at present receiving less than any officer in the same position in the other Provinces. I would like to impress this on the hon. Minister.

CULLING TIMBER.

	Montreal.	
	Deputy Supervisor	$ 900 00
	Book-keeper and Clerk	600 00
	Quebec.	
	Supervisor	2,000 00
	Deputy Supervisor	1,600 00
	Cashier	1,400 00
	Specification Clerks	1,950 00
191	Messengers	350 00
	Specification Clerks, &c., 8 months—	
	1 at $1,000	
	2 at 700	
	3 at 600	5,300 00
	2 at 550	
	Assistant Book-keeper	1,100 00
	Total salaries	15,200 00
	Pay of Cullers	43,000 00
	Contingencies	8,000 00
	Annuities to superannuated Cullers	5,600 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to see this sum increased and the receipts diminished. Last year, apparently, we only had $41,162 deposited to the credit of the Receiver-General; and, under the circumstances, being out of pocket every year some $30,000, we are asked to increase this vote. It does appear to me that this is really a very considerable abuse in practice, and that we ought not to be paying two dollars for every one we get, for the purpose of culling timber which really does not belong to us at all.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman explain as to these superannuated cullers? I know it has been paid in former years.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is to make up for the decrease we propose in the pay of cullers. The decrease having been made in that item, an increase appears in the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still the increase is larger than the decrease. The increase is $5,600 and the decrease is $4,500, and the increased contingencies $3,700. The result is, as I stated, that we got last year $40,100, and on this we are called upon to pay $4,500 more. We are paying $31,800 more than we received in 1883. It does look like an abuse.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AAD GAS.

	Salaries of Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors of Weights and Measures	$43,950 00
	Salaries of Inspectors of Gas	11,450 00
	Salary of Commissioner of Standards	800 00
192	Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postages, stationery, &c., for Weights and Measures	17,200 00
	Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, &c., for Gas	6,500 00
	Salary of the Chief Inspector of Standards, to be transferred from the Inside Service	1,800 00

Mr. WELDON. I see a vote for gas. I understood the previous vote covered the gas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I stated that the $6,215 increase on the expenditure went to the Inspectors, Deputy Inspectors and Excisemen. As to Gas, there is an increase for travelling expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But here is a precisely similar item. "Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, &c., for Weights and Measures;" and immediately below, "ditto, ditto for Gas." If the hon. gentleman is taking here $6,500 for gas, I do not exactly see how he reconciles that with the statement he made a little while ago, that the increase of the last vote under the head of "Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c.," was largely due to the necessity of providing additional accommodation for Gas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; not accommodation for the officers, or anything like that. The $6,000 there, I stated, was largely on account of the additional travelling expenses incurred by the additional officers we had to appoint by extending the gas inspection to different cities, and by officers travelling more, on account of the great increase in the manufacturing establishments they had to visit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman specially refers to Gas, and here is a special vote for Gas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If I included that in the previous item, I should not have done it.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I desire to ask the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue if, in the aggregate here for the salaries of Inspectors of Gas, provision is made for the Inspector of Gas in the Province of British Columbia, and if it is his intention to put the Inspector of Weights and Measures and the Inspector of Gas together, to form a position separate and distinct from the Collector of Inland Revenue in that Province, and if provision is made in these Estimates for that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman as to the combination of the different offices he alludes to. I think I may say it is the intention to provide for the inspection of gas in British Columbia, and to appoint an officer.

Mr. BAKER. Hitherto the Collector of Inland Revenue in Victoria has performed the duties of Inspector of Weights and Measures. Now, in addition to that, I understand that an Inspector of Gas will be appointed. What I would desire to see, as representing that constituency, would be that the Inspector of Weights and Measures and the Inspector of Gas should be one and the same person, and that that same person should be separate and distinct from the Excise officer—should not be the same individual.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right, and it is upon that principle we generally act in making appointments.

Mr. BAKER. There is provision made in these Estimates for the appointment of an officer of that description.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; there is provision made.

INSPECTION OF STAPLES.

193	For the purchase and distribution of standards of flour, &c., and other expenditure under the Act	$3,000 00

ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

194	To meet expenses under the Act	$15,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman want the additional $3,000 for?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is a very small increase, I think. Under the vote of $12,000 we were enabled to maintain an analyst and provide for the inspection of food and drugs in Montreal, London, Halifax, St. John, Quebec and perhaps one or two more cities that I do not recollect now. It is desirable, of course, to extend the operations of that Act, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will admit that we cannot extend it very far with $3,000. We have made arrangements to extend it to Winnipeg. That will take part of the $3,000, and the balance will be used to extend it to any other city that we can with the means at the disposal of the Department.

MINOR REVENUES.

195	Minor Revenues	$5,000 00
	Dominion Lands	2,000 00

In answer to Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The vote for Minor Revenues includes such expenses, for instance, as the maintenance and care of the bridge at the Chaudière. We pay the officers, who are appointed by our Department. As for Dominion Lands, some of them are leased and our officers are appointed Collectors.

PUBLIC WORKS.

201	Collection of slide and boom dues	$20,985 00
202	Repairs and working expenses, Harbours and Slides	89,250 00
203	Telegraph Lines between Prince Edward Island and the mainland	2,000 00
204	Land and Cable Telegraph lines of the Sea Coasts and Islands of the Lower Rivers and Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Maritime Provinces	15,200 00
205	To meet the cost of working steamer *Newfield* when required on cable service	5,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in case a steamer may be required to repair the cables; it may not be expended at all. The small cable has been cut once and sometimes twice. It was cut accidentally by friction on the rocks.

206	Telegraph Lines, Manitoba and North-West Territories	$17,000 00
207	Telegraph lines, British Columbia	37,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes that to be so expensive? and what do the lines in Manitoba and British Columbia pay?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The revenue has been largely increasing in British Columbia during the last three years, but I cannot tell how much these lines pay. I will give a statement for both lines on Concurrence.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) In British Columbia the receipts last year were close upon $13,000.

Mr. GAULT. The Department is doing so well in British Columbia with the telegraph service that I hope the Government will very soon take over the whole of the telegraphic and telephone lines of the country into their own hands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a big question, which the Government will do well to consider. If I am rightly informed, the results in England have not been altogether so satisfactory as were expected. However, there is room enough for discussion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a big question, and I do not think that after midnight is a proper hour to discuss it.

208	Telegraph and Signal Service generally	$9,500 00
209	Agent and Contingencies, British Columbia	4,000 00

Mr. BAKER. I was not aware there was an agent specifically of the Department of Public Works in British Columbia. What is his salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The agent is the hon. Mr. Trutch, and the amount paid to him for the services he performs for the Department of Public Works is $600. There is also salary of the accountant, Macdonald, $1,200;

allowance to Gamble, engineer for services rendered in connection with works under the control of the Department of Public Works, $360; messenger, $400; stationery, $200; fuel, $200; advertisement for tenders, &c., $200; travelling expenses and contingencies, $840; total, $4,000.

Mr. BAKER. When Mr. Trutch was appointed agent, were the members for the Province of British Columbia consulted or asked about who should be appointed to the position?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The members of Parliament were not consulted. The appointment was made under the responsibility of the Government. We appointed a gentleman of high standing, and we have found him acting towards the Government in a very straightforward way, and I must say he is one of the best officers we have.

Mr. BAKER. I quite endorse what the hon. gentleman has said, but I desire to know whether members of particular constituencies or the Province generally have any say, or should be considered in these matters. That is all I wish to know. I am not casting any reflection on the integrity of the Minister of Public Works, or the ability of the gentleman so appointed. I have the very highest regard and esteem for both. At the same time, I desire, being a young politician, to know whether I have any right as a representative of a constituency, to have any say as to who shall be appointed to certain official positions in my constituency or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, who says he is a young politician and does not know exactly what position he holds, I may say this: Of course a member has a perfect right to make representations and give advice to the Government, and the Government having received such and having weighed them well, act on their responsibility, and they appoint those whom they think best qualified for the service, and for those appointments they are responsible to Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the hon. member that the extent of the power of members in respect of recommending persons to offices is very apt to depend on the majority possessed by the Government. I have seen the time, ten or eleven years ago, when the hon. gentleman could have got exactly what he wanted from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BAKER. I am speaking generally, not particularly in regard to this matter, and I thought it a very opportune moment to ask for the information I desired. I believe the appointment in question was made previous to my representation, and I heartily endorse the appointment; but, at the same time, I am looking a little into the future, possibly into the near future, and I desire to know whether I am to be consulted in regard to matters appertaining or pertinent to my constituency.

POST OFFICE.

210	Ontario	$1,102,475 00
	Quebec	585,084 00
	New Brunswick	206 270 00
	Nova Scotia	2 7,450 00
	Prince Edward Island	52,000 00
	British Columbia	87,237 00
	Manitoba, Keewatin and North-West	269,450 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any arrangement been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the mail service?

Mr. CARLING. The ordinary rates will be paid; there has been no special arrangement made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much per mile?

Mr. CARLING. That depends on the amount of business done. If the mails go by the fast train, 8 cents; if by ordinary trains, 6 cents and 4 cents, according to business done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We used to pay the Grand Trunk so much per mile over its entire length.

Mr. CARLING. That was a special arrangement with the Grand Trunk and also with the Great Western.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGAT. Then I understand that as regards the Canadian Pacific Railway, the arrangement is 8 cents, 6 cents, and 4 cents per mile.

Mr. CARLING. Yes; according to the business done, the number of trains and the speed of the trains.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to have a statement showing what was paid last year to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the estimate for the present year.

Mr. CARLING. They will be brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the present allowance paid the Grand Trunk and Great Western per mile?

Mr. CARLING. The present rates are: Grand Trunk, $160 per mile; Great Western, $124; Intercolonial, $132; Prince Edward Island, $40. The other companies are paid by the mile according to work done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the intention of the Government to make a mileage arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. CARLING. It is not at present the intention of the Government to do so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the mail service on those railway lines which have now only one service a day? I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the railway from Palmerston to Wiarton and Durham passes through a thickly settled country, and the people wish two mails per day each way. The expense would be light, as we have now two trains to Palmerston, and I hope the Minister, as he is increasing his vote, will be able to give the people along that line all the convenience and benefits which may arise from proper postal facilities. The people in that locality, in common with the people in the country generally, have been giving the people in the cities free delivery and additional mail service, and they think it is a reasonable thing that the Postmaster-General should increase the service in that part of Canada. On the one line, the places which would be benefited would be Palmerston, Mount Forest, Holstein and Durham; and on the other, Palmerston, Harriston, Ayton, Neustadt, Hanover, Elmwood, Chesley, Tara, Alanford, and Wiarton—all thriving business places. I believe that the increasing revenue from this change would be such that the increased outlay would not be felt.

Mr. CARLING. I may say that an application was made to the Department for the increased mail accommodation the hon. gentleman has spoken of. The matter has been referred to the inspector for a report, and as soon as that report is made to the Department, it will be favourably considered.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I would call the attention of the Minister to the necessity for increasing the service in the outlying municipalities around Montreal. The hon. gentleman has already considered the service in the post office in Montreal, and the new Hochelaga ward, but he is aware that outside the limits of the city there are a number of towns, such as St. Cunegonde, St. Jean Baptiste, and St. Gabriel, all large towns, which though not included in the municipal organization of Montreal are, to all intents and purposes, part of the city, and as such their postal service ought to be under the central office of Montreal, as there are large manufactories going on there all the time. I think the organization which has been adopted for Hochelaga ward should be adopted in all those municipalities. I hope the hon. Minister will give his attention to the matter.

Mr. CARLING. The Chief Inspector of the Department has been at Montreal for some time examining into the working of the post office system there, and I expect that shortly some of the improvements which the hon. gentleman has mentioned will be carried out.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is his intention to put on a daily mail between Portage la Prairie and Minnedosa, on the North Western Railway, as the people of Minnedosa only get a mail twice a week, although the trains are running daily. At Brandon, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is about the same distance, they have a regular mail, while in the case of Minnedosa, they have only two mails a week, and these mails are taken by stage a distance of 32 miles across the country.

Mr. CARLING. I understood that up to this time trains have not been running daily.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; they have.

Mr. CARLING. I believe a report has been sent in from the inspector, in regard to this matter, and if the railway company are running trains regularly, no doubt the arrangement will be made.

Mr. WATSON. Trains have been running daily for about six months.

Mr. GAULT. I am glad to see the great improvement in the postal facilities of Montreal, and I believe, before long, Montreal post office will be the model post office of the Dominion. I am glad the Postmaster-General is determined to make it so.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B. C.) I may state, that before leaving the capital last year, matters were arranged for the appointment of a city postmaster at Victoria, British Columbia. The salary of a second-class clerk was provided, $900 and, an addition of $600 to the inspector, making $1,500. My colleague and myself left here with the distinct understanding that that amount would be appropriated for the payment of the salary of city postmaster, separate and distinct from the Post Office Inspector. At that time the Post Office Inspector was also the city postmaster, receiving $2,400. The gentleman who holds the joint position is 63 years of age, and certainly has not the activity necessary for the position of city postmaster, so as to look after the young clerks in a proper way, and see that they perform their duties efficiently and persistently, as they should in so large and thriving a city as Victoria. I have no doubt that what has been done has been done unwittingly by the Postmaster-General, a gentleman for whom I entertain the highest respect, and I wish him to understand that when I protest against the change which has taken place, I do so in the interests of the public service of the constituency which we have the honour to represent. My colleague and I have advocated that the two positions should be kept separate and distinct. We were perfectly willing that the original Post Office Inspector should continue to hold that office and receive the salary which he then received; but what we really wanted was, a live man who would look after young fellows in the office, and see that they did their duty and would give satisfaction to the public. This can hardly be expected of a man who is sixty-three years of age. I think it would have been wiser to have left that gentleman in his position as Post Office Inspector, and to have appointed a gentleman whom we could recommend, under forty years of age. To my surprise and great chagrin, before reaching Ottawa this Session, the first notice I had of any change there was in an American paper, where I saw that the Post Office Inspector had been disrated, so to speak, and his subordinate, the assistant inspector placed over his head. I have every desire that Mr. Wallace should be retained in the position of inspector until he reaches the age of sixty-five, when I believe he should be compulsorily retired under the Civil Service Act, and the assistant inspector promoted in his place. Now, I notice that provision is made in the Estimates that that unfortunate individual who has been disrated to the city postmastership shall receive a salary of $2,400. I think the House will agree with me that under the Civil Service Act a city postmaster of the fifth class cannot receive more than $1,800. I am just as much one of the custodians of the public money as the members of the Cabinet, with all respect to them, and I would be failing in my duty if I did not point out this discrepancy. I move that $2,400 be struck out, and that $1,800 be substituted therefor. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works if I am not correct in the statement I make.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the appeal is made to me, I will answer the hon. gentleman is perfectly right, that if the present officer should die, and another man were appointed in his place, we should have to act according to the Civil Service Act. But as this officer occupied the double position, and received this salary, he must be left with the salary he had before.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to have an explanation from the Postmaster-General.

Mr. CARLING. I would say to the hon. member for Victoria that if a new postmaster had been appointed, certainly his recommendation and that of his colleague would have been taken; but in the interest of the public service, and of the Post Office service in British Columbia, it was thought well that the gentleman who was acting as postmaster and inspector should cease to hold the two offices, and should be appointed to the office of Postmaster in the city of Victoria, and that his assistant, Mr. Fletcher, who has had considerable experience in the Department at Ottawa, and been a considerable time in British Columbia, and who was a younger man than the gentleman who was acting as inspector and postmaster should be appointed inspector. I believe that Mr. Wallace, who was the inspector and postmaster, is a very efficient man, and fills the office very satisfactorily to the Department, and that Mr. Fletcher also gives great satisfaction. As my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, has stated, if Mr. Wallace should cease to hold that office, then the person appointed in his place would come under the Civil Service Act, and would receive a salary of something like $1,800; but so long as Mr. Wallace lives, we give the salary that he had when he held the two positions.

Mr. BAKER. If the Postmaster-General is perfectly satisfied with the incumbents of these offices, I have no complaint to make against them, or that they should receive these salaries. At the same time, I say it was very unfair to promote the junior over the head of the senior, and I know, of my own personal knowledge, that a gentleman who was at one time inspector and city postmaster went to his bed and was sick for a week on the subject. So he evidently was not satisfied. As a matter of justice to him, I would say it was unfair to promote his junior over his head, and I desire that this error should be rectified.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

FIRST READINGS.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally read the first time:—

Bill (No. 132) to extend to British Columbia certain criminal laws in force in other Provinces of the Dominion.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Bill (No. 133) to extend to the Province of Manitoba an Act for the more speedy trial, in certain cases, of parties charged with felonies and misdemeanours.—(Sir Hector Langevin).

Bill (No. 134) further to amend the Act respecting the Public Works of Canada.—(Sir Hector Langevin).

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The right hon. First Minister, having been obliged to leave the House, has asked me to say that a statement has appeared in the *Globe* newspaper that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have applied to the Government for a further loan of $5,000,000. There is no foundation at all for this statement. There has been no application, either by the Company or by any member or director of the Company, for any such loan or any loan whatever.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:20 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in moving the adoption of the Seventh Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, said: This report was presented yesterday, and appears in the Votes and Proceedings to-day. It contains a report of the Sub-Committee in which is recommended the payment of a small gratuity of $100 for services rendered last year by Mr. Romaine and his assistant in the stationery office, for special work performed in making indexes and work of that kind, the amount to be divided between those two officers. It also contains the printing accounts of the Printing Committee, and although they had been audited by Mr. McDougall, the Auditor-General, the Committee considered that it would be well to continue the practice of auditing the accounts which they had adopted in the past, and they caused them to be audited again, and now submit them to the House. The report also recommends the granting, in answer to applications made by Mr. Romaine and Mr. Sloane, of $300 to one and $200 to the other, for special services rendered by them in the stationery office. The duties of that office are set forth in the report which is presented, and I need not here specially refer to them. I may mention, however, Mr. Speaker, that up to within the last three years the proof-reading of all Parliamentary documents has been done by persons outside that office, with the exception of two documents, the list of bank shareholders and the penitentiary returns, which were read in the office of the Clerk of Stationery. The proofs of all the other documents were read by persons ontside, and at one time there were as many as four persons engaged outside the office in the work of proof-reading which is now done entirely within the stationery office. Then, Sir, the practice has also been recently adopted—and it is one of the services which it is proposed to reward in this report—of going carefully through all the documents and excluding from them duplicate matter and matter which is really not at all necessary to be printed; and when I tell the House that during the last year no less than 1,159 pages of manuscript were thrown out, without reference at all to the great care which had been exercised in condensing the matter which was put in, it will be admitted that a very substantial service has been rendered by that department in this connection. I may also say that the preparation of the index with the Sessional Papers and Journals of the Session, is done now in the office, though it had always been done previously by clerks outside the office. In addition to that those members who are familiar with the work in the office itself as to the manner in which the stationery is now kept, and as to the economy which has been effected in the purchase of a cheaper class of envelopes and a cheaper class of paper for the translators' office and the *Hansard*, will, I think, all admit what was testified to by a Committee of the last Parliament on the subject, that very much more than the salary paid in that office has been saved by the officers who are now in charge of it, by the skill and industry which they have displayed in conducting it. The proposal is that, in accordance with what has always been the practice of the Printing Committee, they shall receive a small gratuity in addition to their salaries, for special services rendered to the Committee itself.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When was the stationery office placed in charge of the Joint Committee on Printing?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The stationery office, I think, is not under the Committee; but this is work done in the stationery office—such work as proof-reading. The work of going through manuscript and excluding all unnecessary matter, and the work of preparing indexes for the Journals and appendices is certainly within the control of the Printing Committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The work is done in that office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The position is this: The Printing Committee appear to have assumed the charge of certain offices in the building which are in connection with the House of Commons. The Printing Committee have nothing to do with the stationery office or with the Journals; they have simply to do with the printing of documents referred to them by both Houses. I object to the motion for the adoption of the report on a point of order: the Committee's report deals with matters which were never committed to them. I ask that the report and appendix be read.

The motion was allowed to stand.

MEGANTIC CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment and decision of the said Court in the Election Appeal relating to the Electoral District of Megantic, in the Province of Quebec, wherein Louis Israel Côté, *alias* Fréchette, Appellant, and Jacques François Goulet, *et al*, Respondents, by which the said election was declared void.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House, that in conformity with the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 5, Section 36, he had issued his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out a new Writ of Election for the said Electoral District.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

The following Reports were laid upon the Table:—

Report on Weights and Measures, being Supplement No. 2 to the Report of Inland Revenue, 1883,—and Report on Adulteration of Food, being Supplement No. 3 to the

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, 1883.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Volume 2 of the Census of Canada.—(Mr. McLelan.)

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and the Acts amending it. He said: The first section repeals section 46 of the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and substitutes another in its place. The amendment consists in, first, providing for a temporary or permanent diversion of a street or highway, where otherwise the railway would cross on a level. Secondly, in giving the company power to enter upon lands not more than 200 yards distant from the centre of the railway, and not being a garden, or orchard, or park, &c., for the purpose of repairing the railway and for carrying out the requirements of the Railway Committee. Section two provides that the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, shall apply to all railways and railway companies subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. It will be remembered that a year ago an Act was passed in respect to this matter, exempting certain companies that had express legislative sanction, and the clause removes that exemption. Section three provides first, that a railway company shall not with its funds purchase its own stock; and second, that it shall not with its funds acquire the shares, bonds or other securities of any other railway company whose line competes, or may compete, with it. A proviso is, however, inserted that the section shall not effect the right of any railway company in Canada to purchase shares, bonds or other securities of railways in the United States of America. It will be remembered that when the River du Loup Branch was purchased from the Grand Trunk, a condition was made that the amount paid by the Government for that branch should be applied in accordance with the view of the Governor in Council. It was also stated that the intention of the Grand Trunk was to promote the extentson of the line to Chicago. Under these circumstances we feel it is right to make this exemption, otherwise we would prevent their carrying out the objects that were sanctioned. Section four provides for the appointment of commissioners to make enquiries into accidents on railways causing loss of life or damage to property. I may say that in consequence of the very terrible accident which occurred near Toronto by a collision in which there was a great loss of life, and in which a great many persons whose lives were not sacrificed were seriously injured, application was made to the Government by some of the public authorities asking the Government to cause a strict examination to be made into the accident; but on looking into the matter it was found that it was doubtful if the power was possessed by the Government to hold such investigation; and the object of this clause is to enable the Government in cases of that kind, to make enquiry into accidents on railways causing loss of life or damage to property. Section five adds to the powers of the Railway Committee, and gives them authority: First, to regulate the rate or speed at which trains and locomotives may be run in any city, town, or village; second, to regulate the use of the steam whistle within any city, town or village; third, to impose penalties for contravention of this section. Very many complaints are made in various sections of the country as to the use or rather the abuse of the steam whistle; and complaints have reached me from many localities where church congregations are thus disturbed on Sunday during service.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is a matter of municipal regulation. The municipalities have power to deal with it, and power to regulate it, and I know this has been done in very many cases.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At all events that question will come up when we deal with that clause of the Bill. I am inclined to think, however, that it would not be outside the authority of this Parliament, with regard to any railway under its control to provide for anything of that sort. I think it will be found that that authority will not interfere with any municipal right, or prevent the municipalities from taking such action as they may desire. The third clause imposes penalties for contravention of that section. The sixth section provides that trains shall not be allowed to stand on highways longer than five minutes at one time, and provides penalties for the contravention of this provision. After a good deal of examination into this question the Raiway Committee came to the conclusion that five minutes was a reasonable time and this amendment provides for carrying out the views then expressed. The seventh section provides that railway companies are to keep crossings in proper condition, and that persons for whose use such crossings are made shall keep the gates closed and shall be liable for a penalty for contravening the provisions of this clause. There has been a great deal of difficulty about this question of crossing and of keeping gates closed in connection with the killing of cattle on railways, and it has been a question as to where the fault lies for the killing of cattle which have had access to the road. The eighth section repeals the fourth subsection of the 15th clause of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1869, and substitutes another for it. The effect of the amendment is to make the section applicable to cases where a roadway is carried under as well as over a railway. Section nine provides that a Judge of the Superior Court or County Court, or in the North-West Territory a Stipendiary Magistrate, and not the Minister of Railways and Canals, shall appoint the third arbitrator. There is found to be a good deal of difficulty in these remote sections of the country, in obtaining the third arbitrator, as the law now provides that he shall be appointed by the Minister of Railways. That provision occasions a good deal of delay, and it is thought it will be better to place the appointment in the hands of a Judge of the Superior or County Court, and in the North-West Territory, a Stipendiary Magistrate. These are the general provisions of the Bill which I have the honour to introduce.

Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when the House adjourns this day it shall stand adjourned until Saturday at three o'clock, and that Government Orders shall have precedence on that day. He said: I have adopted the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is understood that we will have an evening session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair I wish to place a motion in your hands, and before doing so I will speak to the subject matter of the motion as briefly as I can. The rapid increase of the expenditure of this country, especially for the last two years, is in my opinion a matter that ought to excite alarm. And although the increase in the Customs taxation in this country has been very large indeed, that increase amounting to $12 per head of a family in the year 1883, as compared with 1878, yet, in the face of

that very material increase, the public debt is increasing very rapidly, and will continue to increase still more rapidly in the near future. The financial history of this Dominion naturally divides itself into three periods, the first period extending from the date of Confederation to the year 1873, when the Reform Administration came into power; the second period extending from 1873 to the year 1878, when the gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches came into power again, and the third period extending from the time these gentlemen came back to office, down to the present day. The expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund in the year 1867-68, was $13,486,092; in 1873-74, it was $23,316,316, or an increase in six years of $9,830,000, or an annual average increase of $1,635,000. The expenditure for the first year of the second period, commencing with 1873-74, was $23,316,316. The expenditure for the year 1877-78 was $23,503,158, an increase of $186,842 for the period, or an average annual increase of $46,710. For the third period the expenditure, commencing with the year 1877-78, was $23,503,158, and the expenditure, based on the Estimates for the current fiscal year, will be $32,009,747, or an increase of $8,506,589, or an average annual increase for the third period of $1,417,764. And if we were to add one important item, now charged to capital account, which during the *regime* of the Reform Administration was charged to income, to wit, the expenditure on Dominion Lands Surveys—if that were added, as it should be added, to the current expenditure chargeable to income, the sum would be $652,000 larger. In that case, the total increase would amount to $9,058,589, or an average annual increase of $1,509,444. As is well known, Sir, the expenditures of this country are placed under three distinct heads—first, expenditure for debt and subsidies, an expenditure over which Parliament has very little control; second, ordinary controllable expenditure; and third, charges upon revenue, for carrying on Customs, Excise, post offices, public works, &c. Now, Sir, the desire of a Government to exercise economy must be shown in the matter of controllable or ordinary expenditure; and that expenditure, we shall find, increased in the first period I have named, the period from 1867 to 1873 with extraordinary rapidity. In 1867-68 the controllable expenditure was $3,630,298; in 1873-74 it was $8,324,076; or an increase in six years of $4,693,778, or 123 per cent., the average annual increase being $728,296. The record of the Reform Administration presents a great contrast. Commencing with an ordinary controllable expenditure in 1873-74 of $8,324,076 they reduced it to $6,542,510 in 1877-78, a decrease of $1,781,566, or 21 per cent. Coming down to the third period, we find that the controllable expenditure increased from $6,542,510 in 1877-78 to $9,253,870 in 1882-83, an increase of $2,711,360, or 41 per cent. Briefly, then, the controllable expenditure shows an increase in the first period from 1867 to 1873 of 128 per cent., a decrease from 1873 to 1878 of 21 per cent., and an increase again from 1878 to 1883 of 41 per cent.; and if we summarize these results, and place the first and the third period together, amounting to 13 years, we shall find that the total increase in the expenditure chargeable to the Consolidated Fund during those periods was $18,336,812, or an average annual increase of $1,410,524, while the average annual increase under the Reform *regime*, in the second period was $46,710; or, to place the contrast in another light, the average annual increase under the Conservative Administration during those two periods was thirty-fold greater than the average annual increase under the Reform Administration, from 1873 to 1878.

Now, Sir, I have hitherto assumed that my hon. friend at my right was only responsible for the expenditures in the years 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878. The Reform party, if my recollection serves me, took office on the 8th of November, 1873. At that time a little over three months of the financial year had passed away, and seven months and twenty-two days of the financial year were under the supervision of my hon. friend at my right. The Reform Government resigned on the 10th of October, 1878, giving to our friends opposite eight months and twenty days of that financial year. Now, Sir, a more accurate mode of making a comparison between the expenditures of the two Administrations can be adopted than that which I have pursued. If we take the sum which my hon. friend opposite took power to expend for the year 1873-74, and if we find that that sum was not exceeded by the expenditure actually made, then I think we may reasonably assume that the hon. gentleman was responsible for the expenditure of that year. Now, I find that my hon. friend opposite took power to expend in the year 1873-74 $23,685,000, made up as follows:—

By original Estimate	$20,941,183
By first Supplementary Estimate	368,340
By second " "	57,300
By third " "	100,000
By 36 Vic., chaps. 30 and 41, and New Brunswick Subsidy (assumed Provincial debts)	819,349
By 36 Vic., chap. 31 (provided increased salaries, &c)	300,555
By 36 Vic., chap. 40 (provided admission of Prince Edward Island)	418,000
By 36 Vic., chap. 35 (provided organization of Mounted Police	200,000
By balance carried forward under Order in Council	480,282
Total	$23,685,009

This sum was not exceeded by the actual expenditure made by my hon. friend at my right. On the contrary, he reduced it by $369,000, his actual expenditure being $23,316,316. For this reason we can properly hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for the total expenditure of 1873-74. Now, Sir, the Estimates of my hon. friend at my right, including the Supplementary Estimates, for the year 1878-79—of which year hon. gentlemen opposite were in office for eight months—amounted to $23,669,000. Now, the question is, had my hon. friend remained in office, would the expenditure for that year have exceeded this estimate? I believe I am warranted in saying that it would not, and I will cite some corroborative evidence bearing on the matter. I find that the expenditure of 1876-77 was $23,519,301, and the expenditure of 1877-78 was $23,503,158, a decrease of $16,143. Well, Sir, the Estimates for 1878-79 provided for an increase over the expenditure of 1877-78 of $165,842. Bearing in mind, therefore, the fact that the expenditure in the preceding year had decreased, as compared with the expenditure for the year which preceded that, I think I am warranted in saying, that had my hon. friend remained in power, the expenditure of 1878-79 would not have exceeded the Estimates for that year. I think we are warranted in saying, and I think my hon. friend will bear me out in asserting that the expenditure for 1878-79 would not have exceeded the estimates made by my hon. friend, to-wit $23,669,000. This, therefore, establishes a basis upon which to make a comparison as to the expenditure during these different periods; and upon this basis we find that my hon. friend opposite did expend in 1878-79 $786,381 more than my hon. friend on my right had estimated the expenditure for that year would be. On this basis, the expenditure for 1873-74, when the Reform Administration came into power, was $23,316,000, while the expenditure for 1878-79, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite was $23,669,000, or an increase during that period of $352,684, making an average annual increase of $70,536. In making a comparison upon this more accurate basis, we find that the increase during the third period, the period from 1879, to the present day, has been from $23,669,000 to $32,009,747, or a total increase of $8,340,747, being an average annual increase of $1,168,165. Now a comparison of the increases

on this true basis would show as follows:—From 1868 to 1874, the increase was $9,830,223, averaging annually $1,638,370; the annual average increase in the period from 1878-79 to 1883-84 was $1,668,105, based upon the estimates of the current fiscal year; and the average annual increase under the Reform Administration was $70,536. This reveals this startling fact that the ratio of increase in the first period from 1867 to 1873-74 was 23 fold greater than the increase under the Reform Administration, and that the ratio of increase in the second period from 1878-79 to 1883-84 was 23 6-10 fold greater than the ratio of increase in the preceding period under the Reform Administration. This shows a remarkable contrast between the first period and the second—showing an increase 23 fold greater in the first compared with the second; and a still more remarkable contrast between the second and third, the increase in the latter being 23 6-10 fold over the former. What greater financial contrast could be presented between the Administration under Reform and the Administration under Conservative control? I am well aware that my hon. friend will say that the increase in expenditure is more apparent than real; I am well aware that he will advance the argument that many public works were created, and that from the cost of management of these public works which is set down in the expenditure should be deducted to the revenue derived from these public works, to arrive at a true estimate of the increase of the expenditure of the country. I admit there is force in that contention, but if it were applied to the second period, the period of the Reform Administration from 1873 to 1878, if from the cost of managing the public works created by that Administration had been deducted the revenue derived from these works, the expenditure under the Reform Administration would have shown a large reduction instead of a slight increase, as compared with that under the preceding and subsequent Conservative Administrations. The truth is that our expenditure for the purpose of creating public works has gone on with tolerable regularity since 1871. The expenditure on public works in the second period of which I have been treating, the period when the Reform Administration was in power, was largely in excess of that in the first of these periods from 1867 to 1873, and was very little less than that in the third period from 1878 to the present time; and the population increased as rapidly in that period of the Reform Administration as in the previous one and more rapidly than in the subsequent one. The Reform Administration were called on to provide increased postal facilities and incur increased expenditure in consequence of increased population; our settlement had already commenced in the North-West; and the Reform Government spent over $40,000,000 in the creation of public works. I hold therefore that the argument that the increase of expenditure is more apparent than real, in consequence of the fact that public works have been created and the cost of maintaining them charged to expenditure, will apply with equal force to the period from 1873-74 to 1878-79 as to the preceding and subsequent periods.

So much for the question of increases in expenditure. I now propose very briefly to refer to the increase in the public debt under the Reform Administration as compared with the increase in this debt under the present Administration. It is well known that an estate may be encumbered by its possessor and that his heirs and assigns are bound to pay the obligations incurred by him; and it is well known that a Government may incur obligations which its successors are obliged to discharge. Were the Reform party to get into power to morrow, they would be bound to carry out the obligations of the Government now in power; they would be bound to carry out the odious Syndicate contract which they fought with all the energy they possessed; they would be bound to carry out the arrangements made this Session by which the Government has become sponsor and partner in a great railway monopoly. They would not be responsible for these obligations; but in carrying on the Government of the country, they would be obliged to fulfil the obligations entered into by their predecessors in office. When my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) became First Minister, he found certain obligations resting on the country; and in discharging these obligations, he was compelled to expend large sums of money. The expenditure in each of these years, therefore, increased largely, not in consequence of any motion or act of his, but in carrying out the obligations entered into by his predecessors, obligations for which he was not responsible and against the incurring of many of which he had strongly protested. As First Minister, however, he was bound to see that they were discharged. On the 30th of June, 1874, our public debt amounted to $108,324,964; on June 30th, 1879, it had increased to $142,990,187, or an increase of $34,665,223. There is the fact admitted then of the increase in the public debt; the next question to examine is the cause of that increase. Was it in consequence of any act of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie)? I answer it was not. What then was the cause? The hon. gentlemen now in power had made a certain contract or arrangement for the construction of a railway from the St. Lawrence river to Halifax, the Intercolonial Railway. The increase in the debt in consequence of this work amounted to $5,283,965; the increase due to the Canadian Pacific was $11,032,617, and the increase through work on the canals and other public works, $17,645,985, and out of this entire sum, my hon. friend was only responsible for an expenditure of $250,000 on the St. Peter's Canal. These expenditures make up the increase of the debt less $682,656 and that deficiency is more than accounted for by payments into the sinking fund. Or we could make a comparison extending over a little broader period. The debt on the 30th June, 1873, was $99,848,461, and on the 30th June, 1879, $142,990,187, or an increase of $43,041,726; and it was caused by these expenditures—debts allowed to Provinces in 1873, $4,927,060; increase due to Intercolonial Railway, $8,701,626; increase due to Canadian Pacific Railway, $11,362,841; increase due to canal enlargement and public works, $18,172,796; total, $44,164,323, or an expenditure for these objects in excess of the increase of the public debt for that period of $1,122,597, for all of which again the Government now in power were responsible, except the paltry expenditure upon the St. Peter's Canal. It may be said that my hon. friend might have cancelled these contracts, that he might have ceased these expenditures.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There were no contracts made.

Mr. CHARLTON. What would have been said if the expenditure upon the Intercolonial road, which was almost half completed, had been suspended? What would have been said by the Opposition if the policy of the Government as to the expenditure for the enlargement of the canals had been suspended? What would have been said if no attempt had been made to afford the North-West an outlet, which it had become apparent was necessary? Why, my hon. friend was obliged, under the very circumstances of the case, to proceed with these expenditures that had been entered upon by the preceding Government and with these works which had been largely advanced by them.

We may hold, then, that the Administration of my hon. friend from East York was characterized, first, by an arrest in the increase of expenditure. The Government that had preceded him had increased the expenditure $9,800,000 in round numbers in six years. He arrested this increase, and it only amounted to $365,852, on the correct basis of comparison, in five years. The percentage of increase of expenditure, on this basis of calculation, under my hon. friend, amounted for five years to seven-tenths of one per

cent. only, while the increase of the population of this country during the same period was over 8 per cent., or the ratio of the population increase was eleven times greater than the ratio of increase in expenditure. The Administration of my hon. friend was characterized, secondly, by an arrest in the increase of debt, except as due to the obligations incurred by his predecessors. It was characterized, in the third place, by honesty in the mode of letting contracts. A clause was inserted in the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill of 1874 which debarred that Government from letting any contract for more than $10,000 without having first advertised for tenders, a clause which was entirely disregarded by their successors when the Syndicate contract was entered into, although that Statute was still in force. He made provision in reference to tenders for public contracts requiring a deposit of 5 per cent. of the amount as an evidence of good faith, and to prevent a species of thimble-rigging and log-rolling by which other than the lowest tenders were saddled upon the Government. In all this we had an example of frugality, of economy, and of honesty, and that example stands in striking contrast to the example of extravagance, waste, and reckless increase in expenditure that characterizes the period before and the period subsequent to the period when my hon. friend was in office.

Now I intend to make two or three pertinent comparisons between the debt burden, the interest charge, and the expenditure of this country and of the United States. And, Sir, if these comparisons should be unfavourable to Canada, I trust I may not be accused of lack of patriotism, for certainly I do not believe it is the duty of a patriot to conceal the truth from his fellow citizens. In the intimate relations in which the United States and Canada are placed towards each other, the financial condition of one of the countries, if much worse than that of the other, must necessarily exercise an unfavourable influence upon its progress. Both countries have large areas of unoccupied lands, both countries are desirous of having their latent resources developed, both countries desire to prevent an exodus of their own citizens, both countries desire to secure immigration of the right class; and, in order to retain their own citizens at home, in order to offer inducements to foreigners to emigrate to either of the countries, it is desirable that one country should not have a heavier debt burden, a greater amount of expenditure, a heavier interest charge than the other; and, if Canada is advancing rapidly to a position where its debt charge *per capita* will be very much larger than that of the United States, where its interest charge and its expenditure account will be heavier, where its Customs duty taxation will be heavier, all these things will exercise an unfavourable influence upon the prosperity of the country; and it is the duty of the Government of this country to avoid any such result as that. Unfortunately we have advanced very far towards obtaining a position were a contrast between ourselves in this respect and the United States would be very unfavourable to us, and for this reason I hold, among others, that it is necessary we should call a halt in the progress we are making towards financial embarrassment. I shall make these few comparisons and then conclude. I take the population of the United States in 1883 at 54,000,000, and the population of Canada at 4,400,000. I find that the Customs and Excise of the United States for that year amounted to $359,426,864, or $6.65 per head of the population; that the Customs and Excise for Canada amounted to $29,269,698, or $6.65 per head—identically the same. I find that the Customs duties, leaving out the Excise, for the United States were $214,706,496, or $3.97 per head; and for Canada, $23,009,582, or $5.22 per head; excess of Canada over the United States, $1.25 per head, or 31 per cent. I find that the gross expenditure, including capital account, stood as follows:—United States, $265,408,131, or per head, $4.91; Canada, $42,901,560, or per head, $9.75; difference per head, $4.84 against Canada; difference per cent., 98 against Canada. I find, if we compare the United States gross expenditure, capital expenditure and all, with our own expenditure chargeable to income, we get the following result:—Gross expenditure of the United States, as stated before, $265,408,131, or $4.91 per head; expenditure of Canada chargeable to Consolidated Fund, $28,730,151, or $6.52 per head; difference, $1.61 per head against Canada's Consolidated Fund expenditure compared with the American gross expenditure, or 32 per cent. The expenditures of the United States are exceptionally large, because that country is placed in exceptional circumstances. It is not many years since the country passed through a great civil struggle, and it has an enormous pension list. That pension list, for the year 1883 amounted to $66,012,000. In addition to that it has a large army and navy list amounting to $64,194,000 for that year. The total under these three heads was $130,206,000. Now, Sir, our expenses for the same items, including mounted police, for that year were $1,310,625; and if we make these deductions in each case from the expenditure the statement will stand as follows: Gross expenditure in the United States, deducting the three items of pensions, army and navy, $135,102,000, or $2.50 per head; Canada, gross expenditure chargeable to income only, after deducting these items, $27,419,562, or $6.23 per head. If we take Canada's gross expenditure as compared with that of the United States it would be deducting these items, $41,590,935, or $9.38 per head. In the one case, comparing Canada's gross expenditure with that of the United States, the excess in Canada would be 275 per cent. over that of the United States, and in the other case, taking the gross expenditure of the United States and deducting the items of pensions, army and navy in each country, and comparing that with the expenditure of Canada chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, the excess for Canada would be 149 per cent. In addition to this the United States have their consular and diplomatic service to provide for, which is another expense in excess of any we have in this country to speak of. If we go back a few years in the history of the United States, and take that country when its condition nearly resembled our own in regard to development and wealth per head, if we take, for instance, the period from 1850 to 1849 inclusive, a period of ten years, I find that the revenue of that country from Customs and Excise duty amounted to $217,411,000, or an annual average of $21,741,000 for that period, on an average population of 20,130,000. Take Canada from 1874 to 1883 inclusive, when our condition more nearly resembled that of the United States in the period mentioned, and we will find in that ten years that the revenue from Excise and Customs amounted to $210,936,000, or an annual average of $21,093,000 on an average population of 4,070,000. The average annual taxation from Customs and Excise per head was, in the United States, $1.08 per head, while in Canada it was $5.15, or 4·9 times greater in Canada than in the United States. Now, when we contrast our present condition and state of development with that of the United States during the period of ten years I have mentioned, and when we consider that our expenses now are nearly five times greater per head than were those of the United States at that time, I think we may reasonably assert that our expenses are altogether too high. In the matter of the public debt, I find that the public debt of the United States on March 1st, was $1,483,501,000; that debt was reduced in the month of March by $15,000,000 in round numbers, making the debt on the 1st of April, $1,468,501,000, or an amount per head of $26.68 on an estimated population of 55,000,000. The public debt of Canada according to official returns, on the 1st of January—the net public debt—was $163,578,402, or an amount per head of $36.33 on an estimated population of 4,500,000, which

is undoubtedly too high. I find, Sir, that the debt of of Canada exceeds that of the United States by $9.65 per head, or 36 per cent. Now, the United States debt is rapidly decreasing; there was a reduction of $15,000,000 last month, and the reduction during the present year will probably be more than $100,000,000. We may reasonably suppose that in three years from this time that debt will not exceed $1,300,000,000, or a *per capita* charge on the present population of $23.63; while we may assume with equal certainty that within the next three or four years our own net public debt will reach the sum of $200,000,000, or a *per capita* charge upon the present population of $44.44, or in three years from this time it will be within a fraction of double that of the United States. I have no doubt that when the three years have elapsed we will find that the net charge is double, *per capita*, that of the United States, which will be a very bad showing for this country indeed. The interest charge per head was 95 cents in the United States for the past year, while it is $ .75 per head in Canada, an excess of interest charge in Canada of 80 cents per head, or an excess of 84 per cent. as compared with that of the United States. Now, Sir, it is but a few years ago—I do not remember the exact number, but not more than six years ago, certainly—when the case was reversed and when the interest charge in the United States exceeded that in Canada. It is only five or six years since the orbits of the two countries crossed, and since that time our interest charge has been increasing over that of the United States until to-day it is 84 per cent. greater. I will not trouble the House further with comparisons. These figures challenge attention.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. An hon. gentleman says, "Yes." So they do, Mr. Speaker. The fact that the annual expenditure of this country has increased in the last five years over $8,300,000 as compared with an increase of $365,000 in the preceding five years; the fact that notwithstanding the great increase of taxation the public debt of this country is rapidly advancing in volume; the fact that the policy of the Government is distasteful to a large portion of the people of this country in the matter of its Syndicate contract, in the matter of its partnership lately entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the matter of its land policy—all these facts are producing their legitimate and natural result; and, Sir, there will doubtless be a greater exodus from Canada in the present year than this country has ever seen before. Rumours of this come from every part of the West. From my own riding I hear that sixty families are moving from one township to the United States; I hear that the very best men in that Province are moving, not to the North-West, but to the United States. I hear complaints coming from all parts of the West, that the country is ruined, that it is no longer prudent to remain in this country, that the Government of the day are involving it in difficulties so great that the property of this country must continue to decrease in value, and that its development and prosperity are likely to be arrested if this policy is continued. That feeling, Sir, is producing its natural results; that feeling, Sir, is one that is going to produce disaster in this country, and, unfortunately, that feeling has, to a certain extent, good ground for its existence; unfortunately, Sir, the management, or rather the mismanagement of the affairs of this country, has been so reckless and has increased the taxation so largely, and the prospective increase of the public debt is so great, that business men deem it only prudent to flee from the wrath to come. I think, Sir, that we ought to do something to avert the ruin to which we are hastening. I shall not detain the House any longer, but move the following amendment:

That all the words after "that" in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

Mr. CHARLTON.

The Expenditure for 1878, was $23,503,158.25;—that the Estimates for 1884 amount to $32,009,747.48, that the increase of expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund between 1878 and the succeeding years, is as follows:—

1879	increase over 1878	$	952,223 31
1880	" "		1,347,476 20
1881	" "		1,999,396 17
1882	" "		3,553,945 33
1883	" "		5,226,999 20
Estimates of 1884	" "		8,506,589 13

That the expenses of Dominion Land Surveys, amounting to $652,000 in the Estimates of 1884, which are charged to Capital Account, are of a character more properly chargeable to Income, as was done in 1878; and they increase the excess of expenditure over that year to $9,058,589.13.

That the revenue from Customs for the year 1878 was $12,782,824, being a tax of $15.60 per head of a family on the estimated population of Canada in 1878, while the revenue from Customs for the year 1883 was $23,009,582, being a tax of $25.70 per head of a family on the estimated population of Canada in 1883.

That a very large proportion of the expenditure consists of fixed charges, or charges of a permanent character, which, when once created, are difficult of reduction.

That recent legislation, and the completion of existing engagements will result in a large increase of the public debt, and a steady increase of the public charges.

That this House views with regret the great increase in the burdens imposed upon the people by Customs duties, and the undue and rapid increase of the expenditure.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, if such statements as have been made by the hon. member had been presented to the House for the first time, and had not been many times answered, I would have felt it to be my duty to have occupied more time in answering them than I think it necessary at this late period of the Session; and I think I will meet the wishes of the House by dealing with them as briefly as possible, and by taking up only a few of the leading points in order to show the fallacy of those statements. The hon. gentleman has drawn a contrast between taxation in the United States and taxation in Canada. The hon. gentleman had a perfect right to do so, and this course could not be objected to, because in dealing with the condition of our country it is quite natural we should consider it as compared with that of the country lying alongside of it. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to the statements he made on that subject, instead of launching out to speak of the dissatisfaction that existed in his locality with respect to the state of affairs in Canada driving, as he says, people out of the country by hundreds and thousands, he would have acted more wisely, and he would have shown more patriotism than he has shown on this and former occasions. It must be borne in mind that the condition of Canada differs very materially from that of the United States. The General Government contributes nothing whatever to the support of the different States. Under our constitution it is provided that a very large proportion of the money required for education, railways and bridges, and other objects, which otherwise would compel direct taxation, is furnished by the Dominion Government and the Provinces are relieved to that extent of taxation. I recollect when visiting the United States some years ago, in conversation with a friend relative to the taxation of the country, he said the taxation of the General Government was nothing compared with the State and local taxation; and he brought out a statement to show that he paid that year no less than 3 per cent. on the value of his property for local and State taxes. We have comparatively no direct taxation in this country for Provincial purposes. The different Provinces are sustained very largely out of the subsidies granted by the Dominion Government, for which the people generally are taxed; and if the hon. gentleman had been fair and desired that the country should occupy its true position in the eyes of our American neighbours and the outside world, he would have said that it is but right I should point out that such difference between the taxation in the two countries is more apparent than real. It would have been better for the hon. gentleman had he

done so. We know that a large portion of the debt of the United States was created by the civil war, we know that the debt of Canada has been created—and I have the declaration of the hon. member for West Huron in support of my statement—that in the expenditure for public works we have indirect value, if not direct value, for the expenditure. We have subsidized railways, and constructed railways; we have the best canal system in the world, which has cost millions; we have indeed a great deal to show that the net debt of Canada has been in a large degree created by the construction of these valuable public works. The hon. gentleman should have called attention to that fact, and he might have taken the prospectus issued by the late Finance Minister in London, and shown that although our debt is large, and has been increasing for a number of years, yet we have good value to show for it. That would have been a better line to have taken, and one more in the interests of the country, and it would have shown the condition of the Dominion more fairly than it has been represented by the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, it has been a common thing for the last six or seven years or more—aye, for ten years—to speak of the debt of the Dominion of Canada in 1867, and compare it with 1873-74. Why, Sir, do we not know that a large portion of the increase of that debt was not oppressive to the people of the Dominion of Canada—was not in fact a tax on the people of Canada; it was simply assuming on the part of the Dominion of Canada the debt which had rested on the Local Legislatures, they having the general power of taxation, which the Local Legislatures had not; so that it was simply taking the money out of one pocket and putting it in the other, and was not increasing the burdens of the people. Still we are told that this increase of debt, which was perhaps $14,000,000 or $15,000,000, assumed by the Government of Canada in 1873, was an increased burden on the people, when as a matter of fact, it was no such thing. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman prides himself on the fact that there was no great increase of expenditure from 1873 to 1878. Why, Sir, we had no new Provinces coming in during that period. But what had we done from 1867 in 1873? We had brought in Prince Edward Island, and with her we had necessarily to have an increase of debt, because we gave to that Province what we had ourselves, and a little more, as the debt which her people were permitted to come in under, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the case. We brought in an increased population, and with them we brought in an increase of the debt. We brought in British Columbia, and with her came an increased population, increased territory, and an increased debt. With Manitoba and the North-West we brought in an increased population, a largely increased territory, and an increased debt—all these Provinces adding to the debt and adding to the expenditure. And yet the hon. gentleman affirms that the increased expenditure from 1867 to 1873, was a proof of the extravagance of the Government of that day. In 1867, when this Union was formed, we did not know what our revenues would be, what our circumstances financially were to be; and the greatest economy had to be used for the first two or three years. Scarcely any money was spent on public buildings and public works, and the Finance Minister of the day gave as a justification for his asking for only a few hundreds of thousands of dollars for public works throughout the Dominion, that he wished to see what our position was to be, what revenue would be at our disposal; and as the revenues came in under the Tariff of 1867-68, and as they increased, the Government and Parliament felt that they might increase the expenditure, and they went on to establish lighthouses, to increase the facilities for the commerce and trade of the country, erecting public buildings, finishing the Parliamentary and public buildings in Ottawa, and other public buildings throughout the Dominion. They did this because they had the means, because it was in the interest of the country that the expenditure should be made, it was in fact demanded by the people. And now we are to be told that at that day we were extravagant, because we used the means at our disposal—not incurring any debt, but had surpluses every year, in order to give the facilities and advantages which the country felt they ought to have, and which as a matter of fact they did receive. It was natural that we should do so—we could not have done otherwise. If the hon. gentleman extended his own business operations, so as to double them within two or three years, would any person say he was extravagant if he showed, at the end of the period, double his former expenditure, providing his profits had equally increased—providing they were sufficient not only to cover that double expenditure, but to give him a double profit at the end of the year? Who would say that under these circumstances he was reckless or extravagant in the administration of his affairs. That was exactly our position. We had enlarged our territory; we had added to our Dominion Provinces and Territories extensive and valuable. We had developed the resources of the country, and were then having surpluses, notwithstanding this increased expenditure, notwithstanding that we had not increased the taxation of the people so far as increased duties were concerned. But if we were extravagant, why did not hon. gentlemen in 1873-74 lay their hands upon the expenditure; why did they not reduce it? But we know that they did not do it. And what was the fact? The fact was simply this, that in addition to the other expenditure I have referred to, one of the conditions of Union was that the Intercolonial Railway was to be constructed, and that as rapidly as the means of the country would warrant, we were to enlarge and extend our canal system. In compliance with these terms of Union we commenced the construction of the Intercolonial Railway and our successors did what was right and proper, did what they were bound to do, they went on to complete it, adding to our expenditure and adding to our debt, during the time they were in power. But hon. gentlemen did not diminish the expenditure chargeable to consolidated revenue. It is true they did not increase it very largely, though they did to some extent increase the expenditure from 1873 to 1878; but, Sir, to say that the two Administrations were to be judged by the increased expenditure as between the one period and the other is a fallacy. Sir, it is not logical, because we had increased our population, we had brought in new Provinces bringing in with them new debts and new expenditures, and we had not at the same time increased the taxation. The hon. gentleman refers to the large sum of money they were compelled to expend. He says they spent $19,000,000 on canals, and he has asserted that the only increase of debt during the period from 1873 to 1878 for which they were responsible was $200,000. Why, Sir, where are the deficits to begin with? Was the debt of the Dominion not increased by the deficits, and were not they responsible for those deficits? Were they not responsible for the construction of the canals. I do not complain, I do not say that they should not have constructed them, but still they were not bound to carry out all those works, or to expend much of the $19,000,000 which the hon. gentleman claims we had thrown upon them; because it is well-known that while tenders were in the hands of the Minister of Public Works when they came into power in 1873, we know that they did not accept those tenders. We know that they advertised anew. They were not bound to do so; they were not under contract for a great deal of the work entered into. If the Government considered it wise and judicious that the expenditure on canals should be suspended they might have done so. I do not say they ought to have done it; I do not take that view, because they were in a position of carrying out in good faith the en-

gagements made under the terms of Union, as rapidly as the means of the country would warrant; but they might have been justified, under the condition of things which then existed, in not carrying them out; because the condition of the finances of the country was not perhaps such as to compel them to do it. But they did go on. and they increased the debt from $37,000,000 to $40,000,000 during that period. Now, that itself is an important item, and it cannot be shown that they were compelled to incur it. When the hon. gentleman points out that the expenditure was twenty-three times greater from 1867 to 1873, or from 1878 to 1883, than it was in their time, I do not see how he works it out. But there is one way of solving this question, and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show that I am in error. I assert it as a true test of the comparative extravagance of the two Governments, and the taxation upon the people. I say, as I have said before, that if hon. gentlemen opposite had paid all their expenditure chargeable to consolidated revenue during their term of office, and we had simply collected what was necessary to pay the expenditure, including this year—in which is the largest expenditure we have had, because we will have $3,750,000, or $1,250,000 more than usual—the taxation for Customs and Excise, which is the direct and only taxation our people have to pay, has been less per head of the population during our five years than it was during their Administration. I make that statement, and I am prepared to stand by it—that the taxation imposed upon the people from 1873-74 to 1878-79 was as much per head of the population as it has been in our period, though we have expended large sums of money since 1878 upon public works—upon our canals and our railways. It is quite true, we have collected more taxation from the people; but what have we done with it? We have expended $37,000,000 in public works during that period; yet, while their debt increased by $37,000,000, ours increased only by $15,000,000. Under these circumstances, I cannot see why there should be that fear and dread that the hon. gentleman has spoken of among his friends in the West, unless he has engendered it, as some of his friends have stimulated the discontent in Manitoba and the North-West. He calculates that the Estimates for this year are $32,900,000. They are, but the expenditure will not amount to that; I do not think that the total expenditure of the present year will exceed $31,300,000 or $31,400,000; and for the next year it is to be hoped, even with the Estimates which we are yet to bring down, that the expenditure will be even less than that of the present year. Sir, I do not feel that, in incurring the expenditures which the Government of Canada have been incurring during the last two or three years, for the rapid extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for deepening and enlarging of our canals,—about the propriety of which there may perhaps be some doubt—although it gives us one of the largest and best inland navigation systems in the world—and for the development of all our resources—I do not feel that there is any ground for the distrust which the hon. gentleman has spoken of. On the contrary, while it is true that we are incurring larger expenditures, and while Parliament will be asked in a few days to take upon itself an additional burden—and yet not really an additional burden, because it is to relieve the Provinces of an amount of taxation that they would have to pay into their local treasuries—while we are doing all this, we feel, and have a right to feel, that the people of this country will not be discouraged and disheartened as to the future, and will not be dissatisfied with the course that the Government have been and are pursuing for the development of the country; but, on the contrary, will feel that life is short, and that if we are to have any benefit from these expenditures, we are not to wait for a century or a quarter of a century for them, but that we and our children should derive some of the advantages from these expenditures.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to detain the House any longer than I can help; but it is a matter of regret to me, and I think it ought to be a matter of regret even to the hon. Minister himself, that it has been found necessary to defer the consideration of Supplementary Estimates of such magnitude to so very late a period in the Session. It is little less than a public scandal that we should be called upon at this time to deal with questions involving the addition of $1,000,000 to the expenditure of 1883-84, and with other questions involving the addition of many millions to the public debt. Why, we have not even all the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1884-85 before us.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We did not force this question now upon the hon. member.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but I say it is a very bad practice indeed, for which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are responsible, that they wait until the Session is within the very last days, when they know that every hon. gentleman here is impatient of discussion and so anxious to get home, that they could hardly listen even to the temperate and admirably reasoned speech of my hon. friend beside me in patience. That is the time that the hon. gentleman and his friends choose to submit to us questions of the very first magnitude, involving the imposition of additional burdens of millions upon the people; and I repeat my statement, that it is not creditable to the management of public affairs in this country that year after year—because this is far from being the first time—the Budget debate goes on without the House having before it one half the information it ought to have to enable it to form an honest judgment upon the propositions of the Government. I say this is not the first time. Ten or twelve years before, under somewhat similar circumstances, when there was another Canadian Pacific Railway on the *tapis*, we had the hon. gentleman bringing down estimates which were found to be utterly inadequate to the wants of the year. Why, Sir, I found, when I succeeded that hon. gentleman, that he had made no provision in his original Budget for about $3,000,000 a year, which he had added to the public expenditure; and but for the increased taxation which we were compelled to impose, there would have been in 1873-74 and in 1874-75 very large deficits which were daverted by that taxation. Now, the hon. gentleman complained that my hon. friend beside me compared our position with that of the United States, unfairly, as he said. Sir, it is quite true that in making a comparison with the United States, the Minister, on the one hand, is justified in taking credit for the subsidies which we pay to the Provinces; but my hon. friend was equally justified in deducting from the expenditures of the United States, at the very least, the enormous sum they pay in pensions, incurred during the late war. I say nothing of the expenditures on account of the army and navy, which are expenses incidental to the position of an independent nation. But let me call attention to this—that if you offset the subsidies on the one hand, and the pensions on the other, the comparison will be greatly more to the advantage of the United States, because they pay $66,000,000 in pensions, while we pay $3,500,000 in subsidies; so that, although their population is thirteen-fold or thereabouts that of ours, still the amount of their pensions is much larger relatively than the amount of our subsidies; and therefore my hon. friend was quite correct in calling attention to the unfavourable condition of things which now exists as between ourselves and the United States, but which did not always exist. The hon. gentleman also spoke of a fact which is partly true, that in the United States there are very heavy municipal and state taxes.

Does the hon. gentleman suppose that in the Province of Ontario, at any rate, there are no municipal taxes to be paid; that there are no heavy taxes in our cities to be paid?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Nothing like in the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He does not know practically the expenses which are inflicted on the holders of property in a very large number of the towns, villages and cities of Ontario. I know well that the municipal administration of the United States, is a blot on their system, that the people are plundered in many of the cities of the United States; and I know that we in Canada are not so much behindhand. I know that in Canada the burdens of the people are in many places very heavy, and that they are very largely caused by the same evils of administration which prevail in certain parts of the United States, though not in all. Although it may not be true of all the Provinces, it is true, at any rate, of the chief Province, that taking an average State of the Union, not one particular State selected by the hon. gentleman, but an average State, you will find Ontario is paying in proportion just as much for those purposes and in some cases more, as the hon. gentleman will see if he will make the comparison, than many of the States of the Union. There are isolated cities where such a state of things as that to which he alludes prevails, but they are only isolated and not a fair average in the United States in general. He said another thing to which I will call the attention of the House. He stated we incurred no additional debt by assuming the provincial debt. That is a very great fallacy and a very great mistake. When he chooses to relieve a Province by assuming its debts, as the hon. gentleman has done once and is going to do twice, I can tell him that he will remove from the Provinces every kind of inducement to the exercise of a wise and wholesome economy; he will teach them the worst lesson they can be taught. The whole of this system of subsidising the Provinces was known to be a weak spot, an unfortunate expedient, necessary and unavoidable perhaps; but if the hon. gentleman will look at the original debates which took place in Parliament, he will see that many of us who knew the risk warned the Government that it was likely to bring the Provinces again and again to apply to the Dominion Exchequer, that it was likely to remove all wholesome restraint and tend in a very great degree to extravagance, corruption and mismanagement in the conduct of Provincial affairs. What is more, of these taxes more comes from the public than goes into the Treasury. I am not speaking of the hon. gentleman's financial system, I am not speaking of a protective Tariff; I waive that, but the hon. gentleman knows that every tax which brings a dollar into the Public Treasury takes, at the very least, $1.25 out of the pockets of the people; and it is by no means true, for that reason alone, that it is a mere shifting of the burden when we assume the Provincial debts at the cost of the general public. The hon. gentleman asks why we did not reduce expenditure in 1873? We did reduce it and very largely. Let him take the book laid on the Table of the House by himself a few weeks ago, and he will see that the reduction amounted to a reduction of $1,500,000 in controllable expenditure alone during that period. If he wants to know why we did not reduce the other expenditures, I will tell him. The hon. gentleman then, as now, had committed the country to enormous contingent liabilities. Then, as now, he had undertaken to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway on most unduly onerous terms to the people, against the protest of every member of the Administration that afterwards succeeded his; he had engaged in very large commitments for canals; he had begun and we had to finish the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman's memory is gravely at fault when he says that the works on the Welland and Lachine Canals were not commenced before my hon. friend took office. My hon. friend found that contracts had been actually commenced and that work was done in both those cases. Was that not the case?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend says, "yes," and his memory is seldom at fault in those matters. It was not possible for us, nor for any Government coming in, especially under such circumstances, to break off hastily the policy to which the country has been committed. As my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) truly said, the successors of any Administration are, to a very great extent, bound, of necessity, to carry out the policy their predecessors had actually inaugurated and to which the public faith was pledged. For that very reason, much as we disapproved the conduct of hon. gentlemen in committing Canada to the task of building the Canadian Pacific Railway during the next ten years, we were bound to go on with the absolutely necessary portions of that obligation. It was impossible to delay opening up the North-West, and I always held that to be the bounden duty of my hon. friend. He did it in the teeth of obliquy and in the teeth of the attacks brought against him by some of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman; and if he had not done it, the hon. gentlemen knows perfectly well that not for many years to come would it have been possible to have had a railway through Canadian territory to the North-West. He cannot therefore hold him responsible for the expenditure on the Intercolonial, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the canal system. That was so, at any rate, as regards the Welland and Lachine Canals, which are the two works on which the vast bulk of this $19,000,000 was expended. When he charges us with having had deficits, all I can say is this, that had our advice been taken, had our warnings been attended to, had the cautions we gave borne fruit, as they ought to have done, there would have been no deficits, no difficulties. Those deficits and difficulties were produced through the fault of the former Parliament of Canada in undertaking works too great for the strength of the people, and by just such steps as the hon. gentleman had recourse to in assuming those Provincial debts which, he says, do not add any burden to the people. Moreover as a matter of fact his contention is not quite correct. Taking the four years to which he alluded, there was no addition to the public debt through deficits. If the hon. gentleman will add together the surpluses we had in 1874 and 1875 and the sums expended for sinking funds from 1874 to 1879, he will find that in 1874-5-6-7-8 there was nothing at all added to the public debt, after having deducted the surpluses in the first two years and the amount expended in sinking funds in those five years. That is a calculation which the hon. gentleman can easily make for himself. He told us that the tax per head from 1879 to 1884 was less than from 1874 to 1879. He tells us that when we were paying $29,500,000 in the last year on a population of 4,300,000, deducting Indians, the burden per head was less than when, with a population of 4,000,000 we were paying $20,000,000. Let that statement go. We pay $9,500,000 more in taxes, having an addition to our population of perhaps 200,000, although that is doubtful, and yet the hon. gentleman says the taxation is not more per head. I say nothing of the fact that the hon. gentleman under his system has taken many millions of dollars out of the pockets of the people each year than has gone into the Treasury, but I give the simple fact that with an addition of 200,000 people to our population we are paying pretty nearly $10,000,000 more in 1883 than in 1878, and yet the hon. gentleman says the tax is less per head. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman boasts that he has only increased our debt $15,000,000. The hon. gentleman had better wait. I think in the last few weeks we have added

$30,000,000 to our debt for the Canadian Pacific Railway alone. Possibly we may get it back; possibly we may not; but at any rate there it is, an addition to the debt of Canada of $30,000,000. How many millions more is the hon. gentleman going to add before these resolutions of which he has given notice are put through the House? How many millions more for the additional provincial debt? How many more for the various railway subsidies which are alluded to? I am not including the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has all to be paid within the next two years if the work goes on as fast as he supposes; but, taking those alone, we would find that practically to-day the hon. gentleman has increased our debt $60,000,000 instead of $15,000,000. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that a reasonable increase cannot be complained of, but my hon. friend gave full credit for that. My hon. friend's position—and it was a fair position—is this that the increase at present is not a reasonable increase, that the increase is an inordinate increase; that, when you find Estimates brought down like those the hon. gentleman laid on the Table the other day, which show an increase over the actual expenditure of 1878 of nearly $8,500,000 per annum, we say that is not a fair or reasonable or proper increase; that, make what allowance you like for the additional sums received for public works and for the additional sum received for post office, both of which are fair and reasonable enough—although I might remind him that there was an increase on that score of $600,000 in our time as well as in his—let him allow as he pleases for that, still there remains an exceedingly large and an exceedingly unreasonable increase. These excuses are the invariable excuses which are always made by spendthrift Governments and spendthrift individuals whenever their extravagance is brought before their notice. You never yet found a spendthrift debtor who was not willing to explain to his creditors that, although he had spent more than he ought to have done, it was not possible for him to live becomingly or conduct the necessary improvements in his business or in his house or in his style of living for anything less. I will for a few moments call the attention of the House to a point which has possibly not attracted as much attention as it deserves. Here in Canada, no matter what the hon. gentleman may say, we are not a very large country or a very rich country. I hope we may soon become one, but I know that this system of taxation which exhausts to such an extent the resources of the people is not the way to make us rich and prosperous. We began moderately enough. For the sake of argument I leave out of sight altogether everything except the amount collected for Excise and the amount collected for Customs, and the amount collected during a portion of the time for Bill Stamps, and I would just call the attention of the House to this simple fact, that in the 16 years which elapsed from 1867 to 1883 we have paid in actual taxation, under these two heads of Excise and Customs $307,150,000 as per these Public Accounts, that in 1884 we are going to pay $26,000,000 more, so that this poor and young country in 17 years has been obliged to pay $333,150,000 in hard cash in taxes. And, as it is perfectly well known to everybody who has studied the subject, that the exaction of those taxes involves a very large further addition to the amount taken out of the public pocket, even in cases where the utmost possible pains are used to ensure that the taxation, be it much or be it little, shall take as little as possible out of the pocket of the people more than goes into the Treasury, you would find that in all human probability not less than $420,000,000 have been taken in taxes out of the people of Canada in that interval. Now, I have put, all through this discussion —and I was glad to see that my hon. friend did—entirely on one side all disputed questions of policy as between Free Trade and Protection; but I say every hon. gentleman who knows anything of the mode in which public expenditure has increased, and who chooses to compare it with that of other countries, either old or new, under similar circumstances, must agree with me, if he gives the subject one moments' reflection, that our financial position is becoming a serious one. What we warned hon. gentlemen of in the early part of this Session has happened. They have carried their point, but they know best at what cost. They know perfectly well that such another victory as they obtained, when they induced an unwilling House to sanction an advance of $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, would be another name for ruin. These hon. gentlemen object to comparisons made with the United States or to comparisons made with England. My friend beside me is right in saying that you cannot escape or elude comparison with the United States. Every man in Canada, every man who comes to Canada, will of necessity compare our position with that of the United States; and it is a very grave subject for reflection that, as I showed, and the figures were not disputed, because they could not be disputed, our position as regards that of the United States has become enormously worse within the last few years. But, lest the hon. gentleman should say that the position of the United States is peculiar, and that therefore we should not make a comparison with it, I will take two other countries in Europe, of almost similar population to our own, one a very rich country, another a country which compares in many respects very closely to Canada; and I will call the attention of the House and of the country to the position in which those countries are financially as compared with Canada. And first of all, I take the Kingdom of Sweden—not Norway, which is a very poor country, but Sweden—which compares very closely as regards a large part of its territory with ourselves. The population of Sweden, according to the last statistics was 4,565,000 souls. The total expenditure in Sweden, according to the estimates for the last year, amounted to £1,374,000 sterling, including some extraordinary expenses for railways, including a vote for army and navy of $1,250,000; so the total expenditure per head—in Sweden was considerably less than $4.50, and this may be very well compared with our own total expenditure, because in Sweden they have also, as probably the hon. gentleman knows, been engaged in constructing a great number of railways at the public cost. The Swedish railway system is now about as large or nearly as large as our own, and has been constructed under circumstances of considerable difficulty, through rocky and mountainous regions in many places. You find, whereas we had an expenditure to our population of something like $7.25—a gross expenditure—the gross expenditure of Sweden was barely $4.50, and it will not do for the hon. gentleman to say that Sweden is not a fair example. Sweden, in many respects, is in a very good position, has a very fair trade, and a trade, too, largely similar to our own trade in many respects. Or, if he objects to Sweden, let me take the case of Belgium. Belgium had a population of 5,500,000; the actual revenue of Belgium, excluding the amount received from public works, they being a large owner of railways, and I believe of vessels also, amounted to £7,160,000 sterling; their total expenditure, deducting the same amount, was £8,000,000 sterling; they had to pay for their army alone $9,000,000 a year, having to maintain by reason of their position a rather considerable army. I will deduct our public works, which amount to $3,000,000; we have then an expenditure similar to the Belgian expenditure, of $29,000,000 a year, as by the present Estimates. So, Sir, that it follows we are spending to-day nearly twice as much as Sweden is spending per head on her population, and we are spending a little more, apparently than Belgium, which, as the hon. gentleman probably knows, is one of the

richest and most populous States in Europe, is spending for its total services. Moreover, the case is worse in our respects than most. We have, as my hon. friend pointed out, an enormous proportion of fixed charges. Our fixed charges amount to something like $12,500,000, and in that I do not include expenses for collection of revenue, although it must be regarded to a great extent as fixed; I do not include the Treaty allowances to Indians, and I do not include the very considerable number of items which are really, as the hon. Minister knows very well, to all intents and purposes fixed. I say that alone ought to cause the hon. gentleman to speak more seriously than he does—perhaps not more seriously than he thinks—of the present position. But I further point out that under these very measures the hon. gentleman is passing, a very large addition is going to be made to our fixed charges. He will have to make a large addition for the advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway—it may be repaid; that remains to be seen. He will have to make large advances in aid of railways. Now, as to the probabilities of the future, the hon. gentleman cannot have shut his eyes to the fact that almost from the first day of July, 1883, to the present moment, our trade and revenue have been steadily decreasing. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that in all human probability there will be a loss of probably not short of $4,000,000 on the tax receipts for this year. He has not as yet laid on the Table the statement of receipts and expenditures for which I asked.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They did not reach me, or I would have sent them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We had this information before; the information we will have in a few days will be only too good evidence of the truth of the statement I make. Now, the House ought to remember that the position of any country which depends, as we do, so largely on Customs revenue is of necessity exceedingly precarious. I do not propose to detain the House by going into a minute disquisition as to the causes which lead to these reductions, but I will call the attention of the House again to this fact, that within the last ten years the reduction of our imports has been larger than it has been in almost any other country of which we know. In 1873 our nominal imports were $127,000,000 for consumption; in 1880, a year which the hon. gentleman holds up to us as an example, because then for the first time the exports a little exceeded the imports, the imports had shrunk to $71,000,000 entered for consumption: that is to say, they had shrunk nominally about $56,000,000. I do not think that our statistics are strictly accurate in that respect because I believe that the nominal importation in 1873-74 was considerably in excess of the real importation. They included, as I have always pointed out, a good many millions of goods which were really merely passing through this country on their way to Europe; so that every gentleman must see that even if you do deduct ten millions, a falling off from $117,000,000 to $71,000,000 is a monstrous reduction, and yet it is a reduction which the hon. gentleman has always contended was desirable and which it was the special object of his policy to produce. Since that time the imports have increased—he says have increased far too much—they have been increased from $71,000,000, or thereabouts, to $123,000,000—they have increased by $52,000,000. Now, Sir, it is quite on the cards, and the hon. gentleman knows it well, that there may be—I do not say a decrease of $50,000,000—but there may be a very large decrease within the next year or two, in which case he also knows his revenue from Customs will shrink enormously, and it will shrink even more, perhaps, than the number of millions would indicate, because the first things reduced are usually those articles of luxury which properly enough pay the highest duty. Sir, we are therefore in this predicament in looking at the future: we have at present a falling revenue, and an almost certainty that it will continue to fall. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no better barometer of the position of a country than the price at which exchange is going. Now, Sir, exchange is becoming more adverse to Canada from day to day; exchange, perhaps, is more adverse to Canada to day than it has been for fifteen years, if I am correctly informed—at any rate it is very adverse. That is very clear proof to every mercantile man, I think, that in all probability for many months to come the condition of trade will be very unfavourable to Canada, inasmuch as we will have very little to sell, and consequently we will be able to buy comparatively little. Then, Sir, he has got to consider, as my hon. friend truly pointed out, the effect on the country. There is no use in the hon. gentleman's disguising from himself what is patent to us all, that these excessive and exorbitant additional taxes have had a bad effect, both directly and indirectly; directly, by exhausting the resources of the people, and indirectly by the effect on their mind. Why, Sir, when you add $8,000,000 a year to the annual public expenditure, it is just equivalent to borrowing $200,000,000, a sum greater than the whole of the existing debt, as he states it. And he will remember this, that at any rate, in the Province of Ontario, whereas formerly our lands and population were both increasing in value, all of us who know anything practically of the state of western Ontario; all of us, I may say, who know anything practically of the value of real estate throughout Canada, are painfully well aware that real estate over almost the whole country, with the exception of one or two towns, is decreasing, or at least is stationary in value. The hon. gentleman must know that; if he does not know it, if he has not had that information given to him in the course of his various journeys through the country, he certainly could not have fallen in with many men who were conversant with the real estate of the rural population of Canada at this present moment. I have pointed out——

An hon. MEMBER. Cut it short.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not my fault, I may remind these hon. gentlemen, that these Estimates were brought down at so late a period, and the least I think that can be done when we are asked to vote so many millions of the people's money, is to give as many minutes to the discussion as there are hundreds of thousands of dollars in the Estimates. I say nothing, Sir, except barely to allude to it, of the discouragement of the settlers in the North-West produced by heavy taxation; but I must say this, that whereas it ought to be our object to make these people's capital go as far as it possibly can, the direct effect of our system are that these people are compelled to pay probably one-third, certainly one-fourth, more for the very tools of trade which are absolutely necessary to develop the country than they need to, and that is a great discouragement to them. I assert that this immense taxation has produced a great absorbtion of the resources of the people. The hon. gentleman boasted the other day that the deposits in the savings banks were going on increasing. Perhaps they are, but the hon. gentleman did not tell us that the bank returns, quite as useful a barometer, show that there has been no increase, if I am correctly advised, in the deposits in the banks between December, 1882 and December, 1883; that important index is perfectly stationary; the deposits in the banks remain without increase. They had increased rapidly, they are now stationary, and there is some danger that they may be diminished. Sir, it is quite true that in a new country like ours the natural tendency ought to be to advance. I have always recognized that, and the House will remember that just as I was condemned without stint by the friends of the hon. gentleman, because, in 1873, and again in 1874, I dared to warn the people of Canada that they and the Government

had been grossly extravagant, that there was danger of trouble ahead, that there was danger of depression, that there was danger of our extravagance producing its natural and legitimate results, and that it was time to take precautions—why, Sir, just as I was abused for doing that in 1873-74, so was I abused in 1878, because I refused then to be dismayed, because, under very peculiar circumstances, the finances of this country were less prosperous than the country could wish. Events in both cases justify my hon. friend and myself. A depression which we told the people must come, did come, and the revival which we told them would come, whether they chose to eject the late Government from power or not, did come. The difference was this, that the revival was not wisely used; that revival and the prosperity that accompanied it were made the excuse for boundless and monstrous extravagance; for improperly entering into many obligations, which the hon. gentleman has pointed out, and which the Minister of Finance has not attempted to deny. The hon. Minister did not dispute a single fact or a single figure advanced by the hon. member for North Norfolk. A greater compliment could hardly have been paid him, unless indeed it was the groans which were extracted from the other side of the House by every paragraph of the hon. gentleman's Resolution. I am afraid it is an unfortunate fact, whether the hon. Minister chooses to admit it or not, that there is an undercurrent of political unrest in this country. I tell the hon. gentleman that men, perhaps not in this House, perhaps not on a political platform, but men all through this country, are looking to the future with alarm and uncertainty; and I, for one, dread sincerely the results of the monstrous additions which the hon. Minister has made, and is constantly making, as the mouth-piece of the Government, to the indebtedness of this country and to the annual expenditure. The fact of the matter is that, just as they acted before, the Government are staking their future, and staking for some years to come the future of the country, on a mere chance. If things go well, if we happen to have good harvests, if good prices are received for those harvests, if trade revives in the United States, if trade is good in England—if the whole chances go in the hon. gentleman's favour, then it is possible, by good luck and not by good management, we may obtain a good deal of relief from the position which otherwise I dread we shall occupy. But the truth is this, that at the present moment, notably in their dealings with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the people of Canada have been taking a leap in the dark, and neither in this House nor out of it is any man justified in saying that the future is reassuring, or that there are not very good reasons for serious apprehension as to the future financial position of this country.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not intend to delay the House more than a moment or two, as I rise simply for the purpose of referring to the comparisons which hon. gentlemen opposite have made. As the hon. Finance Minister has pointed out, there can be no possible objections to comparisons being made between Canada and the United States, provided they are fairly made; but when they are made in a manner calculated to mislead those who may read the speeches of hon. gentlemen, and those who are desiring to settle in this country, I think they are mischievous, and ought, if possible, to be promptly corrected. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), stated that the expenditure of the United States was about $265,000,000. That is quite true; but as the hon. Finance Minister pointed out, the hon. gentleman did not mention State taxation, to which we have nothing analogous in this country. I find the aggregate State debts in the United States amount to $267,762,075, and I find the annual taxation, that is, the regular direct taxation for State purposes—and I do not include that for municipal purposes—reaches $61,434,095. That is a tax, as I say, to which we have nothing analogous in this country. But that is not the only feature in which the comparison made by the hon. gentleman is hardly a fair one. We have in this country expenditures by the Federal Government which are not made by the United States Government. We find, for instance, that the Dominion Government make large expenditures on harbours and rivers, whereas in the United States those improvements are made by the State and not by the general Government. To the expenditures on the harbours of Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York, the States contributed very largely, for which they receive no tonnage dues, they have given the improvements as a free gift to the commerce of the country. In addition to that, we have large expenditures made by the Federal Government in other ways in this country to which there is nothing analogous on the other side of the line; and we may fairly say that, looking at the position of the two countries in regard to those expenditures, any attempt to prove that this country is in a very inferior position, with regard to the taxation of the people, is one which cannot be successfully maintained, if the statements are fairly and reasonably made. When we come to find that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), in order to maintain the comparison made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, actually compared the expenditure on pensions with subsidies to Provinces, I think we may fairly say that hon. gentlemen opposite must be driven to their wits-end to find some means of making comparisons which will prove injurious to the interests of this country. The amount of $60,000,000 spent for pensions goes into the pockets of the pensioners. The subsidies go into the treasuries of the Local Governments, and are expended by them for purposes for which, in the United States, the respective States have to resort to direct taxation. So we may fairly say that an attempt to make a comparison between the expenditures on pensions and the subsidies to the Provinces shows how unfair is the impression which will be conveyed by the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has undertaken to compare this country with the old countries of Europe, as if there were any analogy between the two cases. Canada is a young country; we are developing its resources; we are building it up; we have an enormous territory and a comparatively small population; and in the nature of things, we have to incur large expenditures in order to accomplish that development. A fair comparison would be, not with the old countries of Europe, but with the Australian colonies, which are at this moment in fact, competitors with this country for the emigration of Great Britain especially. And what do I find with respect to those colonies? That Australasia, which includes the group of colonies, has an aggregate public debt of $479,827,910, and the annual expenditure reaches $95,709,230. Remember these colonies are doing exactly what we are doing. They are young countries, developing their resources; they are seeking to make the countries suitable for the homes of people who may come from the old world. On coming to deal with particular colonies, I find these results. New South Wales has a population of 817,464. Its annual expenditure is £6,347,810 sterling, or in round figures, about $32,000,000. That small colony of 817,000 people has an expenditure greater than that of the entire Dominion. New Zealand, with a population of 563,800, has an annual expenditure of £3,824,735 sterling, or in round figures, very nearly $20,000,000—more than $19,000,000 at any rate. Then in Queensland, which has a population of 248,255, the annual expenditure is very nearly $10,000,000. In South Australia, with a population of 293,509, the annual expenditure is about $10,500,000. In Tasmania, with a population of 122,479, the annual ex-

penditure is about $2,500,000. In Victoria, with a population of 906,225, the annual expenditure is $25,000,000. In Western Australia, with a population of 30,766, the annual expenditure is over $1,000,000. Now I think these figures show that, as compared with countries which are situated as we are, young countries seeking to develop their various resources, with a view of making them as attractive as possible to settlers who may go to them—I say the expenditure, of this country will compare most favourably with the expenditure of such countries as those. And when you remember, when dealing with the United States, that that country has a population of about 50,000,000; that it has reached that advanced state of development; that it has had to incur in its earlier history large expenditures, and bearing in mind, that in its earlier history there were not those methods of expenditure which exist now, through railways and canals and other public improvements of that kind—when they reach that position it is not fair, it is not true to this country, to make comparisons such as the hon. gentlemen have made. Then we had another comparison. I understood the hon. gentleman to say, that the Customs duties in the United States are about one-half per head what they are in Canada, and that statement is quite true. But we have heard speeches on the floor of Parliament upon the assumption that in this country, in consequence of the protective Tariff, we must add to the taxation paid to the Customs officer the increased cost of the goods manufactured in Canada equivalent to the duty which is paid on similar goods coming in. Well, if that be the case, what is the position of the United States? They have a smaller Customs import, it is true; they pay less per head of Customs duty, it is true, but they pay double the percentage on the goods they get in; and if the argument of the hon. gentlemen be true, then they pay upon manufactured goods, within the country itself, double the percentage we pay; and no one would pretend to say that the people of the United States do not, man for man, consume as much as we consume in this country. So we find that hon. gentlemen when they want to make a point against this country, when they want to show that we are an overburdened, over taxed community, we find them laying down the fiscal proposition that for every dollar which is put on in the way of Customs, we have to pay a like dollar on the article produced in Canada; while, when it comes to a question of drawing comparisons in the interest of the United States, and against this country, we find an opposite course taken, and they say that they are only taxed for the Customs duties they pay on the frontier. That is the manner in which these hon. gentlemen deal with this country and with the United States. The hon. gentleman has told us that the people of this country are leaving He says that the people in his neighbourhood are leaving by the hundreds—that he knows of 100 families who have left or are leaving that neighbourhood.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, no.

An hon. MEMBER. Sixty families.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Sixty families, then, who are leaving his neighbourhood and settling in some part of the United States. Well, Sir, I venture to say that those sixty families have received from the hon. gentleman not only his own speeches, but the speeches of his friends, and if they believed those speeches they were quite right to leave the country, for a more God-forsaken country than Canada does not exist, if the statements of the hon. gentleman are reliable. Sir, comparing this country with countries similarly situated, countries devoting themselves in the same way to the process of development which we must undertake in youth, in order that we may, as a nation, arrive at a hale and hearty old age, I venture to say that Canada stands as well and as favourably as any other country on the face of the earth, and offers as good homes as any other to those who choose to come and settle on our lands.

Amendment (Mr. Charlton) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Lennox),	Davies,	McIsaac,
Auger,	De St. Georges,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fairbank,	Mills,
Béchard,	Fisher,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Fleming.	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Forbes	Platt,
Bourassa,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Burpee (St. John),	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Gunn,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Springer,
Cartwright,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Catudal,	Laurier,	Vail.
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McCraney,	Wells,
Cook,	McIntyre,	Wilson.—57.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dodd,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Dugas,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dundas,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Moffat,
Beaty,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Belleau,	Girouard,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Hackett,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Hall,	Riopel,
Bolduc,	Hay,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bossé,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hickey,	Ross,
Bryson,	Houde,	Royal,
Burns,	Hurteau,	Rykert,
Cameron (Inverness),	Ives,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kinney,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Tilley,
Cimon,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper (Pictou),
Cochrane,	Langevin,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Costigan,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	McDonald (CapeBreton),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Williams,
Dawson,	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	McCarthy,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desjardins,	McDougald,	Woodworth,
Dickinson,	McGreevy,	Wright.—111.

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

After Recess.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

PRIVY COUNCIL.

213	For allowance to Private Secretary.....	$600 00
	To pay J. L. Burpee, extra remuneration for special work authorized by Mr. Himsworth, Clerk of the Council, from June, 1878, to March, 1882.....	200 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances under which this $200 was granted?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Burpee was instructed by Mr. Himsworth, before his death, to prepare an Index

to the proceedings of Council, from 1878. He has continued to do that work up to 1882, and on the recommendation of the Minister, this was allowed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was surely part of the routine work of the office.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; this was done after office hours.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, there was no necessity for doing it after office hours, because the Privy Council staff was large enough to do it.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides, there is an express Statute on this subject. The law says that no one employed in the public service shall be paid for extra work. The very moment we lay down the principle that an employé in the office for doing s mething extra shall have extra pay, then everything more or less becomes extra; there is a desire to make everything extra, and therefore the law lays it down that this shall not be done. We are now asked to make a vote in bulk for four years' extra work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I observe that this was done in 1878. I have not the slightest recollection of authorizing it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was Mr. Himsworth who authorized it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This sum was for special work, in the way of preparing an analytical index. He was employed by Mr. Stewart and worked at night. The hon. gentleman says the staff in the Privy Council office has always been full enough for all work; he is gre tly mistaken. The business has increased enormously since his time, so much so that with a very diligent set of clerks, they have been quite unable to keep up with the work. Before Mr. Burpee's time, Mr. Côté, the late Assistant Clerk, was specially paid for this work, and Mr. Himsworth, thinking it was a valuable one, instructed Mr. Burpee to do it at night. It is like the work of preparing an analytical index done by Mr. Alfred Todd. This is a special work, very remotely connected with the every-day work of the staff.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see how Mr. Himsworth should have authority to promise this payment in violation of the law. Even the promise of the Head of a Department ought not to be given in violation of the law, much less that of his Deputy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was done under a special rule, and is not a precedent to be followed; but the work has been done and must be paid for.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.

To pay the following clerks additional to their present salary :—

214	E. P. Aldrich	$250 00
	E. B. Holt	50 00

Mr. CARON. Mr. Aldrich came to my Department from the Department of Agriculture, where he had been working for a couple of years. He was appointed to my Department by an Order in Council of the 23rd of May, 1882, as a third-class clerk, at a salary of $700; on the 1st July last he received the statutory increase of $50. It was intended he should be paid from the 1st July, 1883, and the amount was placed in the Estimates passed last Session; and in the re-organization of the staff, his salary was increased by that amount of $250. However, in putting down this amount in the Estimates last year his name was not entered, and as this was not in accordance with the requirements of the Act, the money could not be paid over to him. That is the reason it is placed in the Supplementary Estimates. He belongs to the Accountant's Branch and is considered by the Deputy and the officer who has charge of that branch as one of the very best clerks we have.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he not also the hon. Minister's Private Secretary?

Mr. CARON. Yes; at a salary of 300.

Mr. BLAKE. That makes $1,300 under this arrangement, when he entered at $700 two years ago; that is an enormously rapid rise.

Mr. CARON. What he receives as Private Secretary is altogether outside his salary. At any moment he may lose his position as Private Secretary, and have to return to his branch of the Civil Service.

Mr. BLAKE. When this gentleman is having the benefit of the law which provides for his statutory increase, when, besides, it is proposed to add one-third to his existing salary in a lump sum, the fact must not be disregarded, that he is also receiving $300 a year as Private Secretary. This system of proposing modifications of the Civil Service Act in the way of increasing the salaries beyond the statutory increase is fruitful of great evil. It is likely to render the whole Act more or less nugatory, so far as the salaries are concerned, and produces jealousies, heart-burnings and difficulties in the service generally, calculated to demoralize the service by leading to the belief that there is partiality and favouritism. I am not making observations especially with reference to this case, for I have heard nothing of Mr. Aldrich whatever, but I say that is the natural tendency of proceedings of this kind. I do not think the hon. Minister has given us sufficient reasons for departing from the law. Will the hon. gentlemen also explain the case of Mr. Holt?

Mr. CARON. Mr. Holt is a third-class clerk, who was appointed by Order in Council on the 3rd of May, 1882, at a salary of $700. On the 1st of July last he received a statutory increase of $50, which made his salary up to $750. The amount placed in the Estimates for this year and passed last Session for this salary was $800, as it was intended that he should be paid that salary from the 1st of July, 1883. About Mr. Holt, I may say that he comes immediately after the chief accountant of the Department of Militia, Mr. O'Meara. Mr. Holt has had a large experience. He was employed in a bank as Chief Accountant, at a salary of $2,000, I believe. That bank closed, but I may say, not from any financial disaster. It was more lucky than most banks; it paid every cent in the dollar which the investors had placed in it. When Mr. Holt, being out of employment, came into the Department, from his antecedents, the salary which he was receiving was very small indeed, and so small that, if it had not been that he was out of employment at the time, I am perfectly certain we could not have secured his valuable services for that important branch of the Department—the Accountant's Branch. I thought, in reorganizing under the Civil Service Act the various Branches of the Department, he was entitled to that increase of $50. It was only an increase of $50 this year, and I think it is a very small increase for the services he has rendered. His case is altogether similar to the case of Mr. Aldrich, but from the fact that his name was not given it was considered that under the requirements of the Civil Service Act, he should not be paid that amount, and the amount was placed in the Supplementary Estimates for this year.

Mr. BLAKE. There again, Mr. Chairman, this gentleman entered the service at the salary prescribed for him. He had the option of entering it or of not entering it. He entered the service at the prescribed salary Parliament had fixed, and he knew perfectly well the conditions of his salary, that he should have an increase of $50 a year if he deserved it. The hon. gentleman says that he filled an important and responsible position in a bank, but notwithstanding, he came into the service at this smaller salary.

Mr. CARON. He was out of employment.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose so. It does not seem to me that, in this more than in the other case, there is any reason for departing from the ordinary rules of the service. If this gentleman is efficient, not merely to keep correct accounts of the expenditure of the Department, but also to restrain and moderate and limit the expenditure of the Department, I am willing to go the $50.

Mr. CARON. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right to agree.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not agree, because I do not believe.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To provide for the following payments:—

215	To E. Chateauvert, for performing the duties of J. A. Doyon, during the latter's illness	$313 42	
	For performing other duties	97 00	$410 42
	To pay Extra Clerks in connection with operations of License Law		600 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state who Mr. Chateauvert is? Is he an officer of the Department, or a person brought in from outside?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Chateauvert is not a permanent employé of the Department. He was employed to do certain work in the absence of one of the officers who was seriously ill, and he was employed because it required knowledge and experience beyond that possessed by those who might have passed the qualifying examination, because Mr. Chateauvert had been in the habit of doing work for years before in the same Department similar to the work required to be done in the absence of Mr. Doyon.

Mr. BLAKE. I think this case was up last Session. Was there not a vote last Session for the extra services in the place of Doyon?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Some vote was taken last Session.

Mr. BLAKE. The statement was made that this poor man was affected with paralysis?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; that is the case.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any expectation of his resuming duty?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He has, since that.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the payment made here under the provision of the law? The late Act makes some provision for the payment of services performed during the absence of an officer, and for their being paid out of his salary.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the law only provides for the payment out of the salary in case he is absent on leave. I do not think that the salary paid to one who replaces an officer who is unfortunately stricken by illness should be taken out of his salary.

Mr. BLAKE. "For performing other duties, $97"—what is that?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is extra work, in regard to some statistical work which was behind in the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Here we find him performing the work of another officer in the Department, and then doing extra work besides.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is a very useful officer.

Mr. BLAKE. A handy sort of man. Do you intend to keep him about you?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the present staff is enough, I think, to do the work, but he is a remarkably efficient officer and did his work thoroughly.

Mr. BLAKE. But he is gone?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is gone.

Mr. BLAKE. "Extra clerks in connection with operations of License Law"—is that the License Law of last Session?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes

Mr. BLAKE. Then we will want all the explanation the hon. gentleman can give.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In reference to that small item, I do not think it requires much explanation. The hon. gentleman will admit, of course, that enforcing that law will increase the work of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. That depends on the Act which is coming down.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have had to do something already. We had to prepare the work.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain how many extra clerks have been employed—what the general character of their duties is. We do not know how much has been expended, or what has been done.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This $600 is provided in case extra clerks may be required to do the work. It may not be necessary to spend the amount. If it be not necessary, I can assure the hon. gentleman I have no desire to spend it. We may require some extra help, and sometimes when extra work is required to be done, owing to the strictness of this Act, it is difficult to provide for it. I cannot say that the whole amount will be spent.

Mr. BLAKE. I presume, from what the Minister says, that no part of it has been spent as yet, else we would have heard something about it, as he has given a candid admission of what he wants. We have arrived at a period less than three months from the close of the financial year, so that, if he is going to spend it, he has got to commence at once. A measure is promised to suspend to a certain extent the operation of the Act itself. When he brings down a vote for additional clerks in his Department, we should know what he imagines he will have to spend, how many clerks he intends to employ, and in what way he thinks this extra service will be required.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There was a good deal to do in order to prepare forms and instructions for the License Commissioners. At the same time, each Commissioner has to be furnished with information from the Census, a work which involves a very large cost. We found it would be cheaper to employ a clerk to prepare such information and statistics from the Census for the use of these Commissioners, as to population, &c., than it would be to send a complete set of the Census to each Commissioner. That will easily explain this very moderate vote. At present there are two clerks employed at a salary of $2 per day. They will only be retained a short time.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

217.	To pay F. A. Dixon the difference between the salary now payable to him under an Order in Council, dated 30th June, 1881, appointing him a first-class clerk from 1st January, 1881, $1,275, and the minimum salary allowed to a first-class clerk under the new Act	$125 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Civil Service Act provides that no employé's rank or position shall be affected by the Act, and being a first class clerk before the Act passed, he remained a first class clerk. But although a first class clerk his salary was under the minimum, therefore, to put him in the same position in respect to salary we ask for a special vote.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that in the reorganization the salary was taken as the ruling indication and not the class. A man was classed as a second class, and if his salary was not up to the minimum of the first class, it

requires the action of the Governor to raise him to the position of the first class. I believe that certainly two employés similarly circumstanced have been examined in order to rise from the second class to the first, although they were first class clerks under the old *régime*—I refer to the case of Mr. Barrett, of the Post Office Department, and Mr. Henry, of the Department of the Interior. I believe they were both in the same position as Mr. Dixon, and both went up for examination as preliminary for getting into the first class. I do not see why a different rule and measure should be meted out to one than to another.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I imagine these gentlemen went voluntarily and offered themselves for examination; I fancy so.

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

218. To Increase the salary of Mr Brooke, book-keeper, from $650 to $800 a year, from 1st January, 1884..... $75 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no appropriation to pay him this $75, although he was promoted and got that salary of $800 for this half year, therefore we had to put it into the Estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think that can be precisely accurate. If there was any vote taken last Session it was defective on the same grounds as the other votes we have dealt with this evening, in that the particular name was not given, that the attention of Parliament was not directed to it, and, therefore it was a fresh case. There is something that is objectionable in the Government departing from the law and increasing the salary from $650 to $800 a year. That is an increase beyond what the Civil Service Act prescribes, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to explain why it is that this exceptional increase is proposed to us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will tell the hon. gentleman the state of the case, and he will see that this person deserves a higher salary. Mr. Brooke, though a man of education, entered the Department many years ago as a messenger, and he had the nominal salary of a messenger. He proved to be a very good officer, and was employed from year to year as a clerk. He has turned out to be not only a good clerk, but a very good book-keeper. Mr. Brooke has been for fourteen years in the employ of the Government. His salary at present, dating from November, 1883, is $650 per annum, but being fourteen years a messenger, he could not get his promotion from the maximum, because the rank is that of a third-class clerk. He is represented by the Deputy-Head of the Department to be a most efficient book-keeper and deserving of better compensation than he receives. He has a large family, &c. Had he been made a clerk, as he ought to have been made years ago, he would have stood, I think, high in the ranks of the employés. He is really a very deserving man, and it has always proved very difficult to obtain a good accountant.

219. To pay to the undermentioned Clerks the amounts granted under the provisions of an Order in Council of the 15th February last, being $50 for each and every optional subject passed by them at the examination of the Civil Service Board, viz:—

Privy Council—L. H. Chute		150 00
Post Office Department—E. F. Taylor	50 00	
H. P. W. Chesley	100 00	
E. F. Jarvis	100 00	
A. Geddes	50 00	
W. E. C. Stewart	50 00	
F. E. S. Grout	100 00	
		450 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was stated in the House some time ago, and the proposition seemed to be generally accepted, that clerks entering the service who passed in one optional subject should obtain $50; two optional subjects, $100; and three, $150 extra pay. The persons named here passed their examinations before the Government arrived at the conclusion to which I have referred. This vote is simply asked, so that justice may be done to all parties.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has removed a difficulty I felt about this proposal. I do not wish to be understood as having expressed by silence, and I certainly did not by my speech, assent to the optional plan. I should like to know more about it and ascertain how it works. I was apprehensive that the intention of the Government was to allow clerks to pass their examination and afterwards go up for options; but it seems this money is to meet the cases of persons who passed examinations before the Government adopted the Order in Council. I hope the hon. gentleman does not intend in the future to allow persons who do not take options at the entrance examination to afterwards do so.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We do not.

Mr. BLAKE. So long as the principle laid down in the Order in Council is maintained, it seems reasonable to place these persons on the same footing as those who went up for examination after the Order was passed.

HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR CANADA.

220. To provide for the removal expenses of the High Commissioner from Canada to England and return..... $836 00

Mr. BLAKE. Is this amount for the last removal expenses or for the next?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount is for the expenses of the High Commissioner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The expenses of the High Commissioner when he came out in December to attend the Session?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; and for his return. He said that would cover the whole amount.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it going to be chronic?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; only acute.

BOARD OF CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS.

221. To provide for the payment of the expenses of the Board of Civil Service Examiners... $3,909 10

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The amount asked for was necessary to meet the payments for the services of the chairman, the secretary, the examiners and the sub-examiners in connection with the Civil Service examination, being the amount in excess of the appropriation for the year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have been informed that the examiners, in preparing the papers for the candidates, although paid at a very high rate, have been allowed to employ other people to value the answers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The only complaint I have heard made is that the examiners were rather too strict in conducting the examinations.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What I desire to know is whether parties, other than the examiners, have been paid for valuing the papers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The papers are sent by the sub-examiners to the examiners. The papers are corrected by themselves and valued by themselves.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am a little surprised to receive this information, because I was told by a person who ought to know that parties were engaged to value the answers, as the Commissioners were not able to do it themselves.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I can contradict that statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand from the Secretary of State that the answers are valued by the different sub-examiners.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; on the contrary, the sub-examiners do not correct the papers. They conduct the examinations and forward the papers to the examiners, who examine them and value them. I know one of the examiners who has had 3,000 or 4,000 papers to look over. These papers are valued only by the examiners, and not by persons outside.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What precautions are taken by the examiners to ensure that a knowledge of the questions should not be conveyed in any way to parties about to be examined?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The ordinary precautions which men of sense usually take.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the custom?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the examiners have taken every precaution and have evinced a great amount of prudence and care in regard to the examinations, and in seeing that the papers are communicated to nobody. The discretion of the examiners has been so great, indeed, that I am sure none of the members of the Council have had any communication with them as to the examinations. The *personnel* of the examiners is well known to hon. gentlemen, and it is a sufficient guarantee of their probity and of the care and prudence they exercise in their duties.

Mr. CASEY. It is not a question of the intention of the examiners to do right, but we know that examiners, with the best of intentions, have sometimes been deceived by those who deal immediately with the candidates, those having the mechanical work to do. This happened in the Province of Ontario, in connection with the written examinations for school teachers, where the candidates got access to the papers by bribing somebody, and the result was that a new system was adopted, which is considered to be perfectly invincible. Although the Commissioners are men of the highest intelligence, they may not be up to all the tricks which may be played by candidates, and I hope the Minister will consult with them as to what precautions they adopt and see whether they meet his approval. We have not seen the report of the Civil Service Examiners this year. Has it been brought down?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; it was brought down within fifteen days of the opening of the Session—including all the examination papers, &c., as required by Statute.

Mr. CASEY. It is strange we have not got them, but I suppose the distributing clerk has been careless.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The report, I believe, has been printed. It is very short, but the examination papers would make an immense volume. A list of the successful candidates at the different examinations has been printed and published in the official *Gazette*.

Mr. CASEY. Then the part to which I specially referred has not been printed. In England and the United States, and other countries, it is the custom to publish examination papers, and they should be published here as they are the gist of the ordinary report of the Board of Examiners,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am told by one of the examiners that there were 6,000 papers for one examination.

Mr. CASEY. Those are the answers, but I mean the questions.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the Minister to say that this vote was, in fact, to make provision for a deficiency in the vote of 1882-83, and therefore it is not really to complete the service of 1883-84. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state what the total expenditure was for the financial year which this sum is asked to complete; also the total expenditure for the current financial year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not the exact figures of the amount appropriated, but it is in excess of that voted last year.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that examinations are held in various parts of the country on named days. I presume these examinations take place simultaneously, and that the papers are sent under seal to the sub-examiners, and opened only at the instant of examination. I would ask whether any candidate has been permitted a second opportunity of answering the papers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In two or three cases of examination for promotion, where, by some accident, which was not the fault of the candidate, but an error in the communication of the papers, the examiners have been authorized by an Order in Council to re-examine the candidates, of course from entirely new papers. This has occurred in two cases; for instance, in one case the papers were sent for one examination, but the wrong papers were given, in which case, of course, a certificate could not be awarded.

Mr. BLAKE. It was a mistake on the part of the examiners?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

222	For allowance for Secretary of Department, for performing the duties of Deputy-Head, absent through illness, as provided for in section 11, Canada Civil Service Act, 1882, from 1st July, 1883, to 30th June, 1884	$700 00
	For difference of salary between $1,300 and $1,400, voted in Estimates of 1883-84, for Mr. J. F. Dionne, as first class clerk in Patent Branch of the Department of Agriculture, for "special responsibility of duties, and special technical qualifications"	100 00
	For difference of salary between $700 and $1,200, voted in the Estimates of 1883-84, for Mr. T. McCabe, a second class clerk in the Patent Branch of the Department of Agriculture, for "special and scientific attainments as Model Examiner"	500 00

Mr. BLAKE. What is the first item?

Mr. McLELAN. This amount is given Mr. Lowe under the eleventh section of the Act of 1882. Mr. Lowe performed the duties of a Deputy-Head, and this amount is to bring his salary as Chief Clerk to the amount provided by Statute.

Mr. BLAKE. And the second item?

Mr. McLELAN. This was provided for in the Estimates of 1884, under the head of Patents. The increases were given, and they were promoted for responsible and technical duties; but the Auditor objected to paying these particular persons without having their names specified. Therefore, the amount is just revoted here, with the names given.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that these promotions shall take place without an examination for promotion?

Mr. McLELAN. They were promoted a year or two ago upon the certificate of the Deputy-Head for special technical qualifications in the examination of patents, and they received the promotion by Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS. I observe that in this vote the hon. gentleman takes an appropriation for the purpose of supplementing the salaries of officers of an inferior rank, who have been engaged in the discharge of the duties of those of a higher rank. I understood the First Minister to say, when we were discussing this subject before, that the Government invariably acted upon the rule, in that case, of giving the inferior officer the compensation of the superior officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is the practice.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a case in the Department of the Interior. Mr.

Austin retired some time ago; and I have been looking into the Public Accounts, and I find that there is a clerk engaged in the discharge of his duties, who holds the rank of third class clerk, which he held when appointed in 1876 or 1877.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think Mr. Austin has retired within the past year.

Mr. MILLS. I think he was frequently absent before he was put on the retired list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who is the officer.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Keyes.

DOMINION POLICE.

223. Further amount required to meet the expenditure of the year..... $4,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose is this wanted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been temporarily an increase of the force, from twenty-five to thirty-four. The memorandum I have on this subject says that the military guard has been withdrawn from Rideau Hall, which cost $3,000 annually, and the duties are altogether done by the police. Then, four watchmen, formerly employed by the Public Works Department, have been superseded by two policemen, who perform the duty more efficiently. A mail service is also performed by the police, between the various Government offices every half-hour, during office hours. This system operates exceedingly well. Instead of a messenger being sent with a single letter across the square, sometimes having to wait for an answer, the policemen who are here go every half-hour to a box, into which every Department drops a letter intended for any other Department, and the messengers are kept for more important matters.

Mr. CASEY. If this practice saves any pay for messengers, it is certainly an economy, but I fancy that putting on extra policemen to do the work for which messengers are appointed and paid is not economizing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is merely a part of the work they did before the increase; but the increase is necessary.

PENITENTIARIES.

224 { To meet sundry payments in connection with the British Columbia Penitentiary, to 30th June, 1883..... $1,948 44
Amount required to meet expenditure of Manitoba Penitentiary..... 6,500 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is to recoup the appropriation for the current year, for the following reasons, viz.: In the latter part of July, 1882, $2,128 was paid to the Kingston Penitentiary for clothing furnished to this institution in May of that year. This amount should have been paid in 1881-82; but as the account for that year was closed, it was paid out of the appropriation for 1882-83, in consequence of which there was not enough left to pay the June accounts of that year, amounting to $1,948.44, and they had to be paid out of the appropriation for 1883-84.

Mr. CASEY. What is this vote for Manitoba Penitentiary for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Four hundred and fifty dollars of this amount is to pay extra guards who have been employed at different times during the year, in consequence of the illness of several members of the regular staff; $475 is for an allowance to Mr. Little, the late steward, who was compelled to retire on account of ill health; $1,807 is for maintenance on account of the large increase to the prison population, the amounts asked for under the sub-heads of rations and clothing having been found insufficient to meet the requirements to the 30th of June, 1884. For heating, there is $2,000, the amount voted for 1883-84 having been insufficient, in consequence of the severity of the winter. For the farm, there is $1,768, the amount, $400, voted for 1883-84 having been insufficient.

Mr. CASEY. In connection with the Manitoba Penitentiary, some facts have come to my knowledge which I think the attention of the Government should be called to. It appears that Major Bowles, an American, was a contractor for material to build the proposed fence around the penitentiary, and that Mr. Lecours was the architect instructed to look after the work. Mr. Lecours, it is said, certified to an account for $4,000 for fence material, for which Major Bowles was paid, and it was suspected afterwards that the material had not been furnished. An officer was sent from here to investigate the matter, and he found this suspicion to be correct. Mr. Lecours was consequently recalled and given desultory work in the service here at half salary or something of that kind. If it be correct that he certified to the account when there was no material furnished, his punishment should have been more severe. If he did not do so, then the hon. Minister should explain why he was recalled and remove this suspicion in reference to his conduct. I have also been informed that at a subsequent date Major Bowles furnished the material and received a second payment of $4,000, so that he came out of the affair with a clear profit of $4,000. He is, however, reported to have said to his friends at Winnipeg that but a very small share of that came into his pocket, and he was grumbling on this account. I understand also that the fence has not been put up of wood, but is being erected of stone.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not give me notice privately that he was going to bring this matter up. I could not expect this to come up under this or any other item in these Estimates. The hon. gentleman is right in calling the attention of the House to this matter, but it is unfortunate he did not give me notice, because I am not in a position to give the explanations I would desire to give in answer to his remarks. I think the statement about the lumber is very much exaggerated. I think there was some lost, or some mistake made, but I do not think there was anything like a loss of $4,000. Mr. Lecours had been there as architect, but we found that the presence of an architect there was not necessary, in view of the expense, and therefore, without censuring Mr. Lecours, I thought it better that the position of architect should be abolished. I consequently recalled Mr. Lecours and gave him a position in the Department at a reduced salary which was very proper, because the salary he was receiving up there was in conformity with the larger expenses required by an officer there over those required at Ottawa. The fence the hon. gentleman speaks of has not been erected; my attention has been specially called to it by the Department of Justice, and I may say by one of the hon. members from there, especially the hon. member for Lisgar. I think the hon. gentleman will see that we will have some vote in the Estimates that are to come down which will enable us most likely, not to erect now a stone wall, but probably put up temporarily a wooden fence. I understand there is no fence at all there, but the bulk of the sum to be voted will have to be devoted to the increased accommodation of the penitentiary, which is very crowded and requires a number of new cells. We try to accommodate the convicts there, but I cannot give the hope that we will erect a stone wall.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry I had not an opportunity of asking the hon. member privately about this matter as he would then be able to tell us more about it. Perhaps he may be able to say something more about it on Concurrence. I understood, however, that another officer had been appointed in Mr. Lecours' position, to the same office that Mr. Lecours had held. That was incorrect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the vote for the Manitoba Penitentiary comes up, I hope I will be in a position to give the information.

Mr. CASEY. I had been told that another gentleman had been appointed to the same position in Winnipeg as that which Mr. Lecours held.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; there is a clerk of works, Mr. Dan. Smith. He is not an architect.

Mr. CASEY. Not the same salary or position?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that I cannot but think that this vote of $6,500, added to the other votes which have been taken for the Manitoba Penitentiary, shows that it is not an economically managed institution, and I think it deserves the serious consideration of the Minister of Justice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe Mr. Bedson, who is the warden, enjoys the confidence of the Minister of Justice. I think Mr. Moylan, who is the inspector, also speaks very well of him. Of course, I have not watched the expenses; but I have no doubt the Minister of Justice will observe my hon. friend's statement in the *Hansard*, and will give it every consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope he will observe it in some other way. I hope the hon. Minister who represents him in this House will bring it to his attention. I do not trust to the *Hansard* as the medium of communication between myself and the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very convenient.

Mr. CASEY. The man who has succeeded Mr. Lecours—his office is not called by the same name. How do the salaries compare?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is paid $3 a day, whilst the other was an architect, and was paid $2,400 a year.

LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

	To cover expenditure for additional stationery	$5,000 00
	To cover expenditure for French translation during recess	1,000 00
	To cover amount necessary to complete the publication of the Debates of the Session of 1884, under increasing expenditure authorized by House last Session	16,000 00
	To meet additional expenses of witnesses, shorthand reporters, &c., in connection with Select Committees	1,000 00
	To meet additional expenditure in connection with the Sessional Messengers	2 000 00
225	Printing, printing paper and binding	20,000 00
	To cover extra claims of certain Returning Officers at the last General Elections	2,000 00
	To F. S. Bastien, to re-imburse him for candidate's nomination deposit returned to candidate	200 00
	To pay Hon. Mr. Vail, $232, and Mr. Robertson, $256, balance due them on account of Sessional Indemnity, 1882-83, and to Mr. Colby the amount which will otherwise be deducted from his allowance, on account of his absence during the present Session, $192	640 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were the circumstances connected with this return of $200.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is the case of a candidate who paid the $200. The sheriff paid that over to the credit of the Receiver-General, instead of holding the money, and, when the election was over and the man, having received over a third of the votes, was entitled to his money, it was not to be had, the sheriff having made a mistake and paid it over to the Receiver-General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Lent and returned, in fact?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is to return it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is quite sure that this is the case with reference to Bastien?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; with reference to that item.

Mr. BLAKE. That it was money which the candidate was entitled to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Which the returning officer should have returned to him, because he had more than a third of the votes.

Mr. BLAKE. What election was it, pray?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I forget.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the person did not get a third of the votes, did not go to the poll, and was not entitled to the return of the deposit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On enquiry, I find that is not the statement of fact. In order to get it exactly, we will have this struck out, and have it put in the sub Supplementary Estimates, if it is all right. In regard to the item in reference to the Sessional indemnity, Mr. Vail was taken ill while coming here. I believe he had some difficulty in getting across, and did not get here until some time during the Session. It was thought right, following other precedents, that he should have the whole of his indemnity. Mr. Robertson's case was the same. He started for Ottawa, but could not come to the House on account of a severe bronchial attack. Mr. Colby and Mr. Nelson, the Senator whose name is mentioned in the next vote, were both tossing on the sea in their vain attempt to get here in time. They were on board the *Celtic*, which was tossing about for six weeks, and I think that is suffering enough and this is a small enough compensation for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the return of my hon. friend, the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) to this House, coincided exactly with the return to this House of another hon. member who was kept tossing about most improperly and unfairly on the billows of an election petition, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I think, in all conscience under the circumstances, if this kind of thing is to be done, my hon. friend from Bothwell, who was most improperly excluded from the House last Session, ought to have the whole Sessional indemnity this Session. I do not propose to oppose the other two, but in all conscience and justice I think the name of the hon. member for Bothwell should be added.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was not suggested to us, but now that it has been suggested, we will take it into consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I do not make any claim, because I do not think there is any claim. I think those members who are here for the full time should receive their Sessional indemnity, and those who are here for a portion of the time should receive an indemnity for the portion of the time they are here.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I think the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) is entitled to the same consideration as the member for Bothwell.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Lunenburg is here under a new election. The hon. member for Bothwell is declared to be elected under the election of 1882.

Mr. TUPPER. I think that is a distinction without a difference. The hon. member for Lunenburg was unfairly kept out of the House last Session.

Mr. BLAKE. The election was void in that case. In the other, it was a due election of the hon. gentleman who is now sitting for the county of Bothwell, but he was not only kept out of his seat improperly, but an intruder was imposed

upon the House in his place; not but what I agree in the view of my hon friend for Bothwell, that he should not be paid for any time that he was not here, but the one being a case of void election, and the other that of a member who has been kept out of the seat improperly, to which the courts have declared he was entitled from the first, I do not consider it is at all a parallel case with the election for Lunenburg. I wish to ask how it is with regard to the vote to cover expenditure for French translation during recess. Is that the *Debates* or House work?

Mr. SPEAKER. House work.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it for extra services?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There is a great deal of extra work. The French translation is much greater than it was in former years. Any one who looks at the Sessional Papers will see that they have almost doubled in ten years. There are twelve volumes. The staff cannot do it all during the Session, and we have to employ extra labour during the recess. Last year there were some heavy papers ordered by the House, a great many Sessional Papers, and they have involved this extra expense.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, as I understand from Mr. Speaker's observations, the view is that the work has so increased that the normal staff is no longer adequate to the performance of it. If it be the case that the regular course of work has overrun the capacity of the staff, it would be better to consider the reorganization of the staff. As a rule, I believe, it would be more economical, when in any Department the present staff is found insufficient to discharge permanent duties, to appoint more permanent officers.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not ask for the appointment of permanent officers at present. I think we will probably be able to get on without asking for this vote again. I shall try to keep the expense down.

Mr. BLAKE. The next item is to cover the amount necessary to complete the publication of the *Debates* for 1884, $16,000. I would like to know what the total estimate now is of the *Hansard* for this Session.

Mr. DESJARDINES. Referring to the vote of $1,000 for the French translators during recess, I think this is a proper occasion to call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that the French translators, although their work has increased very much since last year, still remain with the former salaries. As we have been increasing the salaries of the French translators of the *Debates*, who have only three months' work to do in the year, I think it is only fair that the permanent translators, who are kept here during the whole year, should be paid somewhat in proportion.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). So far as I can make out at the moment, the cost of the *Hansard* this year will be about $27,000. The printing will cost about $10,000—at least that is the estimate; my impression is that it will hardly come to that cost, from the fact that the number of pages will not be quite equal to what we anticipated.

Mr. BLAKE. Then if it is to cost $27,000 with existing salaries, I suspect the hon. gentleman's estimate is too low. But there is $20,000 already voted; what is the want of $16,000 more, if the total expense is only going to be $27,000?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think we are to give five bound volumes to each member, and the expense of printing will be somewhat larger than my hon. friend estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the Chairman states $27,000, I move that the $9,000 be struck off.

Mr. WHITE. I estimated $10,000 for the printing, but as my hon. friend remarks, there are to be five copies for each member, instead of two, and that may increase the estimate for printing. This vote is to cover the possibility of increased printing.

Mr. BAIN (North Wentworth). I would like to say, in the interest of the friends of the *Hansard*, that it strikes me it would be better to revert to the old system of supplying members with two rather than five copies of the *Hansard*, if the result is going to be an addition of $16,000 to the cost of the work. As I remarked last Session, I think it is a mistake to distribute five sets of such a valuable and costly work to each member, because they are too valuable to distribute to any extent through the Riding. As long as we are confined to two copies, we are not expected to make any distribution. But the moment that it is known that the members have four or five sets at their disposal, they will have a number of applications from friends in their constituency whom it will be impossible to supply. I think, therefore, it would be wiser for the Committee to revert to the old system of distributing only two sets to members. I also think that a synopsis or a short summary of some of the more important returns could be drawn up and printed in a concise shape, so as to be distributed throughout the country, and I think they would be much more beneficial, and that it would be a better way of spending the money.

Mr. WHITE. That matter was decided last year. It was represented to the Committee that in many constituencies there are four or five Mechanics' Institutes, and it was very desirable that the members should be able to supply these institutions with a copy of the *Debates*. It is, of course, a question whether it would not be better, perhaps, to give to each member only one copy, and give the other copies to the institutions, but the other course was adopted last year by a vote of the House, and it is too late now to change it because the volumes are already being printed.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I can give the hon. gentleman the figures showing how the increase has taken place. The reporters were formerly paid $9,967; now they are paid $11,400; amanuenses, formerly $1,116, now $1,344; printing, $10,473, now $13,000; translating, $2,724, now $3,400; printing paper, $2,343, now $3,500; binding, $1,350, now $2,500; miscellaneous, $514, now $1,000; making a total of $36,144 now as against $28,494 formerly. This is due to the change giving the increased number of volumes as asked for by the Committee and adopted by the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Only partially owing to that; there are increases in some of the salaries and in the number of employees.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is well worth consideration whether next year we ought not to return to the old number of two volumes instead of five to each member. As my hon. friend from Cardwell has stated, in some constituencies there are literary institutions, mechanics institutes, &c., which would all like to get the bound *Hansard*, and I think the House ought to consider whether it is well to continue this system, because, with the growth of the country these institutions will be increasing, and it will be a large additional burden to the nation if we are able to supply a copy to each institution. They may not all have equal claims, but they will all be disappointed if they do not get any. We cannot help it this year, as the edition is now being printed, but it will be well, perhaps, before we prorogue, to make some other arrangement for the future.

Mr. BLAKE. The increased number of copies will make a difference of $4,000 or $5,000, which is, of course, not a very large proportion of the total expense. We find from the estimate that the amount which the *Debates* will cost this year is $36,000. I cannot say what the increased cost for next Session will be; but, in view of the proposed changes, it will be something like $42,000 or $43,000. We

ought to consider the other question to which the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) has alluded, namely, the practical utility of it. I may say it is one of those things in regard to which it is a little difficult to retrace one's steps. If we distribute four copies among our constituents it is somewhat difficult to explain to them why only one copy should be distributed next year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ascribe it to the economy of the Tory Government.

Mr. BLAKE. That is exactly like the Tory Government. First, they make extravagant expenditures; and, afterwards, they claim great credit for having retrenched their own extravagance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We become repentant, which hon. gentlemen opposite do not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hardly think we can consider five copies an extravagant number. In the United States every Senator and Representative receives forty copies; thirty-nine copies for distribution. I apprehend that most of the members will find it easy to distribute four copies. The expense is trifling compared with the benefits to be derived.

Mr. MILLS. A member of Congress hardly ever returns to the House, and the effect of such a large distribution might be the same here. I see a great deal of difficulty in reducing the number of copies. You excite expectations which you will be obliged to meet in some way or other. Hon. gentlemen opposite say we can attribute the change to the economy of the Tory Government. There is no one who would believe it, and I am perfectly certain the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite would insist that it was a base calumny.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As whatever action is to be taken for next Session must be taken this Session, the matter should be considered fairly. For my own part, I am against a continuance of five copies, and I see no difficulty in going back to the former number-two. We had a very large vote, 60 to 100, in favour of abolishing the system of official reporting altogether. That showed a very strong feeling in the House against the expenditure as now proposed. I merely rise to give expression to my own views in favour of returning to the system of distributing to members only two copies, or abolishing the reporting altogether, which I would much prefer.

Mr. SPROULE. Year after year the reports from the Debates Committee are in the direction of increasing the expense; and there can be no doubt that at no very distant time the House will be compelled to reconsider the whole question, and do something to reduce the expenditure. I believe the reporting at the commencement of last Parliament was introduced more as an experiment than otherwise. It was then considered that the work could be done for a certain sum. Experience has gone to prove that the expense could not be kept within that limit; and during the last part of the Session, the Report of the *Debates* Committee recommended the appointment of additional officers, so as to get out the work with the expedition demanded. I do not see any reason why members should receive more than one copy. When they receive two or three copies, members are liable to give offence in their distribution. If a copy is required for a Mechanics' Institute, it could be sent there direct. In view of the fact that the expense is increasing, and that the Committee, from time to time, in their reports, recommended the appointment of another translator, another reporter, or another officer, or clerk, the House will be compelled before long to reconsider the whole subject, with a view, if not to abolish it altogether, at least to curtail and very considerably decrease the expense.

Mr. MULOCK. And also consider the propriety of diminishing the length of speeches.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I think the Committee should devise some means by which the expenditure on this item might be reduced. I would not advise the suspension of the publication of the *Debates*, although I voted the other day in that direction; but I would like to see some means adopted by which the expenditure would be very much reduced. Had the mover of the motion for the abolition of the *Debates* given the details of the expenditure to the House, and had the House thoroughly understood how large the expenditure was in proportion to the results, the vote in favour of that motion would have been still larger than it was; and, therefore, I say that it is well worthy of the attention of the Government whether something cannot be done next Session to reduce the expenditure. We know that early this Session the Chairman of the Committee in a report, or in his remarks in moving the adoption of a report, expressed the opinion that the expenditure was considerably too large, and that the Committee were considering some means by which it might be reduced. I do not find fault, because I know it is difficult to retrench; nevertheless, instead of reducing the expenditure it has been increased from $28,000 for this year to $42,000 for next year. After the expression of opinion given by the House, it appears to me that something must be done in some way or other to curtail the expenditure. And, Sir, I feel that unless this is done, the sentiment which was expressed by the vote a few days ago, for abolishing *Hansard*, will grow stronger and stronger, if the expense increases, or even if it remains where it is, and that year after year we will have votes proposing to do away with it altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. There is an item to cover extra claims of certain returning officers at the last General Election, on which no explanation has been given.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This item is to pay the claims of some returning officers, especially in the city of Montreal. These claims have been before the Government since the last election. One large item of their expenditure was the copying of the municipal lists, according to the new method, and distributing them at the places of voting in the cities. By a clerical error in the law, the expenditure which is allowable has not been paid, this section of the Statute having been inadvertantly, I am sure, taken from the electoral law of Quebec. The election law of Quebec, section 64, says, that the lists shall be taken in such a manner, and the expenditure allowed by the Act was referred to the wrong clause. The item for the copying of the lists, I think, alone amounts to the sum of $300 for each of these three returning officers. The auditor and the officers of the Government will have to examine the different accounts, and I am sure that a sum of $1,500, or perhaps a little more, will have to be paid those gentlemen for regular and necessary expenses which they have incurred. In two or three instances the cases have been taken to court, and judgments have been given against the returning officers, but the Auditor-General here was unable to authorize the payments. This amount will be to cover those expenditures if they are found to be regular, according to the disposition of the Statute.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the explanation is at all satisfactory. We know that there is a Statute which prescribes what a returning officer shall receive and for what services, and the Government is entitled to pay for those services by virtue of that Statute, without a special vote—they are entitled to pay all that the law authorizes. The hon. gentleman says, with reference to the copying of the lists, that there has been an error in the law, and that there

fore the returning officers cannot be paid the sum of $300, which they ought to be paid, because the law is wrong. Now, if that is the case, the hon. gentleman should have introduced a Statute to correct the error, and make it large enough to embrace what in his view—and he can obtain the consent of Parliament to that view—are the legitimate expenses of the returning officers. But it is not because there has been an error in the law which can be amended or altered, that we should be asked to pass a special vote of this character. The hon. gentleman has mentioned one item as to which, of course, we cannot usefully engage in a discussion without any notice, without having had an opportunity of looking into it—an item of $300, but there are $1,700 more.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; the copying would be $900.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says they are extra services; that they are within the disposition of the law; but if they are within the disposition of the law, they should be paid without a vote, and if they are beyond the law, the Auditor-General will have no control whatever. It will be at the determination of the Executive who shall be paid, and what they shall be paid, within the limits of the $2,000, and that is in my opinion very objectionable. I think, on reflection, the Administration will see that what they ought to do is to make the law conformable to what they think it should be, and then there will be no necessity for the vote.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not know that this item would come up, or I would have given an opinion which I think the hon. gentleman would respect; that is, the opinion of the ex-Minister of Justice, the hon. Mr. Laflamme, who has explained the subject better than I can. I think, however, that perhaps the item had better be suspended, and it will be shown that the Auditor-General was, perhaps, a little strict in his interpretation of the law. I may say, also, that the Auditor himself recommended that this vote should be asked from Parliament, to remove doubts, if there were any.

Mr. BLAKE. I maintain that it is of the last consequence that the general Statute Law should prescribe what are the classes of services for which returning officers are to be paid, and it is the introduction of a vicious system to propose extra votes for special services. We know that all sorts of demands are made by returning officers after elections, and that the audit of these claims has been a sort of special science; and to pass a special vote of Parliament for extra services, not warranted by the Statute, will inflict a great deal of inconvenience and difficulty in the future. If it be true that there is some error in the law, by which the real intention of the Legislature has been thwarted, there can be no objection to the passage of a Bill to make the general law right in the future. There will be less objection to dealing with any number of returning officers in the spirit of that legislation which Parliament shall have sanctioned as the true meaning and proper effect of the law for the future. I hope the vote will be suspended, and that if there is any doubt in the law, a short Bill will be introduced to make the matter right.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Will the hon gentleman allow the next item to be called.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The case is this. In the last election in the county of Vaudreuil there were several candidates—at least three. On the nomination day, I think immediately after the nomination, by the interposition of mutual friends, one of the candidates was induced to withdraw, before any expenditure was incurred, more than the necessary expenditure for the two candidates who remained. The candidate retiring held that the interpretation of the law was—not as I do, though I would not give myself as an authority—that a candidate who retires withdraws his nomination papers and with it the deposit he made with the returning officer. Of course, the object of the law is to prevent the unnecessary expenditure of money by the people for polls and for the preparation of papers for the election. In the present case, as the election was contested, there was no extra expenditure incurred by the returning officer, and no extra trouble caused to the people of the county in which the election took place, on account of the candidate who retired. Under these circumstances, the candidate requested from the returning officer the withdrawal of the deposit of $200; and the returning officer, knowing that his nomination had not added to the expenditure, and that his resignation left things exactly as they were, so far as expenditure was concerned, thought proper, before handing over the deposit, to solicit the opinion of the officer who sent him the writs; and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, having been asked his advice, declined to give it. The returning officer immediately afterwards applied to the next best man to whom he thought he could apply; he applied to the then Secretary of State, and the then Secretary of State, my predecessor in office, sent him an answer, both by telegram and by letter, telling him that according to law he was right in reimbursing the retiring candidate his deposit of $200, as no extra expenditure had been incurred on his account. I do not want to give an opinion, as I do not claim to be an authority on this subject; but I say that the returning officer, in applying to Parliament for this amount, is coming to the proper place. The Auditor-General, I dare say, advised by the Law Officers of the Crown, having decided that in strict law the returning officer should not have returned the deposit to the candidate, he comes and, by petition to Parliament, says he has acted in perfect good faith. Of course, the personality of the returning officer has nothing to do with the matter; but I think the peculiar position he occupies, and his good faith, as shown by his whole action in the matter, at least entitles him to the good will of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. The short and the long of the matter is, that before the returning officer returned the deposit, he consulted the late Secretary of State, and the late Secretary of State communicated to him that he would be right in point of law in returning it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He was both telegraphed and written to that he would be right in returning it.

Mr. BLAKE. The Secretary of State was not then a judge, I believe?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A practising judge.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that his successor is more cautious than he was in expressing an opinion. I have not looked at the Statute, but my recollection is that it makes no provision, and I do not see how there could be a provision for returning the deposit. I never was a very great friend to the deposit, but the system must be worked alike for all; and it is important that no action of Parliament should take place which should throw doubt upon this question. If it is intended by this vote to decide that third candidates may have their deposits returned, we had better know it; for, after the hon. gentleman shall have succeeded to some higher position, we might have a recurrence of a Secretary of State giving the advice which has been given on this occasion. After the statement of the hon. gentleman, I can see that the returning officer is, in a partial sense, exonerated from an improper proceeding, though I do not think the Secretary of State should have advised him. It is a very improper thing for Ministers to give advice to returning officers, on any subject whatever. The returning officer ought to have obtained independent advice, which it is impossible that the advice of a Minister could be, under such circumstances. While I felt it my duty to make these ob-

servations, I feel that as the Government, through one of its members, chose to take the course of giving this advice to the returning officer, he may be said, personally, to occupy a better position, with reference to the present demand, than he otherwise could; but I think it ought to be distinctly understood from the other side, that no advice at all is to be given to returning officers by the Executive, and that this payment is not in any sense to form a precedent.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I can assure the hon. gentleman that during the time of office of the present Secretary of State there need be no fear. I happened myself to be in a similar position. The candidate opposed to me withdrew during the contest, and I was consulted by the returning officer as to whether he could not return the deposit made by the retiring candidate. Pleased as I was to see my opponent retire, I was obliged to give the opinion that the deposit was forfeited.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the next item, which relates to Sessional allowance. I understand that the practice adopted is that members of Parliament, who have been detained by sickness or other unavoidable causes from attending, shall be allowed their full indemnity. There is the case of the hon. member for Napierville, who is exactly in the same position, having been debarred by illness from attending during fifteen days of the Session, and of course, if the principle is adopted, it must be applied to his case.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The attention of the Government was called to this matter and it was intended to insert that in the Estimates to come down, and ask the House to vote it.

SENATE.

226. To pay the legal representatives of the late Hon. Mr. Bourinot $960, balance of Sessional Indemnity, and to Mr. Nelson, $88, which will otherwise be deducted on account of his absence this Session..... $1,048 00

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

228. To meet expenses of Archive Service..... $800 00

229. To pay balance of account, $6,403.20, certified in accordance with the Order in Council, dated 8th April, 1880, (less $1,491.78, due for the purchase of the site and hospital) to the Winnipeg General Hospital, for patients admitted from the 1st April to the 30th November, 1883..... $4,911 42

PENSIONS.

230. For payment to Mrs. Edward Duckett, the amount short paid to her late husband on account of superannuation (voted in 46 Vic, cap. 2, and not paid)..... $1,200 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This amount to Mrs. Duckett was voted the year before, but not paid, as the application came in after the close of the year. This is asking a revote.

MILITIA.

231 { Clothing $16,000 00
Contingencies of Militia Service..... 3,000 00
To provide for pay of extra Militia Force in Manitoba, authorized to drill..... 2,500 00
Public Armouries and care of arms..... 9,544 09

Mr. CARON. This item of $16,000 is to supply military clothing for the year 1883. This supply is absolutely necessary. The contractors are Messrs. Auclair & Gagné, of Ottawa, who were the lowest tenderers. The number of tunics required is 7,500. The item for contingencies, $3,000, is for type-setting, printing and binding the Militia Regulations and Orders of 1883; the item $2,500, is to provide for the pay of the 19th Battalion of Rifles, in Manitoba, which was organized last November, and has gone through this year's drill. The amount of money voted last year was for the force as it existed at that time. It was considered advisable to authorize the organization of that battalion, and the drill having taking place, it was necessary to pay the amount required, and it was therefore put in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is the intention to establish any more volunteer battalions in the North-West. There are several towns in Manitoba where there might be good companies organized. I should like to know if it is the intention to furnish them with accoutrements as soon as they are ready to organize.

Mr. CARON. The organization of the volunteer force in the North-West and in Manitoba is a very large question. It has been, and still is, engaging the attention of the Department. Under the estimates as they now exist, it would be impossibe to get up anything like a proper organization in that district, but the battalion which has just been provided for is the beginning of what I believe will be a proper organization of the force there.

Mr. WATSON. I think probably too much of this money is spent in Winnipeg. There are rural towns which might have a company, and have their headquarters in Winnipeg. There is Portage la Prairie, Minnedosa, Rapid City, and also Brandon. It should be disiributed more through the Province and not confined to Winnipeg.

Mr. COCKBURN. I may also remind the Minister of Militia and Defence that in the constituency I formerly represented, which contains 27,000 inhabitants, and several large villages, one with as much as 2,000 inhabitants, no volunteer company has ever been organized. There is most excellent material. Plenty of good men would be volunteers, and have been offering their services for a long time, but they have never had an opportunity to organize.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought some attention had been paid to the organization of a brigade in your county.

Mr. COCKBURN. We do not care about the whiskey brigade. I would ask the Minister not to forget that section of the country, if he recruits more volunteers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I understood the Minister to say that part of this $3,000 for contingencies was to pay for printing the books, the Militia General Orders, at the Queen's printing office. Is not that the work printed by Foote, of the Quebec *Chronicle* office?

Mr. CARON. I stated it was for the purpose of paying for the printing, binding and type-setting of Militia Regulations and Orders for 1883, $2,500; 4,000 copies were required, at 62½ cents per copy. This was carried on through the Queen's Printer. Immediately after the passing of the Bill consolidating the Militia last Session, it became imperative to prepare new regulations under that Bill, and they had to be printed and distributed to the force. This amount is for the purpose of meeting that expenditure.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do I understand that they are printed by the Government contractor?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I thought that was the work performed by the proprietor of the Quebec *Chronicle*.

Mr. CARON. No; that is different.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the work he does?

Mr. CARON. The work the hon. gentleman refers to is the Militia List, containing the names of the officers composing the Militia force of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is this extra amount required for public armouries and care of arms?

Mr. CARON. This amount is required for payment of services in connection with public armouries and care of arms for 1883-84. The estimated expenditure will be as follows: Allowances for care of arms, 650 companies, at $40 each per annum, $26,000; 40 troops of calvary, at $60 each, $2,400; total, $28,400; pay of storekeepers, caretakers, armourers and labourers in public armouries and stores, $33,144; total amount required for 1883, $61,544; amount voted, $52,000, leaving a balance required of $9,544. I must tell the hon gentleman that for years past this vote has been taken out of other votes which belong more particularly to another branch of the service, but I considered that it was far better to have it under the proper heading, from the fact that these various votes from which this amount was taken were not large enough to cover the expenditure, and I thought it far better to bring down a vote so that Parliament would see what the public armouries and care of arms entailed in the way of expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the excess or deficiency generally distributed over the vote, or was it in one or two items the original vote was found to be deficient?

Mr. CARON. The deficiency applied to the pay of storekeepers, caretakers, armourers and labourers. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in discussing the estimates which were brought down, I stated that the expenditure had been increased from the fact that some valuable property had been transferred to the Department of Militia, which entailed some increase in the way of caretakers. I can also say that, from the fact that the force was increased by the establishment of the permanent force, it was necessary to employ, in the various stores which were required for the purpose of transmitting the arms and clothing and various articles, an increased number, in some instances, of caretakers. The vote for allowances to the various companies and to the troops of cavalry remains stationary, and has not been exceeded; but of course, whenever there is an increase in the force—take for instance the battalion I have just provided for in Winnipeg—an increase of that kind would naturally entail an increase of expenditure from the number of companies which would be added to the permanent force.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman says the increase is largely due to the fact that there is a permanent force. That permanent force is under 600 men. Surely the duty of distributing the necessaries required by these 600 men should not require $9,544.

Mr. CARON. No; I have given that as an instance of the increase, of a partial increase, to the vote, but I have also stated that the number of caretakers and the number of storekeepers have been increased. Of course, hon. gentlemen will understand that, if the permanent force or the Militia force is increased by a certain number of new companies, naturally the expenditure must be increased. The mere fact of paying $40 per annum to a company and $60 to a troop of cavalry is enough to show that, if you increase the number, the vote must be increased also.

Mr. CAMERON. Will the hon. gentleman give us to understand how much of the increase is due to the increased number of companies in the force?

Mr. CARON. I could not exactly say. I could not give the exact amount, but the vote has been too short for years past, as I have explained to the hon. gentleman, and the deficiency upon this vote was taken out of other votes belonging to the Department. I thought it was better, after the experience of three or four years, seeing that this vote was short, to add to it the deficiency which has been provided for in that way, and make one vote which comes up before Parliament under this particular head, for the purpose of providing for the requirements of the public armouries and care of arms.

RAILWAYS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

Intercolonial Railway.

	Halifax Extension	$ 27,000 00
	Increased accommodation at St. John	20,000 00
	Dalhousie Branch	33,000 00
	Rivière du Loup, Town Branch	19,000 00
	Repairs and improvements, Rivière du Loup Branch	500 00
	St. Charles Branch	230,000 00
	Construction Account	10,000 00
	To pay legal expenses in the matter of the Halifax Street Railway Company *vs.* The Queen	606 59
232	To pay Fabien Rochette for land taken	1,702 66
	To pay Alexander MacDonell & Co., contractors for Section 5, the amount due them for work done, as recommended by the Commissioners appointed to enquire into claims arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway	47,605 93
	To pay James Falconer, of Newcastle, N.B., for land damages	677 85
	To pay William Ferguson, of Moncton, N.B., purchase money of land, and interest thereon	2,800 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Halifax Extension, $27,000. That is composed of an over-expenditure of $16,000, and provision for two cranes of 15 tons capacity, $10,000 which, together with sundries and outstanding accounts, make up the $27,000. Increased accommodation at St. John, $20,000. That is to complete the building and other works now in course of construction. The total estimated cost of the passenger station was $123,000. There is available to the 30th November, 1883, $103,000. We expect it will be finished before the 1st of July. Dalhousie branch, $33,000. This work was done by the authority of the appropriation of last Session. The total estimated cost of that work is $93,000; the appropriation was $60,000, and it requires $33,000 to complete. That also will be completed during the present year.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems the cost of the work was $93,000, though it was represented as likely to cost only $60,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The details of the expenditure for the six months ending 31st December, were: For land and damages, $1,100; inspection, $378; transportation of materials, $160; together with sleepers, bridging, tracklaying, cattle cars, fastenings, &c. Then, the next six months' estimated cost show: Contract price for grading, $35,420; land and damages, $500; rails and fastenings, $27,000; sleepers, ballasting, new stations, extension of wharf and freight shed, $5,000; frogs and switches, $200; legal and engineering expenses, $1,021; making, in all, $81,482. There is another list of details: Rails, fastenings and spikes, $27,606; sleepers, $1,883; ballasting, $8,400; new station, $1,500. The freight shed and wharf extension will be the property of the Government, I presume.

Mr. BLAKE. But there seems to be no vote for the wharf.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume it is all included in the land and damages. On Concurrence I will give more explicit explanation. Rivière du Loup, town branch, $19,000. The total estimated cost of that is $44,000, and the appropriation was $25,000; that leaves a balance of $19,000 to complete.

Mr. BLAKE. That is nearly double the vote of last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Rivière du Loup branch is four miles long. Land and damages were $2,692; contract price for grading, $14,104; sleepers, $2,587; rails, fastenings and spikes, $18,207; frogs and switches, $200; ballasting, $5,600; legal, engineering and other expenses,

$707; total, $44,099. That is the estimated cost given in detail.

Mr. BLAKE. How was it that the contract was only for $25,000, when the actual cost was so much greater?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The road had not been surveyed nor located when the appropriation was asked for, and it was found that to make it useful we had to extend it further than was originally intended. Repairs and improvements, Rivière du Loup Branch, $500. This is to pay old land claims.

Mr. BLAKE. Hardly. You would not put them under repairs and improvements.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. What sort of an improvement is an old land claim?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These old land claims may involve making certain improvements in order to meet the claims with reference to damage to lands. I think that is an item that generally comes under repairs and improvements.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be well in the future to know that in Parliamentary parlance repairs and improvements mean old land claims.

St. Charles Branch..... $230,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman promised to give full information on this item.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With respect to the expenditure on the St. Charles Branch, the first expenditure was made in 1881-82, $660; 1882-83, $482,197; from June 30th, 1883, to 31st December, 1883, $196,242; total, $679,099. The details of expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1883, and the six months ending 31st December, 1883, were as follows: Grading, $113,378; bridging, $30,202; removing buildings, $640; land and damages, $302,710; ballasting, $597; track-laying, $1,761; rails and fastenings, $60,449; steam shovel, $7,408; fencing, $4,898; crib work, $105,294; surveying and inspection, $7,362; advertising, $1,328; sleepers, $11,461; engine and car hire and transport, $10,326; crossings, $236; Hadlow engine house, $19,429; total $678,439. Expended previous to 1882-83 $660; making a total expenditure up to 31st December 1883, $679,099. The estimated cost of work remaining to be done is as follows: Grading, bridging, &c., $50,200, land and damages (depends on awards) $51,700; rip-rap, $2,000; fencing, $3,200; road crossings, $1,000; sleepers, $600; rails, $22,200; frogs and switches, $5,700; ballasting, $14,400: track-laying, $400; station building, $20,000; engineering, superintendence, &c., $8,600; coal wharf, $40,000, being a total of $220,000. This gives a gross total of $899,099. Adding $50,000 for probable extra cost and damages, it gives a total probable cost of $949,099.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's estimate in this case as well as in other cases has been largely exceeded. The estimate was about $500,000, whereas the cost as now estimated will be $950,000. Under what headings has the great difference occurred?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The principal point of difference is in regard to the cost of right of way and the property required in connection with it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman estimated the total cost at about $500,000, and I find that the land has cost about $400,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have already stated that I found myself entirely astray in regard to the estimate made. I took the precaution before I made my estimate of applying to the best sources of information within my power. I had the road carefully surveyed; I employed what I supposed to be the most competent persons to make an estimate of what the land damages would be; and my estimate has proved to be entirely fallacious. The land and property were placed at a value which I thought was simply impossible. Every effort was made on the part of the Government to keep the cost at the lowest possible amount.

Mr. BLAKE. Who were these mistaken valuators?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will furnish the hon. gentleman with their names.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe the road is about thirteen miles long.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the exact distance.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not have occasion to buy much more land in that part of the country. I am glad real estate is so very high there, and I trust the remainder of the real estate possesses the same value as that which the hon. gentleman found himself obliged to buy. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain with regard to the item of steam shovels.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We found it was cheaper to buy steam shovels and carry out the work by the Department than to have it done by contract. The engine and cars were engaged from the Intercolonial, and the cost price was charged.

Construction Account..... $10,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. What is this construction account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is another case of repairs.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not like paying these old claims under this head. Where is this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is on the main line of railway. They are for claims which have been resisted for years, and we were compelled to send them for arbitration. One of them is the case of James Faulkner, a very old claim, which was resisted as strongly as possible, but it seems that when these claims for damages to land or property arise we must deal with them as they come up.

Halifax Street Railway Company *vs.* The Queen..... $906 59

Mr. BLAKE. What is this case of the Halifax Street Railway against the Queen?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This railway was crossed in carrying the extension of the road when my predecessor was in office. They put in an enormous claim, which was resisted, and finally it was taken to the Exchequer Court. These are the expenses.

Mr. DAVIES. Were no damages paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They got a small amount—I think $200.

Mr. DAVIES. Did it go to the Supreme Court?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. There is an account of Mr. D. O'Connor for $424.89, so it must have been in the Exchequer Court. I am under the impression that they have appealed it to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Then there is $471.70 to Mr. Wallace Graham. These are evidently the expenses of the Crown.

To pay Fabien Rochette for land taken..... $1,702 66

Mr. BLAKE. What is this claim?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The claim was to pay Fabien Rochette for land taken, $1,702.66. In the land expropriated from Mr. Gabriel Lemieux, was a small plot occupied by Mr. Rochette under a lease known as "*bail à rente cons-*

tituée," which is equivalent to a sale, and for which he has to pay the sum of $34 forever. Mr. Lemieux continued to demand the payment of this rental, notwithstanding the fact that the property had passed into the hands of the Government, and finally took legal proceedings to enforce his rights, the consequence being that Mr. Rochette was condemned to pay the rental due and his goods and chattels were seized to satisfy the judgment of the court and the costs incurred. The full Board of Arbitrators awarded to Mr. Rochette the amount of $1,702.66, without interest, the costs of the arbitration to be paid by the Government. Mr. Rochette's claim was $3,095.35.

To pay Alexander MacDonell & Co., contractors for Section 5..... $47,005 98

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this item, to pay Alexander Macdonell & Co., contractors for Section 5, the amount due them for work done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER This is an account which stands in an entirely different position from all the other claims submitted for the consideration of the Commissioners. They found, on investigation, and so reported to the Government, that this amount was due to Alexander Macdonell & Co., for work at the St. Fabien and Bic stations, $47,005.98, and so far as would appear, there was no possible question as to their right to receive this amount. These claimants were the contractors for the construction of Section 5, under a document in the form usually adopted for this railway. As the work under that contract approached completion, Mr. Hazlewood, the District Engineer, acting under instructions from the Commissioners and the Chief Engineer, made a verbal bargain with these contractors to undertake a new work, namely, the preparation and levelling of the ground and other things necessary for the stations at St. Fabien and Bic, the prices agreed on being according to a schedule of rates for the different kinds of work. The following are the particulars of this claim as submitted to us:—Then follows a description of the work done, with full details. The Commissioners say: "All the work was done under the new agreement and a separate account rendered for it, for the same amount and with the same details as that laid before us. The evidence taken by Mr. Shanly and by us shows that the quantities here stated were actually done by these claimants and the prices are according to the agreement with Mr. Hazlewood. In fact there is no reason to suppose that there has been at any time any contention on the part of the Government or their officials that the amount claimed as aforesaid was not fairly earned by Mr. Alexander Macdonell & Co., as the work done for St. Fabien and Bic stations; and we have seen no reason for withholding from them the amount so earned, unless it was the allegation alluded to in our report on Section 5, by Mr. Chandler, that they had been overpaid on their contract for that section. Although there was an enquiry into that subject before the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons, there was no conclusion reported on the question, and it seems never to have been definitely settled until now. Our investigation into the demands of these same claimants concerning their contract for Section 5, leads us to say, as mentioned in our report thereon, that they were not overpaid, but on the contrary, that there is a balance still due to them on that account. This being the case, we have to report that the sum of $47,005.98 was due to these claimants on the first of August, 1873, for their work at the St. Fabien and Bic stations—this is of course irrespective of interest." This is signed by Geo. M. Clarke, F. Broughton and D. E. Bolton. Upon that an Order in Council was passed recognizing the validity of the claim.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not adopt another course. I think it was the understanding of the House that whatever reports should be made by this Commission they should be laid on the Tables so that we could see them before the votes were taken. We know that there has been one step after another taken—the original discussion before the Government, these discussions before the Chief Engineer, certificates and the refusal to grant them, suits in the Exchequer Courts, and other dispositions of that kind. With reference to claims of such an age as this, it seems to me that we ought to have been furnished in proper time with the important materials necessary to enable us to understand whether or not a proper and just decision was reached. I cannot yet understand, if this claim be so plain and straight as the report represents it to be, why there was any difficulty about paying it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that this matter stands on an entirely different footing. When this claim came to be investigated, it was admitted by Mr. Hazlewood, the engineer in charge, that the work was done, and that the prices were fair; and the only reason why the account was not paid was that a statement was made by Mr. Chandler, that on a previous contract these contractors had been overpaid. But the moment the Commissioners found that in this case they were entitled to prompt payment, it was impossible for us to refuse to recognize their claim.

Mr. BLAKE. Who are the other parties in the firm?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know at this moment.

Mr. BLAKE. The report which the hon. gentleman read makes out so plain a case that I do not understand why it was not settled before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Upon investigation, this was found to be a good claim, but it was left unpaid, under the impression that the firm had been overpaid on another contract, and that instead of money being owed to them, they owed the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. When was the Order in Council passed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think about July last.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the money been paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The money has been paid.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think we ought to be asked to vote the money, as if it had not been paid. I understand that no part of this is for interest?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; none for interest.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will bring down, before Concurrence, the Order in Council, the names of the firm, and an extract from the report which gives the reason why the payment was resisted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a note, and have the papers prepared.

Mr. BLAKE. How do the other Intercolonial claims stand?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I expect to lay the whole before the House within a week.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not observe that there are in the main Estimates or in these, any vote for rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my memory serves me, no rolling stock is required for the Intercolonial Railway, except some additional coal cars, for which a vote will be taken in the Supplementary Estimates of next year.

To pay James Falconer, of Newcastle, N.B., for land damages..... $677 85

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The amount has been awarded on arbitration to Mr. Falconer in full settlement for his

claim for damages sustained from the flooding of his land in the years 1876, 1881 and 1882.

To pay William Ferguson, of Moncton, N.B., purchase money of land, and interest thereon $2,800 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to pay William Ferguson for land expropriated for a siding to connect the railway with the Moncton Cotton Mill.

Prince Edward Island Railway.

233. Rolling tock $9,916 16

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The railway on Prince Edward Island was altogether deficient in rolling stock. The original vote was sufficiently large, with the exception of an over-expenditure of $1,616, which forms part of this vote, and the balance, $8,300, lapsed, of the appropriation taken last year, so that, in point of fact, the appropriation is only $1,600.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The practice of charging that $65,000 for rolling stock to capital account is wholly misleading. It is not contended there was any deficiency of equipment on the Prince Edward Island Railway at that time calling for a vote of $10,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is where the difficulty arose. The equipment of the railway was utterly inadequate for the service; I would like to ask my hon. friend where he would get the means of equipping it when there is a deficiency in the earnings of the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would include it in the annual expenditure chargeable, to the Consolidated Fund, for that railway. That would make the deficit greater, but would not make us any poorer; whether we charge it to capital account or to Consolidated Fund will not make us any better or worse off. As an illustration of the extraordinary fashion in which capital account is made up by the hon. gentleman, I would point to the fact that compensation for injuries received by persons through an accident are to be charged to capital account.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a mistake. I stated last year, when this question came up, that it was decided to charge compensation for injuries to the working expenses of the railway, and that is chargeable to collection of revenue. It appears here by mistake. I have a memorandum of that, and I will have it corrected.

Mr. BLAKE. There will have to be an alteration made so as to indicate that it is not to go to capital account.

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi). To destruction account.

Compensation for injuries received by various persons through an accident which occurred in August, 1880 ..... $23,250 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has asked for details. This $23,250 is in compensation for injuries received by various persons through an accident that occurred in 1880. Very large claims were made which were resisted by the Government, and the subject was referred to a Judge of the Exchequer Court, who gave a very large amount to one of the claimants and substantial amounts to the others. The Government appealed against that judgment and the Supreme Court set it aside; but, at the same time, expressed the opinion that the Government should give full consideration to the claims of those who were injured. That became the subject of consideration and the Government decided to pay to Mr. McLeod $10,000, to pay Mrs. Mary A. Murphy, who was very seriously injured, $2,500. That was the amount of the judge's award in the Exchequer Court; in fact, all the the amounts were awarded, with the exception of that due Mrs. McInnis whose case did not come before the court because the husband who brought the action died in the meantime. The same as that awarded to Mrs. Murphy was given as compensation in that case.

Mr. DAVIES. This sum was voted last year.

Mr. BLAKE. It was not voted last year? $400 were only voted.

Mr. DAVIES. $400 had been paid previously, but when the Supplementary Estimates came down, the remaining sum was voted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not. At all events, the amount is included in the $23,250, and it is not intended to give Mrs. McInnis any more than was awarded by Order in Council. I think you will find that case stood in precisely the same position as all the others to be dealt with by the Government, and charged to collection of revenue for the road. To Mr. T. Stewart, $1,000; to Mr. Charles Holliwell, $750; Mrs. Catherine Macdonald, $1,500, making, altogether, $18,250. Subsequently Mr. McLeod made an appeal to the Government with reference to the very large amount of expenses he had incurred in endeavouring to prosecute his claims against the Government, and the Government decided to allow him $5,000 to cover any actual disbursements made in prosecuting his claims, and in medical attendance. Mr. McLeod had furnished the Government with a satisfactory statement showing a still larger amount expended than the $5,000, and that $5,000 was asked for in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of meeting the additional claim, and giving Mr. McLeod, for expenses and injuries sustained, $15,000.

Mr. DAVIES. While I think the hon. gentleman was right in allowing Mr. McLeod his expenses, it would have been fairer to have allowed him the whole amount actually expended. The amount awarded him was cut down from $35,000 to $10,000, and when he furnished the Minister with a statement of the actual expenditure, the Minister should have taken the whole subject into consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The actual expense was not $7,000; that includes an item of $1,000, for a prospective trip to England.

Mr. DAVIES. I was going to say he had been advised by his medical advisers here to take the opinion of Dr. Errickson, in London, and he went there for that purpose. That was part of his expenses, and I think it would be a legitimate sum to pay him, considering the Government had cut down his claim from $35,000 to $10,000. With respect to the other claims, the hon. gentleman only allows them the exact amount awarded, although the Government compelled each individual case to fyle a petition of right. We endeavoured to induce the hon. member to settle on one claim and let the others be stated on that settlement, but the officers of the Crown would not yield to that. The people were all very poor, and the fact of the matter was the appeal had to be borne in the first instance by the legal advisers. A very large amount of costs were incurred which were deducted from the claims when paid. Take Stewart: he was awarded $1,000. and has never been able to do anything since then, and over $400 was deducted from the amount he received He only got $600, I think, or $620, and he would not have got that much, but the lawyers who represented him in Ottawa made a very handsome deduction from their bill, on the ground that he was a very old, infirm man, and a member of the profession to which they belonged. In the case of Catherine Macdonald, she got a less amount, and so with Mrs. Murphy. I think, as these were test cases, and the Crown insisted on appealing each individual case, it would only be fair on the part of the Government to allow them those costs. The hon. gentleman never contended that they were allowed too much damages. The only case in which there was a contention was McLeod's case, which was cut

down, but the damages in these cases were never alleged to be excessive, and I think it would be but justice to these people, having adopted the principle in the case of McLeod by allowing him $5,000 for his costs, that they should adopt the principle in the case of the others.

Mr. BRECKEN. The case of Mr. Stewart was brought to my notice in the Island. He sustained very serious injury indeed. He is an elderly man, a barrister; he is a very philanthropic man, was some years Indian Commissioner in the Island, and has certainly laid by nothing out of his profession. He sustained very serious injuries indeed, so much so that when he was in the hospital, his life was despaired of, and now one affliction he has got is a stiff neck. He can scarcely walk along the street. He was awarded $1,000. That was considered very low indeed, but that was awarded by the Court of Exchequer, very much out of proportion to the damages which were awarded in other cases, and the costs he had to pay were over $400. He did not net $600.

Mr. DAVIES. He got $600. Allowances were made by the attorneys.

Mr. BRECKEN. Perhaps, next to Mr. McLeod, his injuries were more severe than any of the other people who suffered by that accident, and he is a very old man now, over eighty, and I do not know what his means of support are, scarcely. Although he is a very philanthropic, kind old gentleman, he is almost without means, and he felt it very hard indeed. If he had got the $1,000 he would not have been adequately compensated for the injuries he sustained, and I know as a fact he has not quite netted $600.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume that is the principal item. You say these other parties were very poor, and I suppose there was not much loss in their cases.

Mr. DAVIES. The costs were about the same in all the cases. The petitions of right had to be filed in each case, and the costs, of course, were small compared with McLeod's, because the witnesses were called in his case and paid by him, and the evidence was accepted in the other cases without being gone over the second time, so the costs were comparatively small. When the cases came from the Exchequer Court the Crown appealed in each case, and certain costs could not be avoided. There were agents at Ottawa and the counsel on the trial on the Island.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am surprised to learn how much less generous the legal profession are to their professional brethren than the medical. Such a thing as a medical man making a charge to one of the same profession is unknown. No matter what length of time or the services might be, it would be unheard of in the profession to which I belong. But my sympathies are greatly excited, finding that this respectable member of the profession has suffered so at the hands of his professional brethren. If the particulars are furnished to me, I certainly will submit to my colleagues whether that question should not be considered, and some means found of giving a little more redress than he seems to have obtained.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not confine it to the lawyer. Of course, an anchorite like the hon. gentleman has not the sympathy I would have with the women, but my hon. friend has referred to Mrs. Murphy and others who were sufferers.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has referred to the lawyers. I may say that Mr. Stewart's associates in the Island did not charge him anything at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. DAVIES. But Mr. Stewart had nothing to do with the gentlemen in Ottawa. Of course, they did not know anything about him, and they charged the ordinary fees, and made a very handsome deduction when I represented to them that he was a solicitor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will give me a statement of the actual amounts that these parties have been compelled to pay in order to discharge the costs that they incurred, it is worthy of consideration whether the same principle ought not to be applied to them to some extent that has been applied to Mr. McLeod.

Mr. BLAKE. May I invite the hon. gentleman's attention to the rearrangement of this item.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is already done. It will go to collection of revenue.

CHARGEABLE TO COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

Canadian Pacific Railway.

234

Subsidy for railway and highway bridge over Red River at Emerson (revote)	$20,500 00
Salaries and expenses of Inspecting Engineers; land, and other unsettled accounts.	9,000 00
To pay Thomas Temple for the use of the Temple & Miller Patent Flanger, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, during the winter of 1880-81	300 00
To pay T. Lusted for two horse toboggans supplied in 1879, in connection with the Fort Frances Canal	16 00
To settle the claims of Messrs. Smith & Ripley, for work on the Georgian Bay Branch.	83,000 00
To settle the claims of Messrs. Sifton & Ward, contractors, between Red River and Cross Lake	17,400 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the position of this erection at Emerson? What does it cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The position is this. There was an appropriation of $20,500, and this is a revote. At the two last Sessions, $50,000 was voted for the expenditure for the year 1882-83, but at that date the amount voted ceased to be available. The expenditure had been only $15,000, and the remainder consequently lapsed. An amount of $10,000 being afterwards required on account of this subsidy, an Order in Council was passed to issue a special warrant for the amount. On the 15th November, the Chief Engineer reports that if an assurance is given that an ice-pier will be constructed to protect the work from the ice shove, the work is sufficiently completed to justify the payment of another sum of $10,000. The Order in Council is dated November 24th, 1883.

Salaries and expenses Inspecting Engineers, &c...$9,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain this vote for inspecting engineers, &c.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These are the inspecting engineers in connection with the work that is now going on on the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the contract—the engineers that are inspecting the work and making the returns to the Government as the work proceeds.

Mr. BLAKE. But it also is a sort of *omnium gatherum*. It embraces "land and other unsettled accounts." I do not see anything about repairs and improvments, but almost everything else.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is $2,000 for that. Salaries and expenses of inspecting engineers, land and other unsettled accounts are expected to cover $9,000. Of that, the salaries and expenses of four engineers take $6,000; land and other unsettled accounts, $2,000; and printing Minister's speech, $1,000; in all $9,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cost of the Minister's speech?

Mr. BLAKE. Is that to be charged to the capital account of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should say so—yes. I should say it is a capital charge.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a capital account to charge it to. It is almost a capital crime; but really I do not think it ought to be covered up here. The hon. gentleman is not ashamed of having his speech printed at the public expense, is he?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Why does he not come out like a man, and say what it is for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Especially when it is done by the authority of the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. It is "land and other unsettled accounts." It is extra. Salaries and expenses of inspecting engineers, $6,000; land and other unsettled accounts, $2,000; and the hon. gentleman's speech—why, it is a vacuum; there is no heading under which you can put it in this $9,000. I dare say that is quite appropriate; there was not anything in it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER It is an unsettled account.

Mr. BLAKE. No; that is $2,000. It is the $1,000 there is nothing for. Let us put in "and printing of Minister's speech." Does this include the French edition of the speech?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; it covers all, I hope.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Was this work done by Government contractors or by outside parties.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The English edition certainly was done by the Government contractors.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any item in the Accounts for my speech on this subject?

Thomas Temple, for use of Patent Flanger $300 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt there will be at a future date. Then we ask for $300 to pay Thomas Temple for the use of the Temple & Miller Patent Flanger on the Canadian Pacific Railway, during the winter of 1880-81.

Mr. BLAKE. Who is this Tommy Temple, who is to get $300?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Temple is a gentleman whose acquaintance you had the pleasure of making this winter, the member for York, N B.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How came the services of this gentleman to be ignored by the Government until now? This is three years old, apparently.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a claim for the use of a patent flanger on the Canadian Pacific Railway during the winter of 1880-81. It was purchased by the Canadian Pacific Railway when we operated the road ourselves. The Chief Engineer states that this flanger was fitted on to two or three engines during the winter of 1880, and tried for a couple of months, and he recommends that Mr. Temple be paid $300 for the use of it. It is an old claim, which was put in long ago, and this is the first time it has been brought forward. It was submitted to the Government before the hon. gentleman became a candidate for election.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the date of the Engineer's recommendation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will furnish that later on. The claim for payment has been in controversy for some time. It has been a long time before us.

Mr. BLAKE. It was tried on two or three engines, experimentally, I suppose, and found not to succeed. I hope the hon gentleman will give a little more information about that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the date of the account being sent in, and what the claim was.

Mr. MILLS. Was this the whole amount of the election expenses?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought the hon. gentleman knew more of the character of such expenses than to ask such a question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether this valuable flanger is used on the Intercolonial Railway, which is under the hon. gentleman's special care.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give a full statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Don't forget that particular. We want to know also what the Canadian Pacific Railway are doing with it now.

Claim of Smith & Ripley, Georgian Bay Branch $83,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The next item is $83,000, to settle the claims of Messrs. Smith & Ripley for work on the Georgian Bay Branch. This is a claim somewhat of the category of the others to which we referred a short time ago. I had, perhaps, better read the Order in Council which contains all the facts: On a report, dated 3rd March, 1884, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, submitting that under date the 2nd of August, 1878, a contract was entered into with Messrs. Heney, Charlebois & Flood, for the construction of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, namely, the Georgian Bay Branch, extending from a point near Nepissigon to the head of navigation on French River, the whole to be completed by the 1st of July, 1880. The Minister represents that under the authority of two Orders in Council, one dated the 25th July, and the other the 14th August, 1879, and for reasons therein given, the works comprised in this contract were stopped and taken out of the hands of Messrs. Heney, Charlebois & Flood, the contract itself being annulled; and that on the 5th August, Messrs. Smith & Ripley, who had previously identified themselves with the works, informed the Department, by letter, that they had purchased all the interests of the original contractors therein, and that they desired to be recognized as the successors of the original contractors, and with this letter they forwarded deeds of agreement, the last dated the 30th June, 1879, under which the contract had been transferred. The Minister observes that whatever arrangements had been arrived at between these parties and the original contractors, were effected without the consent of the Crown, and were entirely opposed to an express condition of the contract, whereby Messrs. Heney, Charlebois & Flood were prohibited from making assignment without such consent, and that Messrs. Smith & Ripley were accordingly on the 11th August, 1879, notified to the effect that the contract had been cancelled prior to the receipt of their letter, and further, that the assignment of the contract without consent was prohibited. That after the aforesaid cancellation of the contract, namely on the 24th of October, 1879, Messrs. Smith & Ripley procured from Messrs. Heney, Charlebois & Flood "for a valuable consideration" an assignment of all their rights and claims and moneys due, with claims for damages and loss of profits, &c., being constituted their lawful attorneys for the said purposes. The Minister further observes that upon the submission by Messrs. Smith & Ripley of certain claims in this connection, a petition of right was granted them and these claims were heard before the Court of Exchequer, the result being a decision in their favour as against the Government, the amount awarded them being $171,040.77 with costs. Of this sum, $100,000 was for prospective profits, and $71,040.77 for expenditure directly in connection with the contract. That this

decision was thereupon appealed from on behalf of the Crown, and the case was ultimately re-heard before the Supreme Court of Canada, Messrs. Heney, Charlebois & Flood being joined as co-suppliants, but not as beneficially interested. The Minister also observes that the judgments severally given by the judges of this court are, with one exception (the judge before whom the case was heard in the Exchequer Court, who maintains his previous holding) decisive in asserting the rights of the Crown to cancel the contract under the provisions therein contained. The majority of the judges, however, express opinions to the effect that in view of the integrity and good faith shown in the conduct of the works, the suppliants are entitled to receive the most favourable consideration, one of the judges stating his views in the following words: "I have come "to this conclusion (adverse to the claimants) with great "reluctance, for I see that an injustice is done to the re- "spondents by such a judgment. I am sure, however, that "the Government will not avail itself of this judgment "and of the strictness of the law, to refuse to the respon- "dents the justice they are entitled to at their hands." The Minister further represents that on the 6th of October last, Messrs. Smith & Ripley memorialized the Government, asking that consideration might be shown them, and under date of the 18th ult., they submitted a statement of moneys expended by their firm in connection with and in and about the Georgian Bay contract, during the years 1878 and 1879, the total amount being $127,296.40. Against this they set the amount paid by the Government for work done and received by themselves for plant sold, namely, $21,053.27, leaving a balance of $106,243.13, upon which sum they asked that interest should be paid from the date of the cancellation of the contract. They also asked that a further sum of $10,000 should be paid them to cover legal and personal expenses since 1879, bringing the total amount up to $116,243.13, with interest as aforesaid. The Minister states that this statement has been explained by the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and under date the 22nd ult, he has made a report thereon, advising a settlement with the firm, upon the following basis, which includes the sum of $29,000, excluded from the judgment of the Exchequer Court. Expenditure;——plant, $18,134.05; general expenses, hay, grain and materials used on the works, $44,807.24; expenses—office, travelling and private expenses, $7,057.83. Settlement with Sub-Contractors: — John Shields, $2,427.58; John McDonald, $4,159.76—$6,587.34. Hamilton Powder Company, account of $13,157.40, which was settled at 50 per cent. by returning the powder, $6,578.75; A. Charlebois, account for derricks and tools, $2,412.17; total, $85,577.38. Buying out original contractors:—A. Charlebois, $15,000; J. Flood & Co., $10,000; John Heney, $4,000; total, $29,000. Grand total, $114,577.38, less the following credits:—Paid in estimates, $11,000; proceeds of sale of plant, $10,053.27; total, $21,053.27; leaving, $93,524.11. The above items should, the Chief Engineer considers, be paid; certain other items for legal expenses, salaries, &c, amounting to $22,719, he regards as inadmissible, and he expresses the opinion that the question of payment of interest from the date of the cancellation of the contract is also worthy of consideration. The Minister, considering that the view of the case taken as above stated, by the majority of the judges of the Supreme Court, and coincided in by the Chief Engineer to the extent set forth in his report, is such as the Government would desire to adopt in furtherance of the principles of equity and fairness, rather than those of strict law, recommends that the the Government rights in the premises having been conclusively established, the petitions be dealt with upon the basis of equitable settlement proposed by the Chief Engineer, and that the sum of $93,524.11, together with a further sum of $27,683 14, representing interest thereon from the 25th of July, 1879, the date of the Order in Council stopping the works, up to the 30th of June next, or a total sum of $121,207.25, be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1883-84, to be laid before Parliament during its present Session, for the purpose indicated. The Committee concur in the foregoing report and the recommendation therein made; they submit the same for Your Excellency's approval, deducting however the $29,000, the amount paid for the contract to the original contractors and the interests on the same. The Government felt that in view of the opinion rendered by the court, although in strict law the parties were excluded from pressing their claim, yet as the expenditure had been made in good faith and under the belief they would be paid, the Government decided to ask Parliament to vote this amount.

Claim of Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake Branch..... $17,400 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this item, $17,400 for Sifton & Ward?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a claim by Sifton & Ward, who were contractors on Section 14. Their claim was for $275,000. It was resisted by the Government, who allowed the contractors to go to the Exchequer Court. The court found in favour of the suppliants on the first four items, amounting to the sum asked for.

CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

St. Peter's.

235. To pay H. F. Perley, Civil Engineer, for four years' service, to 21st December, 1883, enlargement of the St. Peter's Canal..... $1,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The matter stands in this way: The St. Peter's Canal was constructed under the superintendence of Mr. Perley, who is Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, and whatever expenditures have been required to be made in relation to the canal have always been done under his supervision. As that officer was not in my Department, and was called upon to perform extra services, we consider he is entitled to this amount for four years' services in that connection. There are now some extensive repairs in progress, which are being made under his direction. I suppose, however, this amount will cover the present year.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose as that officer was connected with the work of enlarging the canal, his services might be valuable in finishing the work; but the regular engineer should be able to attend to repairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is Mr. Perley's present salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $3,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does he receive any other allowances except this one?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; only this one.

Welland.

236 To meet payment of the balance of unpaid labourers' wages and board accounts *in re* J. V. Browne & Company, abandoned contract. $2,436 80

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did the Government come out of this contract; was there a loss sustained?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid there was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But was the work done by these parties equal to the amount paid at various times, apart from this?

Mr. BLAKE. The accounts say that $1,926 was due to the contractor, and the residue must have been lost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was there any cash deposit?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that was the case, and if the amount was paid by estimates properly made, the Government should have had in hand enough to meet such a claim.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That does not follow; but if the hon. gentleman wants further particulars, I will get them on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. On what principle is the payment made? At at an early period of the Session enquiry was made with reference to numerous claims of a somewhat similar character, as to another enterprise which the hon. gentleman has taken under his fatherly protection, in another part of the Dominion, and he said that no arrangements had been made. What are the special circumstances which induced the Government to recognize a claim for an amount in excess of what was due to the contractor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give fuller particulars on Concurrence.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I may say that the contractors got the amount and ran away with it to the other side. They kept the money and the labourers were left unpaid, and this sum is to pay the balance due to the labourers. The contractors paid no wages whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt that the labourers have not been paid, else we would not be called upon to pay them. The point I desire to enquire into, is the principle of action in this matter, because it is obvious if we begin with a small amount like this we may have to pay $150,000, which is, I believe, the amount in question in the other case to which I alluded. I wish it to be understood that further particulars shall be furnished, and that we shall have freedom of discussion on Concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I may say that I think there is a precedent for this in the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), in connection with one of the canals near Montreal, where the contractor was in default and the labourers were paid by the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that in that particular case the Minister of Public Works considered that the Government got full value, and of course if the Government received value, the question would not arise in the shape in which it arises now. I would like, however, to know, in addition to other particulars, what amount was taken on deposit and how it was applied, because *prima facie* there should have been enough to meet this claim.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). As a matter of fact, the Government have received full value, because the contract was taken at 60 cents per yard, which is not more than half value for the work. For that reason I think the principle of letting contracts to contractors, if they only furnish 5 per cent. security, is entirely wrong. In this case the work was really worth $1 or perhaps $1.20 a yard. The country has received full value for the amount, when it is considered that the work was done at so low a rate.

Carillon.

237.	To pay John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, for services as sole arbitrator in the case of R. P. Cooke & Co., $535; and in the case of F. B. McNamee & Co., $635	$1,170 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This appears not only an unusual but an objectionable item. This practice of paying officers of the Department who act as arbitrators, in addition to their regular salaries, does not seem to me a desirable thing to encourage. I should think it would be far better, even if Mr. Page be, as I believe he is, a very competent officer, to employ somebody else than to pay him for work which belongs particularly to his own Department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and this case has been treated rather exceptionally. The belief on the part of the Government, of course, was that Mr. Page was able to settle these claims upon more advantageous terms than would likely be obtained if we had sent them to the general arbitrators. I am inclined to think that although the sum appears to be somewhat large in the aggregate, the expense would have been much greater if the usual course had been resorted to. I agree that as a general principle it is not desirable to have officers of the Department paid for acting as arbitrators in addition to their salaries. This matter, however, was brought before Parliament last Session, and I believe with the general approval of the House. It has been continued, but instead of allowing the sum to accumulate, I requested Mr. Page to make an account for each arbitration.

Mr. BLAKE. It was understood that there were special circumstances with reference to the cases last Session. I certainly felt a great deal of reluctance to acquiesce in that vote, and I suppose that those special and exceptional circumstances, whatever they are, which we have heard so often pleaded, had ended the matter. Mr. Page's salary is $4,500 I believe, and we find here a sum of $1,700 added to his emoluments for the performance of this duty. I say you are entitled to have a fair extent of the services of the public officers in high positions for their salaries. If you impose upon them extra duties of this kind without emolument, they are very likely to shirk them. On the other hand, if you arrange to give them these extra duties, you are taking away a large portion of that time and energy which are wanted for the work of the Department itself. This duty must have consumed a large portion of Mr. Page's time. If his salary be $4,500, this amount is equivalent to about one-third of his ordinary emolument for the year, for which we are supposed to get all his time; and so large a gap in his time cannot possibly have taken place without detriment to the affairs of the Department. More than that, I do not think it is necessary that there should be three arbitrators. I think that is a very expensive tribunal. Ordinarily, I do not think the Government would have any difficulty in arranging for a single independent arbitrator; and then you would save the expense of such a tribunal as this, and Mr. Page would then occupy his proper relation to the Government, which is not that of a judge between them and the contractors, but of the person who brings forward the Government's side of the case, and sees that everything favourable to them is presented. I think the whole system is one which ought not to receive that sanction which the hon. gentleman now challenges for it. Last year, when a number of these awards were before us, I think it was understood that this system should not continue. May I ask whether, in each case, a claim was presented, and the claim was very much larger than the amount awarded?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. If so, on what principle do the Government pay the expenses of the arbitration? It is Mr. Page's duty, as Chief Engineer, to investigate any claim, to point out to the Government what portions of that claim are fit to be acknowledged and what portions ought to be disputed; and if he is afterwards to arbitrate upon it, and to decide as he thought beforehand, the result is, that what the Government would have given without the expense of an arbitration they afterwards give, or thereabouts, and pay the whole expenses of the arbitration besides. On the whole, I do not see that the system is one that ought to be pursued.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said, and as I said before, we have been inclined to treat Mr. Page's case as an exceptional one. He possesses, in a very eminent degree, as Chief Engineer, the confidence of all parties in this House, and of every person who has come in contact with him.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We were therefore disposed to look with a great degree of favour upon any application of this kind. Having been called upon to perform this service, which was outside of his professional duties—for he was not obliged to act as an arbitrator—and having been weighted with very heavy and responsible duties as Chief Engineer, to which he devoted himself with unceasing assiduity, these extra duties involved the necessity of his devoting extra hours outside of office hours altogether, at home in the evenings, to the investigation of these cases. I think we have saved a large amount of money in these investigations, and I think we have probably got through them at a smaller expense than would have been incurred had they been referred to persons who had not an intimate knowledge of the work. But even that would perhaps be preferable to the adoption of a system which is certainly open to a great deal of objection, as a matter of principle.

Williamsburg—Rapide Plat Division.

238 Compensation to Mrs. Clara S. Holden, Executrix to the estate of the late Mr. James Holden, for a storehouse and rent of same $660 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a very old story. On the 12th of March, 1849, a lease was granted to Mr. James Holden of part of a wharf at the lower entrance of the Rapide Plat Canal, with the right to build a storehouse immediately in rear of the said wharf. The lease provided that on the Government requiring to retake possession of the wharf, it might do so on giving three months' notice, and that it might acquire possession of the storehouse in question on payment of the cost of materials, with 10 per cent. added, according to valuation. The property appears to have been re-transferred to the Government in the year 1852, and in 1853, £30 was offered to Mr. Holden as compensation for the storehouse. That sum, however, he declined to accept, not having been able to obtain a settlement of other claims he had against the Government, and that building has remained in possession of the Government ever since, but no payment has been made on account thereof. Mr. James Holden is now dead, and his son has recently put in a claim for $1,350—being $150, the alleged value of the said building, and $1,200, thirty years' rent at $40 a year. The Chief Engineer of Canals recommends to pay to the lawful representative of the late Mr. James Holden the sum of $660, being $120 for the storehouse and $540, the amount of thirty years' rent at $18 per annum, in full settlement of all claims against the Government in connection with said storehouse.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that statement indicates the utter preposterousness of this demand, with the exception of $120. Upon the face of the statement, the Government offered thirty years ago to this man the amount they now say his successors ought to receive; but he refused it, because he said he had some other claims upon the Government. But now, after he is dead, it is agreed to pay his widow what he refused, with interest of $18 a year for all that time. It is absurd, and worse than absurd, that we should be called upon to pay this claim. Besides that, it is a claim against the old Province and not against the Dominion, and he must charge it, if paid, against the old Province of Canada. If the Government offered £30 and the man refused to take it, that should be an end to it.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The age of a just claim does not bar its claim to payment and it appears the Government offered £30 for the property; it was not paid and we have had the property ever since. Under these circumstances, the Chief Engineer recommended we should settle this claim in full. I have no objection to charging it to the old Province, but do not see how I can collect it.

Mr. BLAKE. If it is a debt now, it is a debt of the old Province, and there is no obligation to pay interest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Had he accepted the money he would not have lost interest.

Mr. BLAKE. But he did not take it, and I have no faith in claims of thirty years standing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We know the facts exist and we have the report of the offer, which was not accepted.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand it, Mr. Holden merely had the right to claim rent for the materials which were in his storehouse; if he was offered the money and did not take it, and if the executors to-day changed their mind it is quite sufficient to pay them the £30, that is all they should have.

Lachine.

239 To pay John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, for services as sole arbitrator in the case of Messrs. Williamson, Rodgers & Farrell, contractors for Section 9 ..... $575 00

CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Welland.

240
- To purchase a steam pump $5,000 00
- Services of Watchmen on canal 7,000 00
- To pay for the damages to the cargo and hull of the schooner *St. Andrews* 16,555 95
- To pay for damages to the cargo of the *Jennie Graham* 19,624 74

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the 4th October, 1875, the schooner *St. Andrews*, while passing near Petersburgh, struck against the rocky side of the canal, and was injured to such an extent that she sank immediately, her cargo, which consisted of 15,100 bushels of corn, being consequently damaged. The said cargo is insured in the Anchor Insurance Company, who subsequently brought a claim against the Government, which was referred to the official arbitrators for investigation and award. The arbitrators decided, March 3rd, 1883, that the accident was caused by the negligence of the canal employees, the floating fenders being placed in such a position that they afforded no protection:

Award for the cargo	$ 7,383 12
Interest from 4th November, 1875, to 4th May, 1883, at 6 per cent., according to report of arbitrators	3,322 40
Mr. McIlwain brought a claim for injuries done to the hull of the vessel; the official arbitrators awarded	3,350 00
Interest from 4th October, 1875, to 4th May, 1883, at 6 per cent., according to report of arbitrators	1,524 25
Amount of bill of costs to be paid by the Government, the award having been adverse to the Crown	868 85
Interest allowed to 4th July, 1883	107 33
Total	$16,555 95

Mr. McIlwain's costs have been taxed at $234.76.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How came it that an accident which occurred in 1875 was not arbitrated upon or proposed to be paid until 1884?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These claims are contested; they become the subject of discussion, are continued from year to year, and no doubt the hon. gentleman had this claim pressed on him while he was in the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not before me.

Mr. BLAKE. When was it referred to arbitrators?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The report is dated 3rd March, 1883. On the 25th October, 1875, the schooner *Jennie Graham* struck upon some obstruction and sank her cargo, which consisted of 21,000 bushels of barley, being consequently damaged. The Anchor Insurance Company, with whom the cargo was insured, subsequently brought a claim against the Government for compensation, and the case was referred to the official arbitrators for investigation and award. On the 3rd March, 1883, the arbitrators made their award, determining that the obstruction had been negligently left in the lock, and adjudged that the Anchor Insurance Company should be paid the sum of $12,514.76. On the 13th March, the Company claimed interest stating, that the sum awarded was the exact amount paid by them on 4th December, 1875, in settlement of the loss. On the 10th April, the arbitrators reported that their award was intended to carry interest at 6 per cent, from the 4th December, 1875, to 4th September, 1883, $5,819.36. The award, having been adverse to the Crown, the costs are to be paid by the Government. Bill of costs presented by Company, $1,290.62, making a total of $19,624.74.

Mr. BLAKE. When was this claim presented first?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Order in Council was passed on the 18th August, 1883.

Mr. BLAKE. Again it strikes me I have never heard before of a Government recognizing the right of an insurance company to have compensation in respect to injuries. It is entirely novel to me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman would know better than I, but I would suppose, that if an insurance company insured a cargo or a vessel against damage, and the damage was caused by any negligence on the part of the Government, they would stand in precisely the same position as the owner would. Why should they not? If the insurance company has to pay $12,000 on account of some *lache* on the part of the Government, why should they not pay it the same as any other individual?

Mr. BLAKE. Because it is their business to take these risks. They receive the premium and take the risk. But what I have been asking is, whether there has been, up to this time, any claim on the part of any insurance company which has been recognized by the Government, and whether the legal department of the Government advise that claims of this description should be referred to arbitration without a special consideration of the question of the relation of an insurance company to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will get that information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the same company that has recovered in both instances?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the Anchor Insurance Company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are its headquarters? Is it an English Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I really do not know who the Company are at all.

Beauharnois.

24. To pay L. W. Marchand, advocate, for professional services rendered in 1857-58-59, in connection with the settlement of the claims arising out of the construction of dams at head of Beauharnois Canal.....	$1,207 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the statutory prescriptions ought to apply some time or other.

Mr. BLAKE. Ought not the hon. gentleman to wait thirty years more before paying this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is, I believe, an award.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, no. We do not refer lawyers' bills to the arbitrators.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; it is not an award. Do you want explanations?

Mr. BLAKE. Indeed I do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Upon the construction of the Beauharnois Canal, in 1849, it became necessary to raise the waters at the head of the canal, and for this purpose dams were built, the consequence being that a large quantity of land adjacent thereto was submerged. The Minister represents that, upon a settlement of various claims for compensation arising out of the damages sustained, a special Commission was constituted, the whole matter being subsequently placed in the hands of the Board of Provincial Arbitrators, before whom the interests of the Government were watched by advocates appointed for the purpose, and amongst the advocates was Mr. L. W. Marchand, whose connection with the Board continued during the years 1857, 1858 and 1859. The Minister further represents that, though divers sums of money were from time to time paid to Mr. Marchand on account, this bill of charges never received a final settlement. On the 2nd of July, 1868, a letter was sent to the Department of Justice, in which it was stated that the accounts had been referred when received to the Attorney-General for Lower Canada, but mislaid by him. Copies were, however, enclosed, showing the total amount of charges and disbursements for the three years to have been $6,207, and the payments made $5,000, leaving a balance of $1,207. The Minister states further, that his Department had no means of certifying to the number of days during which Mr. Marchand was engaged; yet the list of cases prepared by him agreed with the returns of the arbitrators, and the clerk to the official arbitrators at the time of Mr. Marchand's employment has, by a document dated the 4th April, 1880, certified that the charge of $10 a day made by Mr. Marchand is the same as had been allowed to the advocates preceding him, and that the number of sittings, to the best of his belief, are correctly given, and the travelling charges moderate. The Minister reports that no action has been taken upon this claim. The Minister recommends that authority be given for the payment of the said sum to Mr. Marchand, being the balance of his account, and that the said balance shall be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for 1883-84.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the date of that report, pray?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is an Order in Council of June 7th, 1883.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the case then that no application was made for the payment of this money between 1868 and 1880?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I have stated all the facts.

Mr. BLAKE. He says some action was taken in 1868, some reference or a note of some reference, and the next thing appears to be in 1880, fourteen years afterwards.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A letter was sent to the Department on the 2nd July, 1868.

Mr. BLAKE. This also, it seems to me, if it is a debt, is a debt of the old Province of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And it was referred to the Attorney-General of Lower Canada, who, it appears, mislaid the papers, and copies of them were produced.

Mr. BLAKE. There appears to be in the Supplementary Estimates of every Session of late years a certain number of these old claims.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope we will get rid of them all soon.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say if he has any more before him that will come in the Further Supplementary Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope not. They are very tiring.

Mr. BLAKE. I think so. Does he propose to charge this to the Dominion or to the old Province of Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it is too small to have an arbitration of the old Province on it.

Mr. BLAKE. I think perhaps he would be more careful about paying these claims if they were charged to the right account, because I fancy the Province would be indisposed to recognize such claims as this. I think, if paid at all, it is clear they should not be paid by the Dominion. It is only by virtue of the proposition that they are debts of the old Province that the claims can be made at all. I do not approve of the vote. I think these claims ought to be supported by much stronger evidence, and in any event they should not be charged to the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In any case, I think the representatives of the old Province ought to be consulted about these matters. If it is a debt at all, of which I have the gravest possible doubt, I confess, after the explanation, it is, as my hon. friend has said, a debt due by the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and it is the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec which ought to decide whether it is a just claim, not the hon. gentleman. He has no right to saddle the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec with this claim that I can see.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid, under the Union Act, we are responsible for the engagements of the old Province in regard to everything that comes under the purview of this Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt; the Act of Union makes the Dominion responsible for the debts of the old Province, but on condition that they are charged to the old Province.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If a claim is made, if it is felt that it is a legitimate claim against the old Province, we are responsible and obliged to pay it, although we have a right to look to the old Province for it.

Mr. BLAKE. We pay it only by virtue of a special statutory obligation, part of which is that you shall not charge it against the rest of the Dominion. It is because it is a debt of old Canada that it comes to us at all, and in view of the division of old Canada into Ontario and Quebec, for book-keeping convenience Canada was called upon to bear the payment in the first instance. But she does not bear the debts of the other provinces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The consolidated debts, but not such debts as this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; in regard to works which came over and became our property.

Mr. BLAKE. On another principle; that would be the obligations incurred in respect of the work. This is not the case of a doctor charging nothing for his services, but of a lawyer, who for fourteen years, forgot to ask for his bill. I never heard of such a case before.

Rideau.

243. To pay land damages between Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills $326 00

M. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Claims have been preferred for compensation by several individuals on account of damages to their properties by high waters. The superintendent and engineers have reported on these claims and have submitted a valuation. The Chief Engineer has expressed the opinion that the amounts are reasonable and should be paid in full of all demands, past and present, provided the respective claimants can show satisfactory title to the land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is rather odd. I know something of the land in that vicinity, and I should say it has been forty or fifty years since the dams and other works in that neighbourhood were constructed, by which any land could be flooded. It is difficult to see how new damage could be done now.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not the damage that is new; it is the claim that is new.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These are quite recent.

PUBLIC WORKS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Ottawa.

213. Additional compensation to Mr. Calvert Vaux, for the plans submitted by him for the embellishment and arrangement of the Parliament Grounds, Ottawa (revote of lapsed amount) $500 00

PUBLIC WORKS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Quebec.

214. Montreal Drill Shed 16,000 00
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... 2,900 00
Quebec Fortifications—To pay H. J. Beemer, in full and final settlement of all claims in connection with his contracts for Kent and St. Louis Gates.... 5,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are asking $5,000 to pay H. J. Beemer in full and final settlement for all claims in connection with his contracts for Kent and St. Louis Gates, which claims amounted to $21,300. After a careful examination of the matter, it was decided, on the recommendation of the chief architect, to allow him the sum of $5,000. Mr. Beemer was pressing his claim, and wanted it to be referred to the arbitrators, but I told him I would not consent, that I thought his case should be decided by the chief architect, like other claims of that kind. I desired to avoid the cost of arbitration. Mr. Fuller, the chief architect, looked into the matter, and reported that the claim of $21,300 should be met by an award of $5,000 in full of all demands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman's attention was directed to the fact that Her Majesty specially contributed £500; and it was suggested that, as was proper, that sum should be specially expended in some way to commemorate the Duke of Kent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount was paid over to the Receiver-General, and placed at the disposal of my Department, and when we built the gate opposite St. Anne's street, it was named the Kent Gate, in honour of the Queen's father. The amount of money that was contributed by Her Majesty was expended on that gate. The plans were prepared and revised by the Princess Louise when she was here, and changed to suit her taste. Special lamps were imported, at her request, and we have put a tablet in the gate, upon which an inscription will be made during the coming summer.

Ontario.

245	Stratford Post Office, Custom House, &c	$1,000 00
	Clifton Post Office, &c	5,000 00
	Port Hope Post Office	5,000 00
	Gananoque Custom House, &c., &c	4,000 00
	Lighting a portion of the Parliament Buildings by electricity	7,400 00
	New pump and connections for water works, Public Buildings, Ottawa	1,600 00
	London Post Office—Fittings and furniture	1,600 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to complete public buildings in several towns in Ontario. Stratford Post Office and Custom House will have cost, when completed, $42,500; this $1,000 completes. We ask for $5,000 to complete the Clifton Post Office, which will have cost altogether about $35,000. On Port Hope Post Office and Custom House we have expended, to the 31st of December last, $20,400; the total estimated cost of the work will be $39,000 altogether. The Gananoque Custom House will require $1,000; this will cost altogether not quite $12,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My attention has been called to the excessive charges made in the legal department, for which I do not hold the hon. Minister responsible, but which are utterly out of all reason. Work for which an ordinary business man would charge $50 or $100 is charged at the rate of $600 or 700 to the Government. All sorts of charges, such as never before heard of, are made.

Mr. DAVIES. The charges made are refreshing to lawyers coming from the Maritime Provinces. Take the account for the Hamilton building. For search of title there is a charge made of $603.90. After the gentleman, J. A. Macdonell, has made every possible charge of which the imagination could conceive, he charges 1 per cent. on the cost of the whole building, $359, which is practically a commission. This gentleman was away nine days, and for that service $185 are charged.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought, in legal matters, there was complete protection, by having the costs taxed by the proper authorities. These costs, I understand, were properly taxed.

Mr. DAVIES. These costs were not properly taxed. They were referred to Mr. Barwick.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Barwick was employed to get the costs reduced.

Mr. DAVIES. If it is to be understood that lawyers employed to search titles for the Government are to charge 1 per cent. on the total value in addition to all other costs, it is well that the fact should be known, as there will be some very heavy bills to be submitted in future. The next case was in regard to the St. Thomas building, and Mr. Macdonell was more moderate. His account was $145. He charged for the deed alone $35, and fee on title, $70. His account for Chatham building was $106, and again we have the 1 per cent. fee. No person ever heard of such a charge in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Is not the reason given by the leader of the Opposition and the Premier why judges' salaries cannot be equalized, this—that the emolument and fees in Ontario are much larger than the fees in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. BLAKE. I never heard before of such fees as these for such services.

Mr. DAVIES. The charges are first amusing, and after a time they strike one as utterly outrageous and indefensible. There is a charge in connection with the Toronto conservatory, of $131; for the Leamington lighthouse, $169. In every case the percentage charge is brought in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My attention was called to some of these accounts the other day by some remarks made, I think, in the Public Accounts Committee, and I accordingly looked into some of them. After doing so, I called the special attention of the Minister of Justice to them, and he told me that he certainly will take care in the future that these accounts are revised and such sums not paid. In regard to the certificate of the registrar, it must be remembered that the lawyer is responsible for examining the title. Of course, I have not gone into the matter closely, but I may assure hon. gentlemen that I think the accounts rendered were rather high, and I have called the attention of the Minister of Justice to the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to hear from the Minister of Public Works that he intends to prevent the repetition of such charges as these being sanctioned and paid out of the public moneys. I am sorry the attention of the Minister of Justice was not called to these circumstances before the public moneys were expended, as I submit, to a large extent, improperly, in the payment of these bills. They are not mere trifles, for I have before me a list, of which I shall give some of the items, though I have not added the total. There are, amongst others, the following items:—The Leamington lighthouse, $169.89; Toronto observatory, $401.39; St. Thomas public buildings, $145.76; Hamilton public buildings, $603 90; Chatham public buildings, $106 78. These are the bills of costs rendered by a professional gentleman practising in Toronto, Mr. J. A. Macdonell, to this Government. I find that these bills were rendered to the Government, and a letter was written by the Deputy Minister of Justice, a part of which I will read. This letter was written to Mr. F. D. Barwick, barrister, Toronto, and sent along with the bills, asking that the bills should be taxed. The letter states:

"It has been arranged with Mr. Macdonell that these bills should be taxed by Mr. Thom, the taxing officer of the Chancery Division, and the Minister has directed me to forward them to you with the request that you will procure an appointment for this purpose and attend the taxation on his behalf. Will you be good enough to do so and to report the result to me as soon as possible."

That letter is dated on the 18th November, 1881. There is another letter dated on the 27th of December, of the same year, from the Deputy Minister of Justice, referring to these bills, with some particulars, and some special instructions. Having set forth the bills at the head of the letter, we find that the meaning of item No. 4, *re* St. Thomas buildings, is that this charge is made for investigating the title to certain lands, in the city of St. Thomas, and the charge made in the account rendered for searching that title is $145.79. Then he goes to No. 5, which is an item for searching title to a piece of land for the purpose of a lighthouse at Leamington. He says:

"I would request you to procure an appointment with Mr. Thom, and have them taxed by that officer. To enable you rightly to represent to the Department the taxation I make the following explanation respecting the several cases referred to in the bills."

Then he goes on to No. 1. I may say that No. 1 is a number of bills against five different persons. I will not mention the names, because I do not desire to draw the names of suitors into the case:

"No instructions were ever given to commence proceedings, as it was known that the gentlemen would pay upon being written to. This they did do. I observe that Mr. Macdonell has made out five separate bills, charging instructions and attendances, &c., in last bill, though the matter was really but one transaction. The Department objects to the charges being multiplied by five."

Well, according to the instruction of the Department, Mr. Macdonell was instructed to write five separate letters to five different persons, and he made out five separate bills for which of course the Government was not to blame, and the bills were paid at $37.61, said to have been the result of the taxation. The letter goes on:

"No. 2. *Re* Toronto observatory. The Department thinks Mr. Macdonell very excessive. This Government own the observatory and certain property surrounding it, but as there was nothing on record in the Department of Marine (which Department is charged with the administration of the observatory) to show the nature of the Government title, Mr. Macdonell was desired to make necessary enquiries and report the nature of the title. You will observe that he has framed his bill as if the case were one in which he acted as counsel. He was employed as a solicitor, and the case was not one in which counsel's services could be, or would be, either useful or required. I am desired by the Minister of Justice to say that the Department wishes to pay Mr. Macdonell fair and reasonable fees for any services which he may perform, but that excessive charges, and charges for which there is no warrant, are objected to."

No. 3 refers to some small bills. No. 4 refers to the title of the St. Thomas property. This is an ordinary case of searching title to land, but it cost the country no less than $145.79 for searching title, that being the amount allowed after taxation. This appears to be an ordinary case of searching the title to a piece of land bought by the Government for a lighthouse, and yet it cost this country $168.89 to have that title investigated. As an evidence of the skilfulness with which the taxation was carried on, and of the attention that was given to the interests of the Dominion, I may say that the result of the taxation of that bill was to reduce it by the magnificent amount of one dollar. Now, the instructions sent by the Deputy Minister of Justice to Mr. Barwick were, that he should cause these bills to be submitted to the taxing officer of the Court of Chancery, Mr. Thom, a person peculiarly fitted to speak on such matters, because they largely embraced what are known as conveyancing charges. They were not submitted to Mr. Thom. The instructions of the Deputy Minister of Justice were ignored, and the bills were taken to another gentleman. It is true, he was a taxing officer of the Court of Queen's Bench. At that time, the taxing officer was the gentleman who is now the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small). He is supposed to have taxed these bills, and Mr. Barwick is supposed to have represented the Dominion and to have keenly looked after its interests on that occasion. Now, let us see how he did it. Take the case of the Hamilton public buildings. A piece of land was bought in the city of Hamilton for $35,900, on which to erect certain Dominion public buildings. Mr. Macdonell was employed to search the title, and he has rendered a bill for that transaction. According to the bill, his services began on the 5th of May, and terminated, so far as getting the deed is concerned, on the 3rd of June—one month. There are some items involved in closing up the transaction after that, such as sending the deeds to be registered, and sending the papers to this Department. But for services alleged to have been rendered during that month Mr. Macdonell succeeded in preparing a bill largely making up the gross charge of $650.80. I am not blaming the Government for the amount of the bill on its face, but I do blame them for the sum they paid in settling it. It was submitted to be taxed. Mr. Barwick disregarded the instruction to have it taxed by the proper officer and had it taxed by another gentleman—the gentleman I referred to; and, with all respect to him, I would say that he is not qualified to tax this bill. He has never had any considerable experience—and I speak what I know—in work of this kind. Mr. Small's professional experience as taxing officer has been almost entirely limited to taxing costs in common lawsuits, and he has not been accustomed to accounts such as these.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope so.

Mr. MULOCK. I hope so sincerely; for the results here are not what is right between man and man. In this bill, he has allowed $180 to Mr. Macdonell, for going up to Hamilton. I am satisfied that no evidence could have been supplied to show that it was necessary for Mr. Macdonell to be absent from the city of Toronto nine days for any such purpose. We know the proximity of Toronto to Hamilton, and the simple mode of communication between neighbouring towns. There are plenty of lawyers in Hamilton, as well as in Toronto, and the ordinary method is to write to some solicitor in any town where a title is to be searched, and get him to make the necessary search. But if the Government desired Mr. Macdonell personally to attend to this matter, he could not, I think, have been necessarily absent on the Government business in connection with this matter for that length of time. Now, we find such items allowed as "Fee, registering deed received from vendor's solicitor, $5;" "Fee on title, 1 per cent. on $35,900, $359." That bill is, in my opinion, simply outrageous, and the interests of the people were in no way looked after in the matter of that taxation. Now, I come to the next bill, which is for searching the title to a piece of land in the city of St. Thomas. According to this bill, the work was begun in the month of June, 1881, and the bill was rendered for $176.79, from which $31 were taxed. I find in that bill such items allowed as $34 for various charges in connection with the preparation of the deed. Now, no person, I think, can say that this is a fair charge. It is beyond all reason. I do not desire to be unreasonable. On the contrary, considering the relation of the parties, I would not have taken exception to a charge, even slightly above the ordinary charge. But I am satisfied that it was a surprise to every legal gentleman here, to find that it cost about $34 to get an ordinary deed, through the agency of Mr. Macdonell. We find that item is made up of such items as: "Rough draft of deed, twenty-seven folios, $5.40;" "Fee for revising it, $10." He is allowed by this taxing officer $10 for looking over his own draft.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Do you call that too much?

Mr. MULOCK. I am telling you what it is, and leaving you to judge for yourself. The next item is, "Engrossing copy for vendor's solicitor, $2.70;" and there are a number of small items, making up the sum of $34.14, for a deed of conveyance. I think the allowance of those charges must satisfy you that these bills were not honestly taxed in the interests of the people.

Mr. WOODWORTH. How did they come to put on 14 cents?

Mr. MULOCK. By postage; it is a case of "the lie with a circumstance." Even, then, he is allowed $1 for the preparation of the bill of costs, a thing which is never allowed in the tariff when a solicitor renders a bill to his own client, which is the case here; and then, in conclusion, he allows an item of $10 as a fee on the title, making altogether, for searching for that ordinary title, $145—a work which, I presume, would have cost a citizen, perhaps, $20. Then we come to the next item in the account, the Chatham public buildings. This appears to be just another case of an ordinary title investigated, and we find such items as these allowed:

"For perusing an abstract, two hours, $4; receiving title deeds and perusing same, $7.20; requisitions as to title, $5; receiving answer to requisitions and perusing same, $4; further requisitions as to title, $3; attending Crown Lands Office to examine papers fyled when patents issued, and to investigate title of the Van Allens, two hours, $4."

And to conclude it all, he charges, on passing title, 1 per cent. on purchase money, $50, which makes the account foot up to $106.78 for passing on this title. In this bill the disbursements amount in all to $5.18, leaving $101.60 as the net profit to the gentleman in question. Then we come to the Toronto observatory. You will remember that the Deputy Minister of Justice said that this bill was made up on an entirely erroneous principle; that he believed the charges excessive, and especially called the attention of Mr. Barwick to the incorrect manner in which the bill was made up, intimating, as strongly as language could do so, that this was not a case in which counsel fees should be allowed; yet, we find this bill allowed the large sum of

$401.39. On looking through the bill, we find such items as these:

"Special report on title, 33 folios; engrossing and counsel fee, &c, $9 90; counsel fee, $10 (reduced by the taxing officer to $30.)"

And then there is another long story: Fee on long and special consultation with Chief Justice Moss, Vice-Chancellor of the University, explaining matters to him, going over all papers, Orders in Council, &c.—which need not have appeared on this account. What did that interview cost this country? It cost us $40. There is another little item. He has drafted a report; so he has sent a report to the Government about the title, for which he has not forgotten to charge, and then he comes down again with "Drafting a second report of title, fourteen folios, $4 20, and fees on same, $20;" reduced by taxation to $10. Thus he is allowed $10 for his fee on drafting a second report. Then we find such an item as this. You must remember what was this matter. The Government had written to Mr. Macdonell, asking him to state what he thought about a certain title to a little bit of land in the city of Toronto, and arrange some matters connected therewith, and in the bill for that work we find such an item as this: "Instructions for brief for Mr. Lash, Q.C., $2;" Mr. Lash gave Mr. Macdonell general instructions, yet the instructions to prepare a brief of the papers for Mr. Lash to look over are charged and allowed. I do not object to the charging; I am simply deploring that the item was allowed. He then has a brief for himself and charges for it as follows:

"Brief for Mr. Lash, $7.50. Instructions for brief for Mr. Macdonell, $2, brief, $7.50."

And all allowed—$2 for instructions from himself to himself and $7.50 for a brief for himself. Then there is attendance with Mr. Langton for plans. This item, I must say is, I think, without foundation in fact, and there never could have been an enquiry into this charge or it would have been found, I think, that there was no foundation for it. Then there is the charge: "Counsel fee on meeting of arbitration, $50." There was no arbitration of any kind, and if the taxation had been properly looked to, if it had been an honest taxation and not a colourable one, there would have been some evidence required to prove that item, or it would have been disallowed. There was no arbitration, nothing like an arbitration, there was never anything to arbitrate about, and that is a pure fiction in order to swell this bill. There may have been some friendly adjustment, nothing more. Then, take another item, a scandalous item:

"Counsel fee on meeting Mr. Langton and Mr. Wells at observatory when it was settled that $20 per annum, 6 per cent. on amount expended, should be paid for rent of both cottages erected by the University on our land. As to compensation for land appropriated by them for the purpose of a road, the University will grant us, on the same terms as we hold the observatory land, so much of the land to the south of the observatory as they can spare without detriment to their building lots, $50."

That meeting with Mr. Langton and Mr. Wells to settle the rental for a cottage, and in the face of the letter of the Deputy Minister of Justice to Mr. Barwick, informing him that it was not a case for counsel at all, yet a counsel fee of $50 was charged and paid. No one ever heard of a counsel fee being allowed in settling the terms of a rental of a cottage between two persons. This bill is a gross overcharge. To summarize some of these transactions, we find as follows:—That it cost the people of Canada $603.80 solicitors' charges in connection with the purchase of a piece of land in Hamilton $105.79; for similar services in connection with the purchase of another parcel of land at St. Thomas $106.78; for like services in connection with another parcel of land at Chatham; and $169.89 for similar services in a similar transaction in Leamington. Surely it is not a mere coincidence that the titles to all the lands that the Government buy are so intricate that such charges as these are proper. Therefore, I was glad to hear the hon. the Minister of Public Works express, very strongly, I may say, for him, his regret at the charges. Now, unfortunately we have to regret that they should have been paid; and I am glad to have the Ministers assurance that the Public Accounts are not again to be disgraced by such entries as these in them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to have some further explanation about these things, surely. Has the hon. gentleman nothing to say in relation to this? All I can say is, that according to the statement made by my hon. friend, this person—I will not call him a gentleman—has committed a deliberate fraud. If the statement made by my hon. friend, that $50 were charged for an arbitration that never took place, is correct, it is simply fraud, most dishonest and scandalous fraud, and I do think the Government owe it to themselves to take steps to recover some of the money which has in this way been robbed from the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I do hope that some steps will be taken in this matter. I never heard of such charges as these being made. I never heard before of such a principle of charging as has been adopted with reference to the titles. I am not very conversant, I confess, with conveyancing charges, but I have never heard or seen such a principle of dealing with the question. This young man, whose professional earnings might, perhaps, amount to $2,000 or $3,000 ordinarily, for searching one title has charged $600; for nine days' absence at Hamilton he has charged $20 a day, day in and day out, and then, at the end, $359 of a fee in addition to all the other charges, including this $20 a day, which is in itself too much. These bills are not honest bills. The taxation by the officer was not an honest taxation, and the protection of the rights of the Crown by the person who was appointed to protect them was not an honest protection. That is the state of the case. Neither the officer the Crown employed served it faithfully in presenting such bills as these, nor did the officer who was appointed to protect its rights protect them faithfully, nor the judicial officer, who was either ignorant of his duty or discharged it in a shameful manner; and it does look to one as if this was an arrangement, in some shape or other, to remunerate for his services a gentleman who, for some years, was the political agent of the political party in Ontario.

Mr. McLELAN. Two of the cases mentioned come from my Department—the Toronto observatory, and the Leamington lighthouse. I am not very familiar with either of them, because they were about closed when I came to the Department; but in regard to the Toronto observatory, there was a great deal of correspondence and a good many papers connected with it, and I saw it was a case which required a great deal of attention on the part of some one, and had received a great deal of attention. It was quite involved as to the boundary lines of the land of the observatory and the University in Toronto. I saw that the bills were pretty large, but on enquiry I was told and learned that they had gone through all the regular forms, and there was no avoiding their payment. I must say that the bills appeared to me, coming from the Maritime Provinces, rather higher than we had a reason to expect, from the custom of that country; and I have been very careful in my Department to see that as few legal expenses were incurred as possible, seeing that the practice of this section of country is so much in advance of the charges paid in Nova Scotia, as far as I have had experience in legal matters. I think, with the exception of these two cases, for the last few years you will not find very many charges for legal expenses in my Department.

Mr. MULOCK. Could the hon. gentleman tell me why the instruction of the Deputy Minister of Justice was not carried out when he instructed Mr. Barwick to have these bills taxed by Mr. Thom, the taxing officer of the Court of Chancery, and instead of that he had them taxed by Mr.

Small, the then taxing officer in the Court of Queen's Bench?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot give that information.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, it would appear that the taxation under the instructions of the Department has never yet taken place.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that when a property is chosen and is bought, the papers are sent to the Department of Justice, in order that the title may be investigated. The Department of Justice then investigates the title by appointing or selecting a barrister to do the work. When the Department of Justice sends a statement or a letter to the Department showing that the title having been investigated, the Department of Public Works, for example, may pay the amount; then the amount allowed by the Order in Council is deposited in the proper name, or in the proper hands, and paid over when the title is obtained. Therefore, from the moment we ask for the title to be investigated until the bill comes back taxed or allowed by the Department of Justice, the Department that has bought the land has nothing to do with this. Of course, I am not saying that to throw the onus on another Department; that is well understood; but I want to explain how the thing stands.

Mr. BLAKE. Quite so; that is understood.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In two or three of these cases, I see that the instructions of the Department of Justice were not followed, and certainly my intention is to call again the attention of the Minister of Justice to this discussion, and to the facts that have been brought out by the hon. gentlemen on the other side, so that he may investigate the matter, and see what course he has to take in order to have these accounts properly overhauled.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt he will do that. Of course, hon. gentlemen know—my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition knows—having been at the head of that Department, that a Minister cannot go into all the minutiæ and see everything in the Department; that abuses may occur, and that as soon as we see them we correct them. I have no doubt the Minister of Justice will look into the case.

Mr. BLAKE. Not merely was the hon. gentleman not improperly endeavouring to shirk responsibility by the statement he has made, but I believe the grossest abuses would arise if any other course were pursued by the Departments than that which he has indicated. The only proper and efficient check on legal charges is to see that they all pass through the crucible of the Department of Justice. I always insisted upon that when I was Minister of Justice, and not only so, but I insisted that, if I was to be responsible for the legal work of the Government, I should have the appointment of the legal agents of the Government throughout the country who were to discharge the business. But, while he has stated the only correct course which ought to be pursued, it is quite evident, on the other hand, that when the responsibility rests with the Department of Justice, it is an effective responsibility and has to be discharged. I do not accuse the Minister personally; I do not suppose he looks over every bill of costs, but I think there has been departmental neglect in this matter. The letters which have been read, so far as they conveyed comments, seem to have conveyed very proper comments to the intended officer who was to cause taxation to be made, but I did not hear the letter in so far as it dealt with the conveyancing charges. It seems to me that the letter might have indicated the extraordinary character of these charges, if it does not indicate it. What I complain of is: a direction being given to tax before a particular person, that the direction is not carried out; the bills are returned evidently only colourably taxed by another person, and are recommended for payment and paid. The hon. Minister has only done what is proper in going further than the original statement which was made, and saying that steps will be taken to overhaul the accounts. I think anything less than that would be less than justice.

Mr. MULOCK. I may say that I am more than pleased at the attitude of the Minister of Public Works.

Port Arthur.

216	Port Arthur—Immigrant shed	$7,500 00

Manitoba.

217	Lieutenant-Governor's residence and stables, Winnipeg	5,000 00
	New Parliament Buildings, Winnipeg	100,000 00

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.

218	Parliament House, Ottawa—Works in connection with experiments for lighting the House of Commons and Senate by electricity; furniture, fittings, &c	16,800 00
	Departmental Buildings, Ottawa—Western Block—Temporary offices in court yard for use of Post Office Department	1,805 00
	Ottawa Geological Museum—Fittings, repairs, &c	1,000 00
	Ottawa Post Office—Repairs and improvements	1,550 00
	Removal of snow—Public Buildings, Ottawa	800 00
	Victoria, B.C., Post Office—Furniture and fittings	2,800 00
	Ottawa Drill Shed—Making good damage by storm of 12th November 1883	130 00
	Victoria Chambers, Ottawa—Rooms occupied by Technical Branch, Department of Interior—Rent and improvements	1,300 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hon. gentlemen must have seen that, on both sides of the building, in the Senate and in the House of Commons, we have had a trial of electricity. On this side, we have had the United States Company, and on the other the Edison Light Company. The matter has been looked into. We had to have that light for a certain time during this Session, in order that the trial might take place. I have had an expert to look into the matter and report to me on the best light to be selected. I am not yet in a position to say what is the result of that test, because I have not had time to look into it, but as soon as the House rises we will see whether we had better keep two lights or only one, and which of the two will be the best; also, whether we will extend that light to other parts of the building. Hon. gentlemen must not be disappointed if we do not have the electric light next year, because I desire to wait until it has been tried elsewhere, either in Washington, Albany or London.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that the next vote has some reference to this same subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the next vote is for a number of matters which were suggested by hon. members at the end of last Session. We had a discussion, as hon. gentlemen will remember, about lighting this Chamber, the ventilation, the draft on both sides near the walls, and several changes were suggested. These changes have been made, both in this Chamber and in the Senate Chamber. While we were at work we found that the glass over our heads was very thin and we were in constant danger from its falling on our heads; therefore I had it removed and replaced by plate glass so that there would be no danger, in case of a light object falling on the glass of its breaking through and injuring anyone on the floor of the House. We did the same in the Senate Chamber. In our own Chamber we took good care to protect the Opposition side of the House, because, of course, we liked to see them sitting there and do not wish to disturb them in their places. I must also say that before the skylights had been arranged, we found it was much

darker on the Opposition side of the House, and I determined to throw more light upon them, so that they might see as well as we do. There is an item of $2,500 to meet expenses of some repairs we did ourselves, and an item of $7,500 for the engines below, wires and lamps connected with the electricity. These we have purchased. When we called for tenders, our idea was that, if we found the experiment a success we would purchase the engines and other apparatus at the rate tendered for, but if we did not find it a success, then the tenderers would have to remove their engines without any cost to the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not seen the electric light on the Senate side, and do not know how it works there, but I must confess to some disappointment from the result on this side. The light does not commend itself to me, as I had hoped, from what I had seen of the Edison electric light in other places. But I do not think it has had quite a fair trial, and I should be sorry to see the hon. gentleman adopt permanently any such plans of electric lighting as is now adopted. The lights are too low. The great advantage of the electric light is that you can get it high up, first of all; and secondly, with a comparatively small expense, you can diffuse it through the whole room. In the dining room of the House of Commons the light is so low that when you are standing it is almost on a level with the eye, which makes it very disagreeable. The same observation applies, to a considerable extent, in the other rooms where the lights are used. I have seen them in very high rooms of a private mansion, just up in the ceiling, and diffused all over the room. I have seen a large drawing room which, I suppose, was about 20 feet high, with forty-two lights all over the ceiling, and the result was a diffused light all over the room, of a most delightful kind. Instead of that, when you have the light concentrated, as in the House of Commons restaurant, with three groups of three or four lights each, and when it is as low as it is there, it is not satisfactory—it is disagreeable from its brightness, being near the level of the eye. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt the electric light permanently in the building—I hope he will not do so without considering these suggestions. The real advantage of electric light, apart from the question of coolness, of its heat rays being so few compared with its light rays, is the possibility, in consequence of the coolness, of its being put high up in a room, and in consequence of the facility of sending the wires wherever you like, you can, with very little additional expense, diffuse the light all over the room. These are the two advantages, but we do not gain them at all by the present plan. I must confess that I would prefer—if I was offered a choice of the old gas lights in the dining room and the electric light—I would prefer the gas lights.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right about these lights being too low down, but we placed them there for the reason that we did not wish to disturb the gas lights, so that we might be able to use them in case the electric light did not work well. Therefore, in order to avoid the danger of a failure of the new light and the danger of expense, we directed the workmen to put their lights on the gas chandeliers. It was an experiment. If it answers tolerably well in that way, then we shall remove these lamps and put the electric lights at the proper height, so that we may have all the benefit which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, of having the electric lights at the proper height. If hon. gentlemen will be kind enough to go to the Senate they will find that the light there is much more brilliant. It is placed higher up and seems to be a better light than that on this side—I must say that frankly, and I expressed that opinion to my officers. I said to them that, in my opinion, the light on the Senate side was the stronger and brighter light, and that seems to be the general impression. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, because it has only confirmed my opinion—and if we adopt the light we shall have to change the lamps.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:15 o'clock, a. m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 5th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. WHITE moved the adoption of the Seventh Report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Report concurred in.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

Mr. BEATY moved that the time for receiving Private Bills be extended to Monday, 7th instant, and that for presenting reports, to Saturday, 12th inst.

Mr. BLAKE. Are we to understand that all hope of proroguing at Easter has been abandoned?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. mover will explain the object of the Committee in making the recommendation.

Mr. BEATY. From the observations made by hon. members it appeared not quite certain that the House would not sit on the week after next. It was thought that this Bill (London Life Assurance Company's Bill, which is deemed of public importance, might not reach its final stage until next Saturday.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am satisfied that members of the House do not mean to sit any such length of time. If the time were extended to Monday next it would be sufficient, as business can be got through in that time.

Mr. BLAKE moved to strike out Saturday and insert Wednesday.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It seems to me that the House ought fairly to consider whether the practice which is springing up is one which should be encouraged. This Bill is simply a Private Bill regulating the internal affairs of an insurance company. There is no public interest connected with it, and the Bill is not of such a character as to justify the House in setting aside its rules. If this practice is to be continued, then those who have doubtful Bills to introduce should not give notice, but petition the House at the end of the Session for permission to bring in the Bills, and the very fact that this is permitted will be taken as showing the urgency of the legislation. I will vote against the amendment if I stand alone. We should at once stop the practice which is growing on the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I entirely concur with every word uttered by the hon. member for Cardwell. It is perfectly monstrous, unless a Bill is of such importance that the Government deem it is in the public interest to pass it, that it should be brought in at this time. It makes utterly useless every precaution to protect private interests; and if the hon. gentleman wants a seconder to any motion bearing on the subject, I will be happy to act as such.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If we simply negative the motion and refuse to extend the time, no Bill under our rules can come in.

Mr. BEATY. This Bill is in the hands of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron). The importance of the Bill arises from the fact that the company, if they do not obtain this Bill to increase their capital, is liable to be injured thereby, and it is of great importance that this company should have the Bill passed. They gave the regular notice, except as to one point, and that is, that they did not say that they wanted to increase their capital stock. They have found it necessary to increase the capital stock, and they come in at this late hour of the Session, not knowing that the matter would be of much importance as they find it to be after the change of management which has taken place within the last few weeks, and after discovering certain defects connected with the management of the company. These considerations make it of importance to them and to others that the Bill should pass. Personally I do not care anything for the Bill in that respect, but it is of importance in the interests of the company and I hope if it is possible within the time to have the Bill passed it may, under the peculiar circumstances, be allowed to pass. I may say I have acted as Chairman of the Committee strictly on the idea that Bills should not come in if possible later than the rules allow. We have acted on that principle in all cases except in these two which are of an exceptional character.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say that the hon. member for West Middlesex conferred with me as to the possibility of this Bill passing, and I gave him to understand that I did not think there would be the least chance, because it was understood on both sides of the House that we were not to be asked to go beyond the extension of time which was previously allowed. I have read this Bill, I may say, and though it may be of importance to the company, I cannot see that it is. I think it would not be expedient that the time should be extended at this stage of the Session. It would make a precedent which might render it possible for other Bills, perhaps of a doubtful character, coming in at the close of the Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Would the hon. gentleman who made the motion state in what position the Bill is. Has it been allowed by the House before it was sent to the Committee.

Mr. BEATY. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At what stage is it now?

Mr. BEATY. I propose to move the first reading now, as it has not been moved. The Committee on Standing Orders passed the Bill, and we propose, if the House allows, that the first reading shall be taken.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope the amendment will be withdrawn so that the House may act upon the question in the main motion.

Amendment agreed to, and main motion, as amended, negatived.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act respecting the treatment and relief of sick and distressed mariners. He said: This Bill of which I give notice some time ago is intended to relieve some abuses which arose under the operation of the old Act. Under the old Act, very little was collected from fishing vessels other than those that had sick mariners on board; and in 1882 I asked Parliament to pass a Bill exempting fishermen from the payment of dues to the sick and distressed mariner's fund, and exempting them from the benefits of that fund. But cases of great hardship has arisen, which have been brought to my notice, and I propose in this Bill that all fishing vessels that pay before leaving the first port of outfit shall be entitled to participate in the benefits of the fund—making the matter optional. That is, if a vessel pays the fees at the port of outfit before sailing, she will be entitled to the benefits of the sick mariners fund for that voyage; but if she neglects to pay before sailing, she will not.

Mr. WELDON. I suppose that if a fishing vessel leaves on her first voyage, and pays afterwards during the summer, she cannot get the benefits of the fund?

Mr. McLELAN. She must pay before sailing on her first voyage, and if she goes upon a second voyage she must pay before sailing on that voyage in order to participate for that voyage. Vessels under 100 tons, by paying once before sailing, participate in the benefits of the fund for the calendar year, but vessels over 103 tons must pay for three voyages in the year, in order to participate in the benefits of the fund for that year.

Mr. BLAKE. So that, as the hon. gentleman understands his Bill, it is to put fishing vessels on the same footing as others, except that it makes it optional for them to pay or not, and if they do not pay they do not receive the benefits of the fund?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. Foreign vessels arriving in a port of the Dominion of Canada must pay their dues on entering.

Mr. GILLMOR. Supposing a fishing vessel should get an outfit in an American port, and on coming back should pay her dues before clearing, could she participate?

Mr. McLELAN. She must make the Canadian port her port of sailing on the first outfit.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 130) to amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 1215) providing for salaries of Assistant Post Office Inspectors and others.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHAPLEAU. By the Act as it now stands, assistant post office inspectors are paid on appointment $1,000; after ten years they get $1,200, and after twenty years $1,500. These officers I understand must be first-class clerks and are placed over officers receiving larger salaries. In giving them $1,200 on appointment and the statutory increase of $50 per year, they will after eight years' service, be in receipt of $1,600. The clause providing the salaries of the superintendents of letter-carriers shall begin at $600 and be annually increased by $40 will be struck out. The mail transfer agents will receive $400 with an annual increase of $40, until the salary reaches the maximum of $600; and the letter-carriers will receive $360 instead of $300 on appointment, as it is found difficult to obtain men fit for the work under a dollar a day.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the expected increase to the public charge in consequence of these changes?

Mr. CARLING. There are 300 or 400 letter carriers, messengers and box inspectors, but of course the resolutions

will not affect those. How many new ones will have to be appointed, it is difficult to say.

Mr. BLAKE. As the new appointments get their increase and their salaries run over those of the old and faithful public servants, the hon. gentleman will come down and appeal to us, with that good which is always beaming in his countenance, to place these old servants on an equal footing with the new ones.

Mr. CARLING. There are very few old servants whose salaries are not over $360, as they get the statutory increase of $50 a year.

Mr. BLAKE. What will be the additional charge on our revenue in the case of assistant post office inspectors.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say for the moment. There are some nine or ten divisions, and the post office inspector in each division has an assistant.

Superintendents of letter carriers struck out; and resolution, as amended, concurred in, and ordered to be reported.

SUPPLY.—FLAG TREATY, UNITED STATES AND SPAIN.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. VAIL. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a matter of some importance affecting the trade of Canada. I wish to make a simple statement with reference to the Flag Treaty entered into between the United States and Spain, which will occupy only two or three moments, and I am, though it is somewhat irregular, sure the House will permit me to do. A treaty, which is called a "Flag Treaty," has recently been made between the United States and Spain placing the American flag in Cuba and Porto Rico on the same footing as the Spanish. It appears that formerly goods by Spanish flag paid 10 per cent. more duty in United States than by other vessels. The American Government have agreed to abolish this 10 per cent., and Spain in return admits American products under the American flag on same terms as their own. This arrangement applies to Cuba and Porto Rico only, and on the general Tariff makes a difference in favour of the American the flag of near 20 per cent. In Porto Rico the duty on our fish by our own vessels is 55 cents per 100 pounds, while American fish by American vessels pay only 42 cents, a difference of 13 cents per 100 pounds, in favour of the American flag. In Cuba it is still more, the difference being 27 cents per 100 pounds in favour of the American flag. In Porto Rico British vessels pay just double tonnage duty, say $1.25 per ton for discharging cargo, and $1 per ton; while the Americans by this treaty will only pay 62½ cents for discharging and 50 cents per ton for loading. Our annual shipment of codfish to Porto Rico is about 150,000 quintals, besides large quantities of pickled fish, and they are in fact our best and largest customers. We also ship largely to Cuba, and the demand there is steadily increasing, so it is important there also. This treaty only applies to fish shipped direct from the United States in American vessels, and consequently fish shipped by American steamers from Halifax to Cuba *viâ* New York are subject to the same duty as if shipped in British vessels. Then, again, the Americans have been for some time complaining of the Spanish Consular charges for papers, which is 10 cents per 1,000 kilos, equal to one ton. They considered this an export duty imposed by Spain on United States products, and should not be allowed, and it is expected that this will also be removed. If so, our merchants should be relieved of this charge as well. It will therefore be seen that this is a very important matter, and places our fish dealers at a great disadvantage to the Americans, and the result of it will be, that our trade will be ruined and the Americans will be in future the suppliers of these Islands with all the fish they require. I hope the Government will, after this statement, take the matter into their consideration and communicate the facts to the British Government, and see if we cannot be placed on the same footing as the Americans are. It is a very important matter, and I hope will receive early attention.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The attention of the Government has been called to this subject previous to the statement of the hon. gentleman. We have obtained some information with reference to the effect of this treaty or arrangement between the two countries, but, as far as we have received it, if it includes the question of tonnage, it does not bear out the statement the hon. gentleman has made, though I dare say he may be right. The arrangements between Spain and the United States were not really as favourable as those between Canada and Cuba or Porto Rico. There were charges made that did not exist here. They have been removed and the United States have been placed in the third list of duties. The Government are quite alive to the importance of having our trade on as good terms as that of the United States, and no time will be lost in endeavouring to bring about such arrangements as will place us on quite as favourable terms as they have.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What treaty is it that governs the traffic at present? Is it a recent treaty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is an arrangement made, such as this, I presume. It is not a treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is independent of any commercial treaty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes. This is an arrangement by which this anomalous state of things is to be removed, and, as far as I have seen the correspondence, they propose to go still further and make treaty arrangements even wider and broader in their operation than those referred to by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail). This is an arrangement made by the representative of the United States and the Spanish authorities, placing the imports entering into Cuba or Porto Rico under what is called the third list. There are four rates of duties and charges, and they are now placed in the third column. The exact effect of this we have not yet been informed of.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But British subjects have a right, have they not, under the existing commercial treaty, to be placed on an equal footing with the most favoured nation? Is not that the case?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I think not.

TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to enquire of the hon. gentleman—he can answer it now or on Monday, as suits his convenience—what is being done with the Government of Newfoundland. They have been making of late some serious complaints as to the effect of our inspection, if I am correctly advised, of their main export to us, and have passed, or threatened to pass an Act—I think they have actually passed it—which enables them practically to retaliate on us to a considerable extent. No doubt, that has not escaped the hon. gentleman, but it would be of interest that he should make a statement on the subject at an early date.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The subject has been receiving only this day the consideration of the Government, and I think a communication has been sent within the last two or three hours to Newfoundland, and I hope on Monday to be able to make the statement which the hon. gentleman has asked that I should make.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

PUBLIC WORKS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

248 Repairs, furniture, heating, &c..... ..... $26,185 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Though it appears that Resolution 248 was passed last night, it was understood that I should give some explanation in reference to the second part of it. A vote is asked of $1,805 for "temporary offices in court yard for use of Post Office Department." It was impossible to get along with the staff of that Department. The space alloted to it was much too small, and we had to erect a temporary wooden building in the yard, on the same plan as I think my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had one erected in his time. Of course, it will disappear in a couple of years, when the new building is erected on Wellington street.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say the post office is to be finally sent to Wellington street?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Or is he going to divide the staff of the post office, part in Wellington street and part in the present building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it is supposed that two or three Departments, probably three, will be put in the new building and that will relieve the Eastern and Western blocks, and the other Departments will thus have more space, and be able to manage their business without this extra wooden building. In the Ottawa Geological Museum certain repairs were required. The beams required to be propped up as the weight on the floors was very heavy; the roof had to be put in order, and some other small repairs done. In the Ottawa Post Office we had to expend $1,550. This sum was absolutely necessary, and a larger amount than that will be required to put the building in proper order. Removal of snow—public buildings, Ottawa—we have asked for $800 more than usual. We had made a contract as usual for this work, but the contractor failed on account of the extraordinary quantity of snow that fell this winter, and the result was that we had to undertake the work ourselves, and we require more money. Victoria Post Office, British Columbia—This item is necessary to complete the work there, and to put in new lock boxes, patent fittings, some furniture, and to provide a small sum for superintendence. The Ottawa Drill Shed—making good damage by storm of 12th November, 1883.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As the Finance Minister keeps a prophet in his Department to prevent storms, I should like to know why he did not avoid the necessity for such an item as this.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. He is there to raise the wind

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It appears he did raise the wind, because he destroyed our drill shed. The next item concerning the Victoria Chambers, Ottawa, is to pay for rent and improvements, as there was not sufficient space in the Geological Museum.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the "technical branch" of the Department?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it may mean the draughtsmen.

Mr. MILLS. Is it true that the Geological Museum is being overcrowded?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think it is overcrowded now. We have done all we could to give space, and I have not heard lately of any complaint in that direction. I understand that the officers in charge find the museum is sufficient, at all events for the present, but I have no doubt that before very long we shall require more space, and perhaps put another story on the present building.

PUBLIC WORKS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS.

Prince Edward Island.

249	Payment to the Government of Prince Edward Island in settlement of their claims and construction, and maintenance, of certain wharfs and piers on said Island.....	$53,222 19
	Rustico harbour, revote of lapsed amount.....	3,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We would like to have very full explanations as to this, and to know in particular what amount of annual charge, if any, will be inflicted upon the country in consequence of this vote.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government of Prince Edward Island made application a year ago for the Dominion Government to assume the wharves and piers of the Island. The Government of Canada decided that there should be an examination made during the year of every pier and wharf on the Island, and the First Minister of Prince Edward Island and his colleagues asked that the local authorities might be present to give explanations. They were notified at the proper time, and when my officers examined these wharves and piers, the local authorities were present to give information, to call attention to the necessity of a pier, or the reason why the pier was made, and to give all necessary details. This work took, probably, six or seven months, and finally, a report having been made this Session, it was revised, examined and collated by the Chief Engineer of my Department. The work is very complete, and gives a full account of each one of these wharfs and piers. The result of that work and the report prepared by my Chief Engineer, make a volume as thick as a ream of paper. There is a plan of each wharf so that we can see at a glance where each wharf or pier is situated, and what portion of the country it benefits. The Chief Engineer made this report, and made a statement showing what each pier had cost, where situated, and what revenue it yielded; and then in another column it stated whether the pier was a local one or a Dominion one, and whether it was merely of a purely local character. The Chief Engineer reported in favour of accepting a number of wharves and piers, and the matter was then reported by me to the Privy Council for their information. A Committee of the Privy Council was appointed to examine the report and statements made by the Chief Engineer. I was a member of the Committee, and we reported to the Council in favour of a number of piers, but a number less than the number recommended by the Chief Engineer. That report was adopted by Order in Council which has been laid before the House.

Mr. DAVIES. Did the Sub-Committee report to the Privy Council that in their opinion the Council should accept fewer wharves and piers than the Chief Engineer recommended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Which did they reject of those which the Chief Engineer recommended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is difficult to specify them just now. The hon. gentleman can find out from the papers which the piers were. The statement shows in one column the piers and wharves which were recommended by the Government of Prince Edward Island as the piers we should accept. In another column there is a statement of the piers

and wharves which the Chief Engineer thought might be accepted. Then it is defined by Order in Council how many we have accepted; and, therefore, by comparing these statements, the hon. gentleman can obtain the information desired. I could give the names of the piers, but they would be of interest to only a few members. I may state that the total value is $53,222; the tolls collected from 1st February, 1873, to 1st January, 1883, eleven years, amounted to $6,096. The cost of the repairs will this year reach about $12,000, because these piers have not been kept up as they would have been kept up if the Local Government had not been satisfied we would accept them. They were somewhat neglected during the last twelve months as regards repairs,

Mr. DAVIES. They were totally neglected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They were not kept up as usual, because the Local Government thought, no doubt, we would assume them. Under those circumstances, $11,000 or $12,000 will be required this year to place them in good repair. The ordinary repairs will amount to between $3,000 and $4,000 yearly.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has failed, however, to state the principle on which this transaction is based—why it is applicable to Prince Edward Island and not to the other Provinces.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, there was no selection of piers made, and they were left in the hands of the Local Government. We took over only three or four, and the Local Government have repeatedly called the attention of the Federal Government to the fact that the piers in the Island should be maintained in the same way as the piers in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Our difficulty was to know which piers should be placed on the same footing as those kept up by the Dominion Government in other Provinces, and we had to make a thorough investigation, which resulted as I have stated.

Mr. DAVIES. I have examined the papers very carefully and I have failed to find that any principle has been adopted, or adhered to, in the selection of the piers and wharves. I do not think the management of the business reflects very much credit on those who had charge of it—I say this with due respect to the Minister—either as representing this Government or the Local Government. The application was made before the Session of the House last year. A deputation of the Local Government came here last year; brought all the information, and pressed the matter on the Dominion Government, telling them that they, the Local Government, would not assume the repairs of the piers during the then ensuing year, and if something were not done, the piers would go to wreck. The Local Government made no provision for repairs. The hon. Minister of Public Works did not determine whether the Dominion Government would maintain the piers, or any of them, and consequently, during last year, the piers and wharves were allowed to go to wreck, and thousands of dollars were absolutely lost to the tax payers, because some decision was not arrived at on this question. During the summer of last year wharves were falling to ruin, and one was almost floating away, because they were not looked after. The two Governments acted like children in this matter. Not one dollar was expended by either of the Governments, and the consequence was that a great many thousand dollars will have to be expended to place the piers and wharves in the condition in which they might have been kept by the expenditure of a few hundreds. Leaving that point, I fail to see that the hon. gentleman has adopted any sound principle in the acceptance or rejection of these piers. The Local Government claimed that the Dominion Government should accept 82, on which there had been expended since 1873, $145,283. They claimed that the money which they had expended on the piers, which now belong to the Dominion Government, should be returned to them. The hon. gentleman did not allow that claim. He sent down inspectors, which was no doubt very proper for him to do, before arriving at a conclusion. He has accepted, on the report of the Chief Engineer, 25 piers. On what principle has he acted? The hon. gentleman or the Chief Engineer has accepted all the piers likely to pay any money, and the piers which are commercially failures are thrown on the hands of the Local Government. The hon. gentleman smiles, but the taxpayers of the Island do not smile. The hon. gentleman, I say, has taken those from which any revenue is obtained and thrown on the Local Government the balance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is not fair. I stated we had assumed 26 piers. The hon. gentleman says we have assumed all the good piers which will furnish any good revenue. The hon. gentleman will see what revenue may be expected from the 26 piers, from my statement that the revenue for the last eleven years was $6,096.

Mr. DAVIES. What has been the revenue from those you have rejected? On what principle have you acted? These piers either belong to the Dominion Government or they do not. If they belong to the Dominion, you have a right to accept them; if they do not, you have no right. The hon. gentleman has not acted on that principle, but he has selected those which furnish most tolls and rejected those which do not pay well. And if I had time to do it I could show the hon. gentleman that the engineer has not proceeded on any principle. I assume that in accepting certain piers and leaving others to the Provincial Government, the hon. gentleman has been acting upon his construction of the British North America Act, which shows in the third schedule what works of this character belong to the Dominion. I say I suppose that is the principle upon which the hon. gentleman acted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. DAVIES. Then on what principle?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has stated that we did not accept them on any principle, and now it will be for him to show on what principle we should have acted.

Mr. DAVIES. Attached to the Engineer's report, there is a statement showing the names of the piers, and the amount of money expended on each since Confederation, the amount received in tolls, and the explanation of the grounds on which they are received or rejected. In one case, I find that a wharf is rejected because it is said, owing to the existence of a railway wharf in the vicinity, there is no necessity for assuming it. Now, Sir, this is not a question of whether the work is a necessity or not. It is surely not to be left to the discretion of a Chief Engineer to declare whether or not certain works shall pass to the Dominion Government under the British North America Act. The next one I can understand, as it is reported to be for local purposes only. The next is not recommended as Dominion property, as the Engineer states the traffic is *nil*. Now, Sir, I say that they do not become Federal property or Provincial property accordingly as the traffic is large or small; that is a question to be decided by the terms of the Act. In another case the Engineer says the revenue was not very large, and therefore he recommends that it be thrown upon the Local Government. I say the hon. gentleman is not acting on a fair principle, for the returns show that he accepts or rejects these works accordingly as the returns are large or small. Under these circumtances I would ask the hon. gentleman if the Federal Government did or did not take charge of these works, under the third schedule

of the British North America Act, and if they did not, on what principle did they take them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The principle which has guided the Government in this matter has been this: That it was no reason for taking over these works, that the Local Government of Prince Edward Island thought proper to build piers at any particular place. We think that if they had built 200 or 300 or 500 piers, if they had built one at the door of every man living along the beach, that is no reason why they should assume them. We thought that we should assume only such as were of general benefit for Federal purposes. And when the returns show that there were only a dollar or two of revenue during eight or ten years, and that the pier was only for the benefit of three or four individuals in a neighbourhood, we said that that was absolutely a local matter and that we should not assume it. In some of the other Provinces there are numbers of piers which may be serviceable to particular localities, but we cannot assume all those piers. In this case we are asking Parliament to assume the piers which we think, after weighing all the circumstances, should be assumed by the Federal Government. The hon. gentleman says there were about 80 piers which were suggested by the Local authorities as piers which we should assume. I have not counted up the number, but no doubt the hon. gentleman is right. Well, we have recommended 25 or 26, which shows that we have been discriminating and trying to do the best we could for the Dominion Government and for the country, and at the same time we were looking to the interests of the Island, without forgetting that our duty was and is, not to assume all these little piers, but only such of them as may be considered of a Federal character. I was told the other day by a gentleman from the Island—I do not say he was a member of Parliament—that there were three piers at a particular place, and that we had assumed only one. The idea apparently being that we should assume them all though they might be within a quarter of a mile of one another. I said to him we are assuming the important pier in such cases—the one to which the trade comes in that region; but previous to the railway being built the Island Government built a number of piers because the wants of the locality required them. Now that the railway has been built, a number of these piers and wharves have become about useless, being purely of a local and a very restricted local character. We have not assumed the use of these, and it is for the House to say whether we are right or not. The hon. gentleman must see, when he stated that we assumed those of the largest revenue, that during those eleven years the revenue has not been large. The largest revenue, I think, at one place during the eleven years, has been $1,300, and that is for the one at Georgetown. Another at Port Selkirk had a revenue of $860 for the eleven years. I have no doubt that these piers will not pay, but they are for the benefit of the country. They are for the export trade of the Island, and I think, under these circumstances, we have done what we could, and we can do no more.

Mr. DAVIES. So far as the case of some piers go which the hon. gentleman has rejected, I quite agree with him that they were not of a Federal character. But I say the Government should have proceeded upon a principle in each case—on the principle that those piers of a Federal character should be accepted, while it appears from the returns that he has rejected many of that character because the tolls upon them were not as large as he thought they ought to have been. And on the very report the Chief Engineer submits says that is so. But the hon. gentleman must come back to the reason why he accepted these piers. The fact of the matter is, I fear very much, that this money is voted to help the Local Government out of a difficulty. They would not put on the taxation their predecessors put on in order to carry on the affairs of the Government; they ran in debt to the amount of $53,000, and that is the amount voted here. Now the British North America Act declared that certain wharves and piers which were the property of the Local Government at the time of the Union should pass into possession of the Dominion; and it is under that provision, and that alone, that the hon. gentleman can take these piers; but he should proceed on the principle he laid down in his speech, that those of a local character should be left, and those of a Federal character accepted. He has put a clause in his report to the effect that this money is not to be paid to the Local Government, unless they agree to accept it as a full discharge of their claims. Now, I understand that a Minute of Council has been passed by the Local Government, setting forth reasons why they should not accept this amount as a full discharge. I would like the hon. gentleman to state whether he laid down in his report to the Privy Council the principle he laid down in his speech, that those of a Federal character should be accepted. Now, I wish to call his attention to the pier at Cape Traverse. That is a Dominion work; it has nothing local in its character. Some $9,000 was expended on that pier. Why did the hon. gentleman not accept it? Here is the reason given:

"The Dominion is now, through the Department of Railways and Canals, expending a large sum of money in the construction of a branch line from the main line of railway in the Island to Cape Traverse, and the wharf at that place has been selected as the terminus on the Strait of Northumberland, and it is being repaired and extended for that purpose. In view of the great benefit to accrue from the construction and operation of this branch line, it is considered that the wharf in question might be handed over towards facilitating the operations of the railway."

Now, if there was one pier in the whole number which the hon. gentleman should have accepted, it was that one. That pier forms part of the railway wharf at Port Traverse, and yet it was constructed at the expense of the Local Government. They have taken this pier, incorporated in their railway wharf and paid nothing for it. Now, I say that the Government in this matter have not adopted a principle that can be defended. The hon. gentleman knows right well that if this report is placed on our State Papers, there will be constant claims made by the Local Government on this account. If the Government had desired to accept only works of a Federal character, I could understand that principle. They have only taken those which they thought would pay well, and they have ust given the Island Government sufficient to enable them to pay the deficit with which they had to meet the Legislature the other day—$53,000. The hon. gentleman has not adopted in his report the principle he laid down in his speech, of accepting those works of a Federal character, and rejecting those of a local character. It is not fair to ask this Parliament to pay for works of a purely local character; but you have rejected works which are more of a Federal character than those you have accepted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the same reasons which the hon. gentleman has for using this matter as he is using it at present—I have not to fight the Local Government of Prince Edward Island; I have no quarrel with them; and therefore I need not try to demolish them in this House where they cannot present themselves. If I wished to attack them, I would certainly try to obtain a seat in the Local Legislature, where I could attack them before their faces, and not here where they cannot defend themselves. With regard to the Minute of Council, which the hon. gentleman speaks of, I understand that some document has been received during the last few days; but my time has been so occupied that I have been unable to take up the matter. But I repeat that in this we have done the best we could for the Dominion. We took the piers that were considered Federal, and left those considered local. We have not to consider the interests of the Local Govern-

ment, but the interests of the country at large, and the interests of the Island at the same time. When the hon. gentleman is a little cooler, I think he will find that we have not done badly for the Island.

Mr. DAVIES. You have done very badly for the Island, but very well for the Local Government. Has the hon. gentleman come to any conclusion as to the tolls he is going to adopt for the wharves he has assumed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As soon as Parliament has allowed us to assume these piers, we shall have to let them by public auction or public tender. As soon as they come into our possession, I have no doubt that either the Department of Marine or the Department of Inland Revenue will take up the question of tolls.

Mr. BLAKE. We should have been better able to discuss this matter if the Government had laid on the Table the materials on which a judgment was formed. We are really voting this upon confidence. It is quite impossible for us to form any judgment as to whether any one or each of these piers came fairly within the spirit of the British North America Act, but the hon. gentleman says he has carefully considered the matter and the Government have reached a conclusion; and we have to assume that that conclusion is right instead of being able to judge for ourselves.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman bring down before Concurrence the representations made by the Local Government which he says have just been received.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said I knew some document had been received from the Island, but I do not know what it is.

Mr. DAVIES. In all the Island papers, it is said a Minute in Council has been passed on the subject of the hon. Minister's report, and the Island Government in this paper attempt to show that he has not allowed sufficient money. The paper is said to be a very exhaustive one dealing with the whole subject, and I would like, before this matter is finally decided, to have an opportunity of discussing it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote for Rustico Harbour of $3,000 is a revote.

Mr. DAVIES. The contractor for that breakwater, Mr. Pearce Doyle, has forwarded to the hon. Minister a memorial asking that certain allowance be made to him on account of damage to that breakwater through a fishing schooner being driven against it during a storm. I do not know whether that memorial has received the hon. Minister's attention or whether his reply is likely to be favourable.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say whether such paper was received or not. A good deal of arrears has accumulated, and unless this matter is very pressing it must stand over until after the Session. If this gentleman has sent any claim of that kind, it will be investigated and he will be treated with justice.

Mr. DAVIES. I called the hon Minister's attention to it last Session.

Quebec.

250	Three Rivers (revote of lapsed amount)....		$2,330 88
	St. Jean Port Joli (revote of lapsed amount.....	$783 14	
	St. Jean Port Joli (additional amount required.....	133 39	
			916 53
	Cap à l'Aigle.....		345 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amount of $916 was voted for removal of a large shoal opposite St. Jean Port Joli. It had been voted by Parliament last year, and when the Accounts came in, this amount had lapsed, and they asked to have it revoted with the addition of $133 required to complete the work. Cap à l'Aigle, the amount is a small addition to that voted last year for a wharf.

Ontario.

251 Toronto Harbour..... $40,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I gave the explanation of this the other day.

Manitoba.

252 Compensation to A. Tait for the loss of the steam scow *Adelaide*, leased by him to the Government in connection with works of improvement carried out on the River Assiniboine..... $3,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The statement is this: To cover a special warrant of His Excellency the Governor General to compensate Mr. Tait to the extent of $3,000 for the loss of the steam scow *Adelaide*, which was leased by him to the Government for use in connection with works of improvement in the River Assiniboine. It sunk while in the possession and under the superintendence of the Government clerk of works. The Chief Engineer instructed the clerk to raise the vessel, and he made an attempt to do so, but failed. Mr. Tait made a claim of $4,000, and the Chief Engineer reported, that in his opinion, the Department was liable for the loss, but that according to the information from the clerk of the works, he could not recommend the payment of any sum exceeding $3,000, and that if Mr. Tait would not accept this, the matter should be referred to the Arbitrators. Mr. Tait accepted the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What part of the Assiniboine?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say the spot.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Did the charter of the vessel provide for the payment in case of shipwreck?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. She was entirely under the control of the Department, manned by our own people, and under the circumstances we could not help ourselves. I delayed as long as I could, but the proof was strong and it would have been useless to refuse payment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is a very unusual and improper arrangement to charter a vessel on such conditions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will find out where this accident occurred and tell us before Concurrence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that in his opinion the Government was liable, but I concede it is a very unusual thing for those who charter a vessel to be liable for the perils of the sea.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I obtained the opinion of the Department of Justice that the Government was liable.

DREDGING.

253 Dredging—Maritimes Provinces..... $8,000 00

Mr. VAIL. Is the hon. gentleman going to send a dredge again this year to Annapolis Basin?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say where the dredges will be sent. There are some places where there is a necessity for them at the opening of the season, but the list will be made, and those which are most pressing will be taken first. At some places, we have been obliged to delay two years before the dredge could be sent. I think at a place in Cape Breton we promised it, and it is only this year that we will be able to send it.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister does not remember whether an application has been made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I do not remember. If an application has been made, it has been noted, and will be laid before me after the Session.

Mr. DAVIES. Do the persons in charge of the dredge receive orders from the Department as to where they should go?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. How does he come to a conclusion—from applications direct to him, as the petitions go in?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are two ways. There are certain surveys, for example, or examinations which are made by my officers during the season. One of my officers reports that there has been damage at a place, or that there is a shoal or something of that kind in the way. The examination is made, and, the reports being made to the Department, the Chief Engineer takes them up and reports that in this case it is not pressing, it is a small harbour, there are very few vessels going there; but this is a larger one, and there are more vessels going there; or this is a dangerous shoal, and he thinks the dredge should go there first. I must, of course, go to a very great extent by what my Chief Engineer says. I have full confidence in his judgment and in his impartiality, and of course I take his recommendations as a rule.

Mr. VAIL. Perhaps the Minister will take a note of that, and be in a position to inform us whether any application has been made from the Annapolis Basin.

TELEGRAPHS.

254.	Telegraph Service generally.....	$316 33

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is that particular item for? It is a curious item.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the telegraph line we have.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In British Columbia?

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. On the north coast, and the Lower Provinces and the sea coast.

MISCELLANEOUS.

255	Infantry School Buildings, &c., at Toronto, St. John's, Que., and Fredericton.....	$44,000 00
	House and furniture for High Commissioner for Canada, London, Eng	42,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me rather odd, bracketing these two together, unless the High Commissioner proposes to take charge of a detachment of infantry and cavalry. Perhaps these are to furnish guards. That would add greatly to the dignity and status of the hon. the High Commissioner. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will keep the second half of it for further discussion, and tell us what he pleases about these infantry school buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At last Session, Parliament authorized the new school of infantry, or two or three of them, and these schools of infantry were announced to be, one at Toronto, one at St. John's, P.Q., and the other at Fredericton. The result of that decision was that we had to put in proper order the barracks and other buildings we had at Toronto, St. John's and Fredericton. The Department of Militia desired that we should proceed at once, and this work is now going on and will be completed in a very short time.

Mr. WELDON. What will be the expense of preparing the barracks at Fredericton?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the present it is about $9,000, but it will require more than that.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be convenient if the hon. gentleman would state what the expenditure for each building is for the year, and the total estimate of what the expenditure is to be.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For Fredericton, it is about $9,000; St. John's, a little over $19,000; and for Toronto, $24,900, but we will require for St. John's and Fredericton probably, $6,000 or $7,000 more, and for Toronto we will require a little more. The estimate was rather low. We could not estimate very closely, because there were a number of small repairs, and in some cases we sometimes find larger repairs are required.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said $9,000 for Fredericton, $19,000 for St. John's, and about $25,000 for Toronto.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the expenditure for this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That is $53,000, and you are only asking for $44,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is $44,000. $9,000 and $19,000, that is $28,000; and $25,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I think he will find that is $53,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Never mind. Take $10,000 from the next item.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Oh, yes, the hon. gentleman is right. The $9,000 from the first page was carried to the next page and made the $19,000. It is $9,000 and $11,000 and $24,000.

Mr. BLAKE. What place is it that is going to be repaired in Toronto at an expense of $24,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At the old fort.

Mr. BLAKE. And the total for Toronto will be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total here is $25,000, but it will require more than that, probably $5,000 or $6,000 more.

Mr. BLAKE. And these buildings are in such a condition that, with this expenditure, they will be useful and fit for the purpose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So I am told.

Mr. CARON. The works which have been carried on so far by the Department of my hon. friend could not be completed so as to allow the infantry schools to be started at the time necessary to make them available for this season, and the expenditure so far has been carried on to as great an extent as possible in the time allowed. In the Supplementary Estimates for 1884-85, there will be an amount of money for the three schools of infantry, in Toronto, St. John's and Fredericton, and also for the cavalry school, which will be transferred to my Department, and will come down in my Estimates. At Toronto, the building where the school is located, was a very good building, but was in a very bad state of repair. The structure itself was just as good as it was possible to get one. It was the old stone building constructed by the Imperial Government, but naturally, as it had not been required for a number of years, it had fallen into very bad repair, and it was necessary to put it in proper repair in order to allow the infantry school to take possession of it. The same occurred in regard to the other schools, the buildings at St. John's and Fredericton being also a portion of the property transferred to us by the Imperial Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand that some further expenditure beyond this amount has already taken place?

Mr. CARON. Not already—will take place.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood him to say some work was already going on.

Mr. CARON. The repairs which are being done now are being done by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. Are they covered by this vote?

Mr. CARON. No; I understand the repairs which are being made now are covered by the vote my hon. friend has brought down. The repairs which will be required, of course, I can only carry out after the 1st of July.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is proposed that a portion of these repairs shall be carried on by the Minister of Public Works until the 1st of July, and from that date they shall be transferred to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In regard to this item of $42,000 for house and furniture for High Commissioner for Canada, London, England, we want some information. Will the hon. gentleman explain whether everything is being done in a style suitable to the dignity of the high functionary who is to occupy this imposing mansion; and where is it, in the first place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend on my right will give these explanations, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman who has just asked the question will be glad to find that this building will be put in such a position and such a style as that when any one of the hon. gentlemen opposite goes to replace my hon. friend, he will find this building a good and proper one for such a high functionary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friends opposite who are willing to relieve me of my position here will be only too glad to learn that proper provision is made for the High Commissioner in London.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If you will only stay in one place.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can promise that I will not be in two places at once. The facts are simply these: the High Commissioner for Canada has had no fixed residence in London, and the circumstance has given rise to a good deal of inconvenience. It was not found either desirable or convenient that the residence should be changed from one lodging, or from one hotel, to another, as would inevitably be the case unless there was some fixed and permanent residence. Under these circumstances I informed myself as well as I could where I could find a suitable position, and upon what terms a suitable building could be obtained. I made some enquiries through house agents and found that in Cromwell Road a very desirable part of London, a residence could be obtained at what was considered to be an extremely moderate rate. The negotiations were all made in reference to this matter through Mr. Thomas Reynolds, and I may say that Mr. Reynolds is himself the purchaser of the house—and when I say owner, I mean the owner of the lease for a term of years, and of the house adjoining the residence it is proposed to purchase. I am glad to say that the Speaker of this House has had an opportunity of personally visiting and examining this residence, and he will be able to bear testimony that it is in every respect a desirable locality, and is a very suitable and appropriate residence for the representative of Canada in England. Finding that this house could be purchased Mr. Reynolds negotiated with the owners and with the result of bringing down the price of the house to a very reasonable figure. It was built in 1877, and it was held at £9,000, or thereabouts. We found that the building could be purchased for a term of, I think, about 70 years, which is the term the lease has to run—the figures are here now; in fact they have already been laid upon the Table of the House—with a ground rent of £70 a year for the sum of £5,125. Mr. Reynolds purchased the house on those terms, and he estimated that the sum required to place the house in a thorough condition, with the necessary sanitary arrangements, drainage, &c., and everything necessary to put it in a first class condition, will be embraced within the sum of £6,000. The estimate for the furniture is about £2,500, which sum will furnish it in a first class manner; and I believe that both the locality and the price of the building are such as will commend themselves to the judgment of the House as securing a proper and appropriate residence for whoever may have the honour of representing Canada in London in future, and upon terms that will be found very advantageous. As I said before I do not expect any opposition on the part of my hon. friends opposite to this proposed arrangement.

Mr. BLAKE. As well as I could judge from the papers the arrangement was that the House is leased for the sum of £575 a year with, I think, an option a purchase at £5,125, or 5,000 guineas. As well as I could make out the arrangement was effected between the Government and Mr. Reynolds, and at the present time, and, until this, arrangement for purchase is consummated, the House will be under lease.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the case stands thus: Of course, the Government have no power or authority to purchase the house; all we could do was to lease it. But an arrangement was made in this way, that Mr. Reynolds became the purchaser and the Government became the lessee on these terms, but with an obligation on the part of Mr. Reynolds to transfer the ownership of the House to Canada for the amount paid by him with 5 per cent. interest until it was paid. But it stands in the meantime as a lease, until the purchase is consummated by an appropriation made by Parliament giving authority to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to purchase the building; but it is a lease with the option of purchasing.

Mr. BLAKE. This arrangement will stand, somewhere until October or November.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The time of assuming the purchase would commence about the first of January—not certainly before the last week of the present year. It was not to take place until the title was perfected and everything of that kind arranged, and possession was not given, nor any liability assumed until the very last week of the year.

Mr. BLAKE. So, practically, the result will be, if this is carried out, that we will pay 5 per cent. interest until the first of January, and, of course, pay the ground rent and taxes in the meantime.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. When we voted $4,000 a year for allowances to the High Commissioner I enquired, not being aware that this arrangement had been made, whether that $4,000 was to be applied towards the expenses of house rent, taxes, &c., and the First Minister answered yes. But, under these circumstances, it would appear as if the public was to provide the house. What is to become of the $4,000 a year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand the $4,000 was in lieu of house rent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will state the way in which the matter stands. The House is aware from the papers laid on the Table, the

communications that passed and the accounts submitted from the late High Commissioner that it was arranged that the rental of a house for a High Commissioner should be charged against $4,000 for contingencies; and I assume under the existing arrangement that the interest on the amount paid by the Government for a residence will be a charge against the contingencies to that extent, because those contingencies embraced the amount paid to the High Commissioner up to the present time for rental, or in whatever shape it might be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the better way probably will be to reduce item 22.

Mr. BLAKE. The arrangement was this: Under the original arrangement, as I understand it, $4,000 were appropriated by the Government to provide for rent, fuel, light and taxes for Sir Alexander Galt during his residence in London. That continued only about a year. The Government then determined by Order in Council to give $3,500 out of the $4,000 as an allowance in lieu of rent, light, fuel and taxes, and from that time forward he received that in a bulk sum, and what became of the other $500 I do not know. When the present High Commissioner was appointed it was stated that his expenses were to be paid in the same way as were those of Sir Alexander Galt. If that had been literally carried out, he would have received a gross allowance, for the year commencing 1st July, and ending 30th June following, of $3,500, and the $500 would have been applied to some other contingencies of the office. Instead of that, although the statement was made that his expenses were to be paid in the same manner as were those of Sir Alexander Galt, a sum of £800, being as nearly as may be equivalent to $4,000, was applied for and received by the present Commissioner, I think in the month of August last; and a return was made by him some time—the date is not given on the paper, but it appears to have been some time in November or December—showing that he had expended £800 less £3 or £4. Therefore, the £300, which was an allowance to pay for rental, light, fuel and taxes for the whole fiscal year from 1st July last up to 30th June next, was expended during the six months the Commissioner was in London; and on the assumption of this purchase of a house, interest on $12,000 at 5 per cent. will have to be provided. With respect to this allowance I made enquiries from the hon. First Minister, and he answered that the matter would go on as before. It is clear that it cannot go on as before, because under the present arrangement, instead of a house being rented, the Government is purchasing a house.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A simple plan would be to reduce item 22 from $4,500 to $2,500. How many years has the ground lease to run before the buildings fall in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think about 70 years.

Mr. BLAKE. How does it happen that this house in London, for which £9,000 was offered a year or two ago, is now offered for £5,125.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said that in 1877 that amount was asked when the House was first constructed.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how it comes about that this House is offered at such a reduced price, except from the fact that, when I was in London, I found that in some districts there was a considerable reduction in the value of property, owing to some apprehension existing in regard to sanitary arrangements. I heard of one case in which a gentleman built a very handsome mansion and disposed of it for one-third of its cost, and of another gentleman who sold for one-half what he had expended on his House. I should be sorry if this London house should prove to be in an unhealthy situation, as we understand that it is for the Commissioner's health we are making this arrangement, and we are expending a considerable sum in order to make the neighbourhood as healthy as possible. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would afford the Committee some information in regard to this investment in London, which is being made for the benefit of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been no time for many years when house property has been so much depressed all over London as it is at present. Houses can be purchased at a much lower rate than formerly, so much so that parties are investing in house property, expecting an early return to normal prices, when they will secure a large interest on their investments. The chief attraction of Cromwell Road is its sanitary condition, and it is regarded as one of the most healthy parts of London. It is a gravelly district, which is especially sought after on account of sanitary considerations. There is no part of London which is looked upon with greater favour, and in fact so many persons were attracted there that house builders went into large speculations, in putting up enormous rows of buildings in that part of London, and in the meantime the place is technically overbuilt. The value of household property—as I know from the investigations I made—is in a depressed condition, and we have purchased the property at a lower price than we could have had it for years. The house was held at a much larger amount, and in fact the parties had refused a larger amount at a comparatively recent date.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is Canada alone in this business? Have the Australian colonies supplied their agents general with houses?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know; but I do know that several of the agents of the Australian colonies and other countries are living in proximity to this property.

Mr. MILLS. In the same democratic neighbourhood.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this practice of providing residences for Ministers to be continued on this extensive scale?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to give notice of that question, for it has not been considered yet.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I object to it, at any rate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt we will have considered it before the hon. gentleman is ready for his residence.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is to be regretted that it has been deemed necessary to submit such an item as this for the consideration of the House. It involves the permanent investment of a considerable sum of money in the purchase of property in another country, property of a more or less perishable character, and so long as the country is unfortunate enough to own it, a continued bill of expense will be the result. Every year we shall find provision in the Estimates for various expenses connected with this property. We know very well that when a person is provided with house-rent free, his demands on the landlord are generally much greater than if he were obliged to meet such demands at his own expense. In this case I believe it is proposed to spend £2,500 in the purchase of furniture. That is, I think, a wholly unjustifiable expenditure, that class of property being of an especially perishable character. There is no way of having supervision over it, no accountability, except the accountability of the tenant for the time being, and we shall constantly be having items in the Estimates for repairs, and improvements, and changes according to the whim of the High Commissioner. When we look at these figures, £6,000 for leasehold, and £2,500 for furniture, making as a mere start $42,000 in round numbers, and add to that the fact that we do not own the property, that there is a ground rent of £70 a year, also taxes I suppose, which will not be a light item, and when we consider that the investment does not in any way represent the extent of the charge

on the future resources of the country, I for one object to the item, as I think it is wholly unnecessary for the proper management of the affairs of this country in England. Take the case of the United States they have what we might call Commissioners in various parts of the world. I believe it has been mentioned that in some parts of the world they have chosen to invest in this way. But the comparison is not a good one; we are not the United States. It may be necessary for them to invest such sums of money, but surely it is not justifiable for a young country like Canada to launch out in this way. I have not the figures showing what the office of High Commissioner costs, but if we take the salaries, the incidental expenses, and what is now proposed to be added permanently, we will find that the expenses of that office are something alarming. I regret that the item has been included in the Estimates, and I hope that the Minister of Railways will still think it better to have it omitted, and allow whoever may be for the time being the High Commissioner, to select his own quarters, and let us make an appropriation of cash for that particular purpose. We would then, at no sacrifice, be able to reduce the expenditure any year, by discontinuing the present system and making a change. But permanently to invest this amount of capital in this way puts us in the position of being compelled to pay a large sum of money in annual additional charges, and if we desire to discontinue the system and sell the property we are most unlikely to get back any considerable portion of the money.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman deplores very much the expense of office of High Commissioner. When I tell the hon. gentleman that in one item alone the saving, since the appointment of a High Commissioner, in connection with the coinage required in this country, would pay the entire expense of the office of High Commissioner, over and above the amount expended for the same service by the late Government, the hon. gentleman need not be anxious on that score.

Mr. MULOCK. Would not the hon. gentleman be as well able to discharge the duties of the office, and effect these savings, if he had a house selected by himself, as well as if he occupied one which is owned by Canada? I was speaking of the expense of the office.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must not be captious. I was dealing with his statement not as to the residence but as to the office; the hon. gentleman knows it, and he cannot escape it. I say there is no increase of expenditure in connection with this arrangement. The hon. gentleman knows that all he can do is to raise the question of the expense of the office, and I say that in one item alone, independent of the other services of the office, the entire cost of the office from the day of its creation down to the present hour has been discharged by the money saved by the Government in that item, over and above what the late Government paid for the same service.

Mr. MULOCK. I say that the hon. gentleman should not himself be captious. I did not object to the office itself, but to the cost; the increasing cost in connection with incidental and other expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in the view that this will not ultimately add to the expense. Nominally it may, but in reality it will not. I make out that the interest on the cost of the building, $30,000, when the repairs are made, at 5 per cent., will be $1,500. The furniture costs $12,500, and the usual rental allowance for furniture, having regard to the wear and tear, is 15 per cent., which would be $1,875. The ground rent is $350, making a total real charge of $3,725 per annum, irrespective altogether of the items of repairs, fuel, light, taxes and insurance. Unless, therefore, some other arrangement is to be made, it is obvious that the substantial result will ultimately be a very considerable increase of cost.

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE.

256.	Further to provide for the maintenance of Lights, Buoys, Beacons, &c.	$5,000 00
	To provide for the payment to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal the annual cost of maintaining the Buoys and Beacons of Montreal Harbour	7,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTRIGHT. I suppose Montreal Harbour here means really the river from Montreal to Quebec.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

257.	Further to provide for the Montreal and Quebec Water Police	$3,500 00

Mr. BLAKE. What is this extra vote for?

Mr. McLELAN. A considerable expenditure was made last year in renewing and lengthening the police boat, which is represented by part of this vote. A portion of it has also been necessitated by an increase of the force, during the strike of 1882.

Mr. BLAKE. How much is due to the boat, and how much to the other expenditure?

Mr. McLELAN. The expenditure on the boat, I think, is $1,500.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the other part for additional pay to the same men, or more pay because there were more men?

Mr. McLELAN. There were more men, and some of the men we kept employed during the winter.

FISHERIES.

258	To pay for services performed by persons in the Customs and Marine and Fisheries Department and other expenses in connection with the distribution of the Fishing Bounty	$4,000 00
	Further to provide for balance of expenses in connection with the International Fisheries Exhibition, the return of Specimens, and to pay Messrs. Samuel Wilmot, W. H. Venning, W. H. Rogers, J. H. Duvar, J. U. Gregory, and A. C. Anderson, for services in collecting and mounting Specimens	7,500 00

Mr. VAIL. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether it is his intention to confine the bounty to the same sized boats that he did last year?

Mr. McLELAN. Last year fourteen feet was established as the minimum length.

Mr. VAIL. I am told that a great many fishermen use a much smaller boat—not more than twelve feet in length—and that a great many have lost their share in the bounty in consequence. I am quite aware that there must be some fixed length; but if the Minister had asked for information on this subject, I think he would have found that many fishermen using such boats ought to get a share of the bounty. I think he might fix the limit at twelve feet top, instead of fourteen feet keel.

Mr. McLELAN. I gave the matter considerable attention, and I concluded that fourteen feet was the lowest limit we could properly adopt. If we adopted twelve feet, there would be complaints from those who use nine and ten feet boats.

Mr. DAVIES. Who are the officers for whom this vote is taken, and what is the nature of the services they perform?

Mr. McLELAN. It is necessary that we should employ some persons to examine the claims that come in, to certify to their correctness, and to see that the cheques are given to the right person. We have employed the Customs officers and certain fishery wardens and overseers, who only receive nominal pay, and it is proposed to pay them so much per

claim—15 cts. or thereabouts—for the claims that they return. We cannot fix a regular rate, because in some localities very much more work is to be performed that in others; but it is thought that we shall require this sum.

Mr. DAVIES. Are these officers to travel from station to station, or will the fishermen be required to go to the Custom house officer to make their claims? If so, there is no reason for any distinction.

Mr. McCLELAN. Very often the return has to be sent back for correction, and in that case the officer must go round and make enquiries regarding it.

Mr. BLAKE. In what part of this vote shall we find Mr. Ogden?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Ogden was employed about eight months altogether the past year to verify claims in the County of Halifax, and other counties where there are a great many presented.

Mr. DAVIES. How can he verify the statements? A declaration is made by the fishermen of the quantity of fish caught and the declaration is sworn to.

Mr. McLELAN. He can see that no fraudulent declarations have been made.

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. Could the hon. gentleman give us further explanations about this item. I do not think that the course he suggests as to the payment of these subordinate officers who are to obtain the necessary information is one which will be found to work well in practice. As I understand the hon. gentleman, he said they could not make a regular tariff, because in many cases, the returns would be defective and the officers would have to send them back again. It would be better to establish a tariff inclusive of anything of that kind, because if you establish extra remuneration in the case of defective returns, you will find more defective statements and more correspondence than by the arrangement I propose. What is the scale of remuneration, because this matter has now been in operation for some time? Is any portion devoted to the inside service at Ottawa? Has the hon. gentleman ascertained that frauds have been committed? If so to what extent?

Mr. McLELAN. A number of claims have been sent back for investigation, and some of these have been found to be fraudulent and have not been paid. In one or two localities, complaints have been made that claims have been paid which were fraudulent; investigation is being made into these complaints, but in no case have these investigations been concluded. It has been intimated in giving notice to present claims that where parties made fraudulent claims they would be debarred from any participation in the benefits of the bounty, and it is to be hoped this will prevent the presentation of fraudulent claims. Last Session a sum was voted for the payment of clerks in the inside service who had devoted extra time to this work. There is an enormous amount of work connected with the payment of this bounty in so many small sums, involving the necessity of issuing about 45,000 cheques in the year 1882. It was decided that it would be more satisfactory to make the payments to these fishermen claiming it who were in the vessels rather than to the owners or captains of the vessels. This work was thrown suddenly on the Department, and it was considered advisable to train clerks in the Department for this work, and to even use them fors extra services in extra hours in order to meet the emergency thus thrown on the Department. Last Session, the House will remember, $3,000 or $4,000 was voted for that purpose, which was for the appointment of some of the officers of the Department for that extra service. For the present year, I have not called upon the officers of the Department for so much extra work, having taken in several hands and having, perhaps, more time to apportion the payments. The principal portion of the sum asked for here is for the outside service. The officers of Customs more particularly declined to have this work thrown upon them unless there was some intimation given to them that there would be some remuneration for it. I propose that the sum fixed for each claim forwarded by each officer shall be the same as a basis, but that where extra labour has been imposed on the officer before the claim has been verified, he shall receive special consideration. As a rule, however, the remuneration will be the same, and that will be fixed at from 10c. to 15c. for each claim. I think about 12c. will be fair unless it is shown afterwards that there have been extraordinary services performed.

Mr. VAIL. I can easily understand that collectors cannot be expected to do this work without some remuneration, and I think it would be better to confine this work to the collectors. I think it would be more satisfactory than to give it to the wardens and inspectors. The collectors, as a rule, know all the fishermen in the districts in which they reside, and I am sure they are a class of men who would keep a pretty bright look-out that no frauds were committed. The Minister says there have been some frauds. I would like to know if that has been since the last circular was issued.

Mr. McLELAN. Previous.

Mr. VAIL. Under the circumstances, I think that, unless it can be proved that these returns which are made under oath have been falsified in some way and are not reliable, we may infer for the future that the returns will be satisfactory, and that there will be very few frauds. My opinion of the fishermen is that, as a rule, when there is this strict instruction that they shall be debarred from receiving the bounty in future if they make a fraudulent return, taken in connection with the fact that the return is made under oath, you may be pretty sure in future that the returns will be reliable. I think it would be better that the collectors should do this work, but I quite agree with the Minister that they ought to receive a fair remuneratien. They have to attend to other duties, and, though the remuneration might be small, it would be something of a compensation for the work done, and their salaries are small as a rule.

Mr. KIRK. I do not agree with the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) in his conclusion that this work should be confined to the collectors of Customs, because there are very few of them throughout the country, and the fishermen must travel to the place where they can make these returns, and, if they have to travel to the collector of Customs, they would in many cases rather lose the money than do so. That is the complaint now in Guysboro' that they have to travel too far, and would rather do without the money. Many of them had to travel 30 miles, and 30 miles going and 30 miles coming is worth almost $5. The Minister knows very well that very few fishermen keep horses and carriages to allow them to drive cheaply to make out these returns, and I think it is very necessary to appoint officers in convenient places for them to make the returns out.

Mr. McLELAN. I quite agree with the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) that it would be as well to place it as much as possible in the hands of the fishery overseers and wardens. There are more of them. They are located where there is fishing, as a general rule, or should be; they are in the neighbourhood of the fisheries, and it is their business to make returns to the Department of the fish caught. It is very important, as the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, said the other night,

that there should be reliable statistics of the catch of fish in the Dominion, and that there should be some inducement held out to the fishery officers scattered over the Dominion to make correct returns of the catch of fish. I think, by giving them some remuneration in connection with this bounty, their attention will be more turned to the matter, and they will be better able to get the correct catch of fish than the collectors of Customs would, or than they now do, not having this inducement, and not being brought so directly in connection with the fishermen. Of course, they should be in connection with the fishermen during the season of catch, but I fear very many of them are a little lax in their duties. If this additional inducement were given to them, they would pay more attention to the service, and would be more likely to send us correct returns, which, in connection with the Treaty of Washington, it is now very important to have. I hope to be able to organize statistics of fisheries in connection with this, and to have the assistance in that matter of the different wardens and overseers of fisheries throughout the Dominion.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am very glad to hear the Minister of Fisheries state that he proposes to ascertain by some means or other the catch of fish in the Dominion. I, of course, can only guess at the catch of fish in the county I represent, but it is very large, and we get only a very small account of the fish that are caught in that locality. It is situated on the frontier, and their salt fish and their fresh fish and their herrings go in year after year without any return at all. I venture to say the Customs returns do not show more than 25 per cent. of the fish caught in the county of Charlotte. Now, with regard to this question of the bounties, I think the Minister has suggested the very best mode. There is no one can tell so well to whom the bounty should be paid as the fishery wardens. There are several of them in convenient localities, and they are all fishermen and know the fishermen in their localities, in the area over which they have supervision. The collectors of Customs cannot begin to do it. They know very little about the fishermen, who are and who are not fishermen, and the wardens and overseers are the very best men to attend to the matter, and I think that very little would be required of any other class of officers, unless it were to go and investigate some misunderstanding or difference which might exist. I think, too, that the wardens are entitled to pay for their services, because you are aware they get a very small remuneration now for their duties as wardens. They know every man who is a fisherman, they know all about the matter, and you could not get any class of men so competent to discharge these duties as the the fish-wardens. Certainly I think the business could be done very well without the oversight of the collector of Customs at all. I do not think there is to-day any other class of officers better qualified for this position. Of course some of them may not be reliable, but as a rule I think you can depend upon them to attend to this matter more efficiently than any one else. I will just take this opportunity to speak to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to the catch of fish. Nearly every portion of that part of the Dominion is convenient to the frontier. Smoked fish goes from the fish houses on the shore into the United States, but no, account of them is taken. Fresh herrings all go that way and many other kinds of fish, yet we have no account of them whatever. I think the fish wardens, with very little difficulty, would be the very class of men to keep an approximate account of the catch of fish in their own localities, and would be able to give very nearly the correct figures. This is an important matter in view of the negotiations that may arise with the United States in reference to our fisheries.

Mr. PAINT. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in what he has said of the fish wardens visiting the rivers. I do not hesitate to say that, as a rule, they do not leave their homes once a year to visit the rivers.

Mr. KIRK. In the Province of Nova Scotia the Minister must be aware that the fish wardens are only appointed for the rivers, to protect the river fisheries. There are no fish wardens on the shore at all. For instance, in county of Guysboro', for a distance of nearly 100 miles, there is but one fish warden that I know of in the whole district, and I think that is the case all round the coast of Nova Scotia. The wardens are up on the rivers, not on the sea coast at all. I would like to enquire from the Minister whether it is the wardens or the collectors of Customs whose duty it is to receive declarations and see that they are filled out properly, and whether they have authority to return to the fishermen the declarations that they think are not properly made out. If I am correctly informed fishermen last year were allowed to make out their declarations at home before a justice of the peace, and swear to them, and then the wardens sent them to the fishery overseer or to the collector of Customs. In cases of that kind I would like to enquire whether it is the collector of Customs or the fishery overseer who has a right, if he thinks these declarations were not properly made out, to return them to the fishermen themselves for correction—or should they forward them to the Department?

Mr. McLELAN. If it is apparent to the official that they are incorrect, he should return them to the party making them out, certainly.

Mr. VAIL. It has been the practice, and I want to know if it is the rule of the Department that the fish warden's duty is confined to the river fisheries.

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. VAIL. That is the way I understood it. Of course, I do not wish to be understood as laying down a cast iron rule for the whole Province, but I am not aware of any duties of these officers which cannot be done by the collectors of Customs. Speaking of my own county, which is one of the largest fishing counties in Nova Scotia, I find there are four fish wardens in the county, and another one was recently appointed, and every one of these five men all live within a stone's throw of the collector in their respective ports. These men have to see that the returns are made out in proper shape, and pay over to the fishermen the amount that may be due them, and I do not see why these duties may not be just as well performed by the collectors, who are all responsible men. Of course the wardens are also very good men, but I cannot help thinking that the business would be better done by the officials in charge.

Mr. DAWSON. There can be no doubt that the exhibition at home last year did a great deal of good to this country by attracting the attention of the civilized world to our inexhaustible resources in fish, both in the ocean and in the great lakes. We had a magnificent display, the nature of which can be seen in Ottawa now at the Victoria Hall. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it will have a good effect in the future in drawing the attention of the business men of Europe to the resources of this country. But we have resources of other kinds as well as of fish which we ought to make known to the world. Now, during the coming summer, in the month of August, I believe, there will be held a great Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, in Scotland. I think it very desirable that we should do as we did in the case of fisheries—have a collection of the products of the country and a collection of our forest trees at this great International Exhibition. We have woods now of very great value but which are little known abroad. It is well known that very valuable kinds of wood in Europe and other countries, such as walnut, and mahogany, are becoming very scarce and dear. Now, Sir, those who are capable of judging

believe that we have in this country woods which are equally valuable, equally ornamental, and equally as good in every other respect as the woods of Europe. Take, for instance, the beautiful birds-eye maple; if that could be brought into notice I have no doubt a great trade would arise in that article. At present, I am sorry to say, it is being burnt off in great quantities by the settlers in the district I have the honour to represent, more especially on the Islands of Manitoulin and St. Joseph. There were magnificent forests of the finest maple which are now being swept away. Now, if people in Europe knew about this wood, and knew its value, it is quite evident that a very good trade might arise in it. There are certain kinds of our woods which are well known, such as pine, which goes home every day, but we have other woods which may be in the future equally valuable that are not so well known, such as our black birch and oak. Our pine is well known at home, but there are many other kinds of woods that are not so well known. I would, therefore, suggest to the Government the desirability of making a small appropriation for the exhibition of Canadian woods at home, and to draw attention to the value of our forest products.

Mr. SPROULE. I endorse every word of the hon. Member for Algoma. I think we cannot over-estimate the importance of the Fisheries Exhibition last year, particularly in view of the fact that the fishery arrangements with the United States are likely soon to terminate, and we shall have to look for another market. The suggested exhibition of native woods would possess great importance. I am aware that a gentleman in Ontario has employed a large number of men during the last few years in getting out small sections of woods and taking them to the old country, and he has found it very profitable. If the exhibition was made, as suggested by the hon. Member for Algoma, it would result in opening up a very extensive and desirable market for Canadian woods, which to-day are being burnt up for fuel.

INDIANS.

Indian Fund.

259 To supplement the grant in aid of and to enable the Department to carry out the undermentioned improvements to the Mount Elgin Industrial Institution at Muncey-town—

Erection of new school room, bath and recreation room	$700 00
Roofing barn	300 00
Windmill, pump and tank	200 00

British Columbia.

261 To enable the Department to rebuild Indian houses in the Village of Kemisquit, on the West coast of Vancouver Island. The houses belonging to the natives having been destroyed during the bombardment of the village by H. M. S. *Rocket*, which had visited the village for the purpose of obtaining two Indian witnesses in the matter of the steamer *G. S. Wright*, which had been wrecked, and the crew of which was supposed to have been murdered by the Indians. 1,200 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The estimates state fully the purpose for which the vote is required. It seems a rather extraordinary proceeding—it sounds more like an action on the coast of Madagascar or Africa than on the coast of British Columbia. Her Majesty's ship *Rocket* went to that coast five or six years ago to look for witnesses as to a murder committed when the ship *Geo. S. Wright* was wrecked there. The Indians took to the woods, being frightened, and the captain of the ship coolly canonaded the village and destroyed the buildings. The case was stated very fully in the report of Superintendent Powell, made two years ago. That officer reported:

"The natives of Kemisquit have never recovered from the destructive bombardment of their village five years ago by the *Rocket*, now, however, engaged in a more peaceful mission.

"The ship had visited the village with the police for the purpose of obtaining a couple of witnesses in the matter of the *George S. Wright*, a steamer that had been lost a couple of years prior, the crew of which at that time, it was supposed, had been murdered by the Indians. The witnesses had escaped to the woods, and not being produced, the village was, I think, unfortunately and too hastily shelled.

"The Chief, who was absent at the time, informed me that hearing firing from the ship, his people had been greatly frightened, most of them running away. They complained greatly of the injustice by which they had been, without warning, treated in this affair, and as there was no lumber to be purchased in the locality, they had been unable to rebuild their village and were driven to shift as they best could in the bush—a number of them dying from exposure and want during the following winter.

"The Chief begged for my intercession, and hoped some assistance would yet be granted them.

"There is, after all, no reason to believe that the crew of the ill-fated steamer *Wright* had been foully dealt with, and, in this view, their case is certainly a hard one and deserving, in my opinion, of practical and humane consideration. There being no saw mill within three hundred miles, they can only hue out building material in a rude manner by hand.

"The Chief begged that they might be supplied with lumber, nails and an assortment of garden implements, which would be a great relief in ameliorating their present distressed condition.

"These Indians being remote and isolated, they have not the same opportunities of making money and of consequent recuperation, and I earnestly hope that you may concur in the desirability of some appropriation for relieving their distress."

Mr. BLAKE. Who was captain of the vessel?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We know who he is, but I have forgotten his name. I think the papers were sent home to England, to the Imperial Government. I think the Committee will agree to Superintendent Powell's recommendation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think Her Majesty's Government should have been called on to pay this amount; but it is not worth while disputing a matter of $1,200 with the Imperial authorities.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think we should apply to the Imperial Government for payment of the amount. We obtain the benefit of the service of the Imperial officers, and must take the rough with the smooth; but I must say that this was a most inhuman and barbarous action on the part of this officer, and may be productive of lasting results. We know that, although these Indians are isolated, there are means of communication between the bands, and a report of an affair of this description will spread far and wide after a time, and the consequences, apart from the act itself, may have a lasting ill effect. So I hope the First Minister will make sure that a report has been sent to England; because while I would not claim the $1,200, I would claim that the officers in the Imperial service who discharge a duty of this description, in which they committed a very grave error, and who would be sharply dealt with if it were committed elsewhere, should be equally sharply dealt with by the Imperial authorities in this case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with everything the hon. gentleman has stated. We cannot ask Her Majesty's Government for the money, because they are not obliged to assist in the administration of justice. They are, however, always ready to do so. It is known that Her Majesty's Government and the Admiralty had a serious intention of removing the squadron to Valparaiso. That met with a strong remonstrance, however, as it was thought that our trade might be interrupted, and that, beside, it might be necessary to get assistance in case of a sudden *émeute* among the Indians up in the vicinity of Alaska. It was promised that one ship or more would always be stationed there for such emergencies. As the hon. member for West Durham said, we must take one thing with the other, and not press for any demand, as there will be a discussion in the English House of Commons about the matter, and they will be asked why they did not employ the fleet. At the same time, I may say, that the conduct of the officer was such that it was brought under the attention of Her Majesty's Government.

Manitoba and the North West.

260 To enable the Department to aid in the erection of grist mills—
At Battleford, Treaty No. 6 ..... $1,500 00
At Fort Pitt, " 1,500 00
At Carlton " 1,500 00
In Treaty No. 7 ..... 2,000 00
To purchase hogs for Indians of Treaty No. 6, in accordance with Treaty stipulations, 1,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. First Minister will give some information in regard to this vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indians, I am happy to say, have settled on their reserves very well. Last year on some of the reserves, crops of wheat of moderate dimensions were raised, showing that the Indians have taken to the growing of wheat. There were, however, no means of grinding their grain, and the Indian Commissioner has recommended, and pressed his recommendation very strongly, that four small mills should be put up on the Indian reserves, so that the grain may be ground up into food. I may say with reference to these mills, that it is not the intention of the Department to set up the mills, as that is rather an expensive operation, along with employing millers, &c. This money will be used as bonuses to get millers to start mills in the vicinity of the reserves. These mills will be useful for the purpose of grinding the Indian products, and the bonuses will be given to induce the parties to build larger mills, so as to supply the settlements as settlers come in.

Mr. WATSON. Do the mills require to be a certain size in order to get the bonus?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, we will see that sufficiently large mills are built, and if there is any immediate prospect of a white settlement in the vicinity, of course we may have to give a large bonus. I may say, that an arrangement has been made at Battleford for the the erection of a large mill there, a gentleman agreeing to build such a mill if he got the bonus.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman propose to ask for tenders stating the smallest bonus for which parties will erect the mills, or will private arrangements be made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that at Battleford, there were one or two offers made, and a gentleman who represented considerable capital, and who was, in fact, a large trader, agreed if he got this bonus, that he would put up a large mill. If you offer it by tender, parties who are without capital may offer to put up a small mill for this money, whereas the object is to get a larger class of mills, so as to meet the future necessities of the country.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose that it will be advertised in the papers that these bonuses will be given.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Full notice will be given.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose the man who builds the largest mill will get the money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The largest and best.

Mr. BLAKE. Let it be understood that a certain amount of bonus will be given for a certain minimum sized mill, with a certain power and capacity. Then there will be an opportunity for several persons offering, and it might be the means of getting exactly the right man. This might not be done unless there was public notice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will, of course, give every publicity. Of course one man may offer to put up a steam mill, another may say that he will put up a water mill or a windmill, and it is of great importance that we should have large and good mills, so as to meet not only the requirements of those who get their grain ground by toll, but for future purchasers as well. Full publicity will be given and we will try to get the best men.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

262 Required to complete the service of the year.. $70,000 00

MISCELLANEOUS.

263 Miscellaneous printing 10,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. What is this amount for?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For reports furnished the different Departments by Mr. Hartney. The item is largely composed of these reports.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Is the printing done under the contract?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

264 To provide for the payment of the engrossing and illuminating of the Address of the Senate and House of Commons to His Excellency the late Governor General $100 00
265 Gratuity of two months' salary to be paid to the family of the late Geo. E. McLaughlin, Engineer in charge of works in the Maritime Provinces $333 32

Mr. BLAKE. What is the meaning of this vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This officer was an engineer of the Department since the 1st of June, 1872, and like a number of other engineers he was not on the Civil Service staff. But he was continued from year to year, and was a little over eleven years in the service. He has always been a most faithful officer, and we thought that under the circumstances we should ask Parliament to allow his widow the two months' gratuity which we generally allow to the officers of the Civil Service.

Mr. BLAKE. It is of course difficult to object to a vote that appeals to one's sympathies for a widow, but after all it is a question of principle. We have adopted the rule, right or wrong, that we shall allow two months' gratuity to the widow of those who die in the Civil Service; but we have not extended it beyond the permanent service thus far. I have always felt that in the case of those very highly placed in the Civil Service, such as judges, the gratuity was rather out of the way, though in the case of those who are more moderately salaried it may be reasonable. But if you are going to extend the rule beyond the permanent service, I do not see why it should not be done on some principle.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree with the hon. gentleman that there might be a rule adopted. But it should be somewhat elastic, so that the Government might be allowed to recommend, or not to recommend, its application according to the services rendered. In this case, Mr. McLaughlin entered the outside service of the Department on the 1st of June, 1873, and was constantly engaged, up to the date of his death, on works in the Maritime Provinces. He had very superior attainments, and his place will not be easily filled. Though not of a very robust constitution, he gave himself up entirely to his work, and during the eleven years that he was in the service he did not take a holiday. He worked until it became physically impossible for him to continue, and he was obliged to ask for leave of absence. He had hopes of recovery, but the anticipated change did not take place, and he died in October, 1883, in harness. Under these circumstances, we thought Parliament would not object to this vote.

Mr. BLAKE. I think if there were any rule, it certainly ought to embrace Mr. McLaughlin.

266 Gratuity to be paid to the widow of the late J. D. Lowden, Keeper of the Picton Lighthouse, whose death was caused by disease contracted in consequence of exposure on the night of 30th March, 1832, when an attempt was made by one Keeting to murder the Keeper and his family and destroy the light $100 00
267 To provide for the payments of gratuities to the families of the following persons lost on the steamer *Princess Louise*;—

Lieut. D. M. Browne	$1,200 00	
Alfred Hiltz	300 00	
John McKenzie	300 00	
Jacob Singer	300 00	
Arthur Hood	200 00	
		2,300 00
268 To defray the burial and other expenses of persons lost on board the steamer *Princess Louise*		775 00
269 To meet outstanding claims in connection with the International Fishery Exhibition		5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total cost of the exhibition?

Mr. McLELAN. About $36,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman give us the details of this item?

Mr. McLELAN. I had hopes that the reports would be published by this time. The memorandum I have does not give the details very fully. The expenditure for preparing specimens was $24,583; the expenditure in London was $3,843; and the expenditure in Ottawa, $10,100. This statement is for the fiscal year. The total expenditure in London was about $16,000. I do not think the cost of the exhibit has been excessive, considering the difficulties that beset us, and the fact that we had to purchase almost everything that was exhibited. In the case of many other exhibitions, private exhibitors furnish the exhibits themselves, and defray a considerable portion of the expense of transport; yet the cost of this exhibit has been something less than that for the Paris exhibition. This vote covers the cost of bringing back a number of the specimens, which are in Ottawa. A considerable portion were also left in London, with the agency of the Dominion Government. It was believed that they would be useful for exhibition at various exhibitions in the country, where the immigration agents desired to have Canada represented by some display of her products.

Mr. MILLS. This no doubt made a very handsome show, and I dare say the hon. gentleman had an agreeable trip; but apart from that, the hon. gentleman has not stated what advantage the country has derived and what advantage he expects will be derived from this exhibition. We know that a gentleman of very great experience connected with this Department came to the conclusion there would be no real or substantial gain to the country by a Fishery Exhibition in London. The hon. gentleman speaks about sending those specimens into the various parts of the United Kingdom where our agents are seeking to persuade emigrants to come to this country, but in what way does he expect these exhibits will induce immigration to Canada. Certainly he does not expect to induce parties from the interior of England, Scotland and Ireland to engage in the business of fishermen. When so large an expenditure as this has taken place, we ought to have had very full explanations; the hon. Minister should point out in what way he expects the country is to be recouped for this expenditure.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman had followed the reports given throughout the press of that exhibition, he would see that the very fact that we make an exhibit of the fish of the Dominion, which surpasses the exhibit of fish from any other country, must have had a great effect on people who were considering the question of emigration. It must have had a great effect in inducing them to come to a country in which there is not only on the sea shore, but in the lakes and the rivers, as the specimens exhibited demonstrated, abundance of excellent fish, and this must have an important bearing on the decision which a man will arrive at, as to whether he will emigrate to Canada or to some other country. I may state that during the six months that exhibition lasted, there was a continual throng of visitors examining these products, and very many were examining them specially with the view of emigration to this country. At that exhibition, we had the large map which is now in the Railway Committee room; we had a gentleman from Ontario stationed there to point out the different localities, the different rivers and lakes in which these fish may be found in abundance. An immense number of pamphlets bearing on immigration were distributed there by that gentleman. The Government of Ontario, at the same time, had their officer also distributing immigration literature, and the Canadian Pacific Railway had also a stand there for the same purpose, showing the products of the North-West in grains, minerals, &c. A full report of the whole matter will be published at an early day.

270 To pay James Barry for preparing Tables of Imports and Exports of Fish		$28 00
271 To provide for the purchase and maintenance of a steamer, and other expenses in connection with survey of Georgian Bay		22,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it necessary to buy a steamer for this work?

Mr. McLELAN. It will be more economical in the long run. Last season we had one hired; this year we have invited tenders, and we think we will have the offer of one at a very low rate, which will be run very economically and be disposed of after the survey is over.

272 To provide for the publication of the proceedings of the Royal Society		$5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this an annual vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was a vote last year, and it was decided we would give another vote this year to start the Royal Society and to enable them to publish their transactions. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has seen their first volume, but is a most creditable work, not only in the way it is got up but in the value of the papers on scientific, geological and historial subjects. They are really very valuable papers, as far as an inexpert like myself can judge.

273 To pay the account of the Honorable Boucher de la Bruère, publisher and proprietor of *Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe*, for the printing of and the type for the Civil Service Lists in French and English		$7,683 74

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What on earth is the explanation of this? Here is not only a vote for printing but for absolutely buying type for preparing Civil Service Lists. What can there be in Civil Service Lists to make it necessary that type should be bought at the expense of the country?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My colleague the Secretary of State not being in his place, I have not the papers to explain them. As far as I recollect the case, this work was given to that gentleman, the publisher and proprietor of that paper, for the printing of the Civil Service Lists in French and English, and it was found that some of these lists would have to be published every year; that it would be more economical that, at the same time, the type might become the property of the Government and the type could remain standing and corrections only take place each year; and the publication every year would thus cost very little, apart from the first investment; therefore, this type has been purchased and the publication of the work paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman show me what those lists are.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must have had a copy or two at the beginning of this Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What would they have cost printed under our contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, but the account was certified to by the Queen's Printer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to know what possible occasion there can be to take this out of the hands of our contractor and hand it over to Mr. de la Bruère, the publisher of the *Courrier de St. Hyacinthe*, unless it be for the purpose of providing a job for that gentleman and providing him with the type. This is one of the most extraordinary items I have ever seen in all my life put down in the Supplementary or other Estimates, and I can only suppose it is designed to make this gentleman a present of a large sum of money at the public expense for services not herein described, but which may be known to the hon. gentleman.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is rather too suspicious. The type was not given to that publisher; it was purchased for the purpose from the foundry and kept by the Government. It is in the office of the Secretary of State, and is to be used for the purpose I have mentioned just now. By the change of a few words, the lists will be ready each year at very small expense, and apart from the first year, the publication will be very inexpensive.

Mr. BLAKE. Could not all this have been done through our contractor? Could it not have been done in Ottawa by McLean, Roger & Co.? Is it only at St. Hyacinthe this could be done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps so; but perhaps also the work to be performed at that period was so heavy that it was found necessary to give this as outside work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I understand that this work was not done at a time when the contractors were busy at all. In the course of the Session I moved for a return in reference to this expenditure, and I may say a few words of explanation in regard to it. The practice I wish to refer to was adopted after the discussions which took place in the Public Accounts Committee last year, with reference to outside printing, which amounts to a very large sum annually. Last year it was $42,000 for outside printing and lithographing. The attention of the Public Accounts Committee was called to this expenditure last year, and several accounts of the same character were asked to be certified by the Auditor-General, who refused to do so, and, in refusing to do so, stated:

"The work done comes under the head of Parliamentary printing, for which there is a special contract with Messrs. McLean, Roger & Co. As my duty under section 32 of the Audit Act, I have ascertained the rates at which the work could have been done under the contract, and I enclose a statement comparing these rates with those claimed. I am unable to authorize payment of a greater amount than the $188.05 therein named."

To pay an account which amounted to $368.60. He goes on further to say:

"I have given the subject of Parliamentary and Departmental printing much consideration since it was discussed before the Public Accounts Committee last Session, and I cannot see that I am justified in passing any account, unless one of the following conditions is fulfilled:

"1. That when the work would naturally be done at Ottawa, the rates are those allowed to the contractors.

"2. That when the work could not be done at Ottawa, without inconvenience, the rates are current ones for transactions of the same magnitude."

I may state here that this decision of the Auditor-General, who I believe is an independent officer of this House, was overruled by the Treasury Board, and these accounts were ordered to be paid by that Board. With reference to this account, which was brought down in answer to a request for a return, the Auditor-General says, in transmitting the account:

"You will notice that no expenditure has yet been made under the warrant for $2,688.74."

And then he gives a copy of the account as certified to by the Queen's Printer, and I will just give a few extracts from it, to show the extraordinary charges which are made for work which ought to have been done by the contractors at the contractors' prices. The type was not taken into consideration in his calculation at all. The Auditor-General reduced the amount of the account, which was $3,757.62, to $1,900.38, taking off $1,857.24. For composition, the Queen's Printer allowed $1,400, at the rate of 50 cents per thousand. The contractors' rate is 25 cents, and the Auditor-General reduced the amount from $1,400 to $700. For press work, the Queen's Printer authorized the payment of 50 cents per token, amounting to $67.50. The Auditor General reduced the account to the contractors' price of 10 cents per token instead of 50 cents, and allowed $13.50. For the composition in the French edition, the account certified by the Queen's Printer was $1,612. The Auditor-General reduced it to $806. The press work was charged at 50 cents and it was also reduced to the contractor's price of 15 cents, amounting to $15.60. The translation was allowed at $56.76; the total reduction was $1,857.24.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On how much?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On $3,757. The Auditor-General, I see by the return, states that the amount has not been paid under the warrant, $2,688.74 being yet unpaid. Other accounts of this character were before the Public Accounts Committee this year, and I had the word of the Finance Minister that he would take the matter into consideration, and give us an answer as to the mode to be adopted by the Government for outside printing in future. I think if the Government choose to subsidize their supporters in this way, it is altogether wrong that the public should be made to pay for it. I think when an account of this kind is reduced about one half, it is time for the representatives of the people to see if some other method cannot be adopted in regard to the public printing. It is certainly outrageous that this book-work, which ought to have been done by the regular contractors, should have been taken out of their hands for the purpose of favouring some particular friend of the Government, and that this extraordinary amount should be paid for the work. I trust the Finance Minister will now be able to say what he intends to do with regard to the payment of this account.

Mr. BLAKE. I think my hon. friend omitted to point out, in mitigation of this double charge, that while the Queen's Printer supplies his own type, this contractor had it supplied at the public expense, which I suppose accounts for the double charge.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I suppose the House would conclude, if they did not know to the contrary, that there is something new in the course pursued by the present Government in reference to printing. It is a well known fact that the late Government as well as the present Government have, from 1873, been in the habit of giving to printers this confidential printing, and printing outside of the contract, to a very considerable amount. The arrangement made by the late Government was, I think, that the contract price in Ontario made by the Ontario Government should be the basis on which the Queen's Printer was to settle the prices at which these accounts were to be paid. It is well known, and it will be an item in the Supplementary Estimates, that a verdict for $69,000 has been obtained by the contractors against the Government of Canada for work performed between 1873 and 1878.

Mr. BLAKE. All between 1873 and 1878?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, very nearly all. I can only say the present Government followed in the steps of our illustrious predecessors in reference to that matter. A certain portion was given outside. The Queen's Printer

stated the rates at which the accounts were to be paid, and they have been paid. Within the last five or six months new arrangements have been made and practically a new contract entered into for the balance of the term, and under this arrangement very little of the work, if any, will be given outside of the terms of the contract. That is the arrangement as it stands at present, I think, shutting out the parties, if that is agreed to, from any claim they might have for any extra work since 1879. The contract has been transferred from Mr. Drummond, in whose name it was, to the parties who are practically the printers at the present time. So, whatever the sins may have been in the past of both Governments, I think the matter is brought pretty nearly to a close under the new arrangement.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I understand it is not being brought to a close, because I am aware of the fact that a large amount of printing is now in the hands and has been in the hands of outside printers within the last few months, not exactly similar to this, but in connection with the Agriculture Department, and that system is being carried on the same as it always was. I do not know that this Government has any right to excuse itself because a former Government carried out perhaps the principle laid down by the Government which preceded it. I think, if we follow such a course as that, we would never make any amends for any evils we might fall into. We should adopt a new system.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We are adopting it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And this is the proof?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As to the amount claimed and obtained by McLean, Roger & Co. for loss sustained through this work having been given out, I think the Minister is wrong in that, for I understand from the contractors that at least one year of the present Government was included in that suit.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There may be a portion of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. And I am satisfied that they have as good a claim for the last five years as they had for the previous five years. I am satisfied, notwithstanding the statement made by the Finance Minister several times in the Public Accounts Committee, that there was a clause in the contract which would shut them out from making such a claim in future, that he is mistaken in that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is not the question now; it is under the recent arrangement made.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood from the hon. Minister last year, in the Public Accounts Committee, that by the arrangement that then existed they would be shut out from any further claim.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is what we claim.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Now, I have ascertained that the arrangement never was in force with regard to the present contract. Of course, if the hon. Minister succeeds in inducing the contractors to abandon their claim on the Government with regard to outside printing during the last five years, he will succeed in saving a large amount of money, probably as much as had to be paid under the old contract. The Minister says that this matter will receive the consideration of the Government, and that in the future outside printers will not be given the printing of documents that ought to be handed to the contractors, to be paid for at rates double the amount that would be paid to the contractors under their contract. I think there can be no justification for the expenditure of public money in such a manner as that. It is no justification for this Government to say that another Government did the same thing, and I doubt very much, if the matter was thoroughly enquired into, whether it would be found that the previous Government was guilty to the same extent this Government has been in this matter; because I understand that a great deal of the outside printing that was done under the former Government was in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and the Maritime Provinces—printing which it was the practice at that time, and the practice of the previous Government under the present First Minister, to give to parties in those Provinces who had formerly been doing the printing for that section of the country. Since that time a different arrangement has been made. Therefore, I hope that in future these contracts will not be given out at such exorbitant rates, and the country be made to pay for the support of gentlemen who publish newspapers in favour of the present Government.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman's observations, it seems to me, are no defence at all, nor do they in any way answer the complaint made by the hon. member who has just spoken. The hon. gentleman says: "We have made arrangements with the contractors, which will prevent them from bringing suits against the Administration, when the Administration gives out printing to private parties." Suppose the hon. gentleman is right, suppose the contract he has made with the printers would have the effect it is intended it should have, and suppose he takes three-fourths of the printing from the contractors and gives it to private parties, that may protect the Government against a suit with the contractors, but it does not protect the public against paying money misapplied. The hon. gentleman will see that he has simply made this statement, that we are now in the position of taking a large portion of the public printing and doling it out to private parties and enabling them to do it on such terms as the Government may choose to make with them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not claim the Government have a right to do that, under the new arrangement.

Mr. BLAKE. When was this new arrangement made?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think four or five months ago.

Mr. BLAKE. Why was it not laid on the Table?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was a transfer of the contract, in which arrangements were made by which they should be shut out.

Mr. BLAKE. I think Parliament ought to have been informed of this arrangement. If the Government make arrangements for transferring a contract and altering the conditions of the public printing, the people's representatives have a right to know all about it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman might have had the papers if he had asked for them.

Mr. BLAKE. We never asked for them, because we did not know they existed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the hon. gentleman did know.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the case is this: that whereas the Government was contending that the new contract was in different terms from the old contract by which they had this right, they have now made some other arrangement by which they concede they have no right to give out the printing to others than the Queen's printers for the future, and by which the Queen's printers agreed not to collect damages against them for the past. If that is so, I would like to know when that arrangement came into force, and if there is any current printing being done outside on the terms of the old arrangement. I desire to know if that system still continues by which the Government have been giving out, with respect to immigration literature, to one newspaper supporting the hon. gentleman 10,000 pamphlets, to another newspaper 10,000 more, and paying

another newspaper for three different editions of the same pamphlet.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is some time ago.

Mr. BLAKE. I know the hon. gentleman is old in iniquity, but it has been going on, and I want to know whether these things are discontinued under the present arrangement, and whether this printing is to be given out hereafter to the Queen's printers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The most satisfactory way will be to lay the arrangement on the Table of the House, and then he will understand it fully.

Mr. BLAKE. I want to know, irrespective of the papers, what the practice of the Government is to be. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will answer me that now?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I cannot answer you that. We will stand by the contract.

Mr. BLAKE. We want to know whether this system is being continued. We know that the mere circumstance that it was against the law and the contract did not prevent its going on, therefore it is important to know when the time comes that the Government intends to give out its printing, whether it intends to give it to the Queen's Printer. I think the time is arrived when an issue ought to be made on that subject, and I should be glad to take the sense of Parliament on that subject, unless the Minister is prepared to say that the Queen's printers are to do the work.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We will lay the papers on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope we will get the papers in time to consider their contents before the Session closes. In the mean time, I call the attention of the Committee to this: that according to the statement of my hon. friend, as well as the statement of the Minister of Railways, the effects of this vote are these—that we are called upon to pay for $4,000 worth of type, or thereabouts, for which we have no use that I can understand, in order to oblige the Hon. Boucher de la Bruère, publisher of the *Courrier de St. Hyacinthe* and President of the Quebec Legislative Council—that we are to oblige him by getting for his convenience $4,000 worth of type that we do not want; and that we are further to oblige him by paying $3,688, or thereabouts, for printing which would have been as well or better done here for $1,800. We give him double the price that our contractors would have done the work for, and we lose $1,800 directly, probably, and indirectly $4,000. That is the position, so far as I can make out from the explanations I have had.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That did not come in connection with my Department, but if my memory serves me right it was for the publication of a list of the employés. The House ordered a return containing the names of the employés in the Civil Service, the Province to which they belong, their age, origin, and religion. Every year returns were being asked for in relation to this subject, because there has been a good deal of jealousy with reference to the representation of the different Provinces in the Civil Service. It was decided that the report should be prepared and amended each year. It is quite a large volume, and it was considered to be an act of economy to purchase the type and have it set up, as in the case of the Militia List, and instead of re-setting it every year, simply change the names, and the publishing would thus be effected at one-tenth of the expense of resetting it each time. Therefore, on the recommendation of the Queen's Printer, it was set up, and the type is in his possession.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is it?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is in the possession of the Queen's Printer—in his care.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At St. Hyacinthe?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is in the Secretary of State's Department. It was sent here to be ready for correction, year after year.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says this was done for the purpose of economy. But he supplied the type to the person with whom he made the contract, and afterwards allowed him to charge as much as would have been charged by the Queen's Printer, as if the type had not been furnished. I can well understand that the hon. Minister will see that next year an economy is effected; but we are not talking about the future, but the present. This seems to be an indefensible transaction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister says the type is here in possession of the Queen's Printer. Has it been sent here from St. Hyacinthe?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I understand so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is for purposes of economy. The type, I suppose, was bought in Montreal, sent here—sent from here to St. Hyacinthe, and sent from there to Ottawa. Next year, I suppose, it will be sent to St. Hyacinthe?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Perhaps not there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the idea to distribute the favour, to send the work round to different papers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We would have a precedent for doing so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For buying type and sending it round?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For distributing favours.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the work could be done in Ottawa; and if it is necessary to buy type, as the hon. gentleman has shown, the work could be done here for $1,800 instead of $3,600. These are double the rates for which the identical work could be done here. It, moreover, was not work of great urgency. I cannot for the life of me see what possible excuse there can be for sending type down to St Hyacinthe to have lists printed there.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). $46.40 was paid for boxing the type, freight, &c. The hon. Finance Minister is altogether wrong with respect to the statement that it would cost ten times more to set the matter up each year. I have made no calculation on the point; but I am confident that the work could be done annually for the sum audited by the Auditor-General as that proper to be paid for the work, namely, $1,900. I am not positive, for I have not made a calculation, but I am satisfied the work could be done for that price without any purchase of type being made. I desire to give the Committee an illustration of the manner in which printing work is being done. A pamphlet called "Misrepresentation Exposed," was printed by the *Montreal Gazette*. There were five editions from November 18th, 1882, to April 25th, 1883. The first edition was one of 50,000 copies; another on January 8th, 50,000; another on February 19th, 50,000; another in March, of 51,600; another on April 25th, of 56,000; and each time composition was paid at full rates, and not only was the rate paid that for outside work, which is nearly double what the contractors' price is, but the composition was paid for five times over for this one pamphlet. $1.75 per thousand ems was paid, while under the Parliamentary printer's contract the price was 25 cents. The press work was in proportion. I do not see how the Government can justify this method of getting out printing. I should like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what is being done with respect to pay-

ment of the item now under consideration. The Auditor-General tells us that $2,688.74 is not yet paid on this account. I think the Auditor-General should be supported in the decision he has given with respect to outside printing. He has declared in his Report that he cannot justify the payment of these excessive prices for outside work; and he has laid down a rule which he embodies in this year's Report. I should like a statement from the Government as to whether they intend to sustain the Auditor-General in his ruling on this matter with respect to outside printing, and particularly so in this case, or whether they intend to overrule all his decisions by orders passed by the Treasury Board. This is a case in point, because according to the Auditor-General's letter which accompanies the return, we have still $2,688.74 in hand. If this be so, the Government have the matter in their own hands, and I think they should adopt the Auditor-General's view of this transaction. I should like an answer from the Government as to whether they intend to deduct the amount taken off from the account by the Auditor-General.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not. Because a contract has been made with these people and they have got to be paid.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The contract was surely not to pay them double prices.

274 To pay one-half the expenses of publishing another volume of cases decided on the B. N. A. Act, 1867, collected and edited by J. R. Cartwright, $600; to pay balance due on account of expenses of publishing previous volumes, $93.50; and for binding 45 copies of the same, $136 25..... ..... $ 29 75

Mr. BLAKE. I presume this is to wind up the second volume.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the Ontario Government pays one-half of the cost and we pay the other half.

Mr. BLAKE. If any arrangement is made at some future time with respect to continuing this publication—and there are a sufficient number of cases for a third volume—I think it is worthy of consideration whether steps should not be taken to obtain a larger edition. I do not mean an edition for free distribution, but so as to enable the public to acquire copies. I am told that this edition is practically out of print; it is a very small edition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe that is the case. I told the Minister of Justice that he and Mr. Mowat had been too economical, and had not arranged for a sufficiently large edition. There should have been a considerable number of volumes in reserve for sale for legal purposes.

275 For gratuity of two months' salary to the children of the late Hon. James Cockburn, Commissioner for the Consolidation of Dominion Statutes .... $ 666 66

276 For the erection of Mounted Police Barracks 40,000 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In 1882-83 a vote of $30,000 was taken; in 1883-84, $60,000, making, with the present vote, in all $160,000. To this sum we have had barracks at headquarters at Regina, at Fort McLeod, at Medicine Hat, at Maple Creek and at Calgary. The sum of $30,000 has been expended on the buildings at Calgary. Several log huts with mud roofs were erected there in 1875-76, but they became quite unfit for occupation, and had to be torn down. I know the question will be asked, if the buildings were put up by public competition. They were not, for the reason that Mr. Walker was the only person there who had any lumber, and perforce the contract was given to him. At Fort McLeod the buildings will cost $45,000. They were originally the same as at Calgary—log huts with mud roofs. Some of these had to be removed or they would have fallen on the occupants. A few buildings of better construction were subsequently erected, but large expenditure had been made from year to year to keep the fort in a condition fit for habitation. This expenditure was most unsatisfactory. It was simply wasting money in patching old huts, which could not be possibly made weatherproof or comfortable. Another objection to further expenditure on the old site was the possibility that the island on which the buildings were erected might be washed away, the river having changed its course since the post was first established. Substantial and commodious barracks have been erected on a new site, about two miles from the old fort, at a cost of $45,000. The buildings there were erected by the North-West Transportation Company, the manager of which is Mr. Elliot Galt, a son of Sir Alexander Galt. The contract was made with that company for the same reason as in the other case. I understand that the buildings have been put up at a loss to the contractors, and that they are admirable and substantial. Fort Walsh has been abandoned, and it was demolished last spring. They had to pull the buildings down in order to get the Indians to move away. As they had been in the habit of assembling there for years, they could not be got to remove to the reserves. Any portion of the material which could be transported with advantage was sent to Maple Creek, but this was very small in quantity or value, as the cost of freighting through the Cypress Hills would have exceeded the value of the material. The log building had become very unhealthy, the sick list at Fort Walsh being larger than in all the other posts together. Four years ago there were about 7,000 Indians—Canadian and American—in the vicinity of the Cypress Hills. These were gradually removed, but it was found impossible to persuade the remnants of the bands to go north, so long as they had police protection at Fort Walsh. It was therefore decided to abandon the post, and the result is most satisfactory. The Indians are now on the northern reservations. Then there are the Maple Creek barracks, $15,000, and the Medicine Hat barracks, $15,000. The changed condition of the country, consequent upon the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, required the establishment of police coast posts at Maple Creek, about thirty miles north-east of Fort Walsh, and at Medicine Hat, north-west of Fort Walsh. The men stationed at these posts will control all the trails leading north from the American frontier, for a distance of about 200 miles. They will also prevent Canadian Indians wandering from their reserves in the north to their old hunting grounds south of the railway. The Regina buildings will cost $50,000. They are part portable and part permanent. If the hon. gentleman will look at the printed report of the Commissioner of Mounted Police, he will find full particulars of the new barracks. It was thought proper to build the headquarters of the force at Regina, directly on the railway. There were two firms with patents for these portable buildings, one at Ottawa and the other at Montreal, and both systems were tried. The buildings proved to be thoroughly satisfactory, though the Ottawa patent was found by the Commissioner to be, on the whole, the better one.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is this vote under the head of Miscellaneous, instead of under the head of Mounted Police; or, if it is an expenditure on capital account, in some of the other heads in connection with the North-West?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps it happened in this way: that it is not an expenditure on the maintenance of the Mounted Police, and as it was done by an officer immediately in connection with the Mounted Police, it could not be charged against the Public Works Department, though there was a certain amount of supervision by an officer of that Department. I think perhaps it should be under the head of Public Works.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is of the greatest importance that these items should appear under their proper headings from year to year, so that we can compare them in the Public Accounts, and easily obtain the results.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may add that the new police barracks were built under the supervision of Inspector Perry, of the Royal Military College, who is an officer of the Mounted Police.

277 For the purchase of new type for printing the Report of the Commissioners and for printing the Consolidated Statutes. $11,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. What about this? Where was this printed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that this type was purchased for the purpose of printing the Report of the Commissioners who consolidated the Statutes, on a report from the Queen's Printer. I suppose a new and better style of type was required than is used for the ordinary Blue Books.

Mr. BLAKE. Who printed it, at what price; how much of this for type, and how much for printing?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). As I understand, the contractors did not consider that this work came within their contract, it was more convenient for the Government to have the printing done at the Government printing office than elsewhere. I believe they acted properly in this matter. This type was obtained in order to facilitate type-setting and proof-reading, as the type had to be kept standing for a long time.

Mr. BLAKE. Are the contractors doing the work?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They are doing it at the contract price.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two exceptional circumstances, then, I believe—one, that this work is supposed not to be in the contract, and the other, that the type had to be kept standing for a long time—which may justify the purchase of the type.

278. Payment to the Hon. Oliver Mowat for services rendered in connection with the Northern Railway Commission, 1876-77... $820 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That ought to have been paid by the Northern Railway. If I had known it, I would have included it.

280 Rental allowance to H. Richardson, Stipendiary Magistrate, in lieu of the free quarters occupied by him at the late seat of Government $500 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Richardson was the Stipendiary Magistrate at Battleford, and while there he had a house furnished to him. He is the most experienced of the Stipendiary Magistrates, and he has been brought down to headquarters at Regina, as he is a sort of legal adviser to the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West, and it was thought better to give him an allowance for a house, instead of putting up one for him just now, and he is quite satisfied with that arrangement.

281 To pay legal and other expenses in connection with the Boundary question $5,000 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the fee to be paid to Mr. Justice Armour, who before he went on the Bench was retained by the Government as counsel for the Dominion. He acted in that capacity for six months before he was elevated to the Bench. He sent in an account which the Government did not feel warranted in paying. They offered him $2,000, which he indignantly refused. He said that, on account of the importance of the subject, he had devoted himself to this work at the sacrifice of his general practice, which the hon. leader of the Opposition knows to have been very considerable. I think he claimed nearly twice this amount. The Minister of Justice referred the case to Mr. Christopher Robinson, of Toronto, who settled the fee at $5,000.

Mr. DAWSON. It is reported—I do not know how truly—that the Dominion Government are to join with the Governments of Ontario and Manitoba in referring the whole boundary question to the Privy Council. If they do, I hope every care will be taken to make out a good case, and to have it presented in all its bearings, because the Government of Ontario have for a number of years, with the greatest industry and by employing the ablest men they could find, been making up their case until they have volume after volume—first a great book of reports, in the preparation of which, I believe, my hon. friend from Bothwell assisted, and another book of documents arranged in chronological order, containing statements of every event and all the correspondence connected with the whole question. So far as I know, there is as yet no proper statement of the case of the Dominion Government at all, except the report of the Boundary Committee of 1880 with the accompanying documents, which was hastily got up, has no index, and is altogether very imperfect. I would just refer to a rather singular circumstance. The Attorney-General of Ontario, in referring the case, says:

"The Province of Ontario claims that the westerly boundary of that Province is either the meridian of the north-westerly angle of the Lake of the Woods, or is a line west of that point."

So that, after all, after being told that the Government of Ontario were going to abide by the award, and were to have nothing but the award, which described the true boundaries of Ontario beyond cavil or question, the Attorney-General, in his agreement with Manitoba, says that the Province of Ontario claims that the boundary is west of the point decided upon by the arbitrators. I merely take the occasion of this vote to point out to the Government the necessity of having a clear case made out to meet the very ably got up case of the Ontario Government, which now occupies five large volumes, so that the case may be fairly heard.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that we voted $8,500 to Mr. O'Connor to get up this case.

283 To provide the expenses of an Expedition (by water) to Hudson's Bay, to test the practicability of the route for commercial purposes $30,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do?

Mr. McLELAN. The plan is not yet fully matured. I have been gathering information from different sources as to the best means of deciding the practicability of the navigation of Hudson Bay.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the Government plan? Here is a specific sum voted; how do you arrive at this sum?

Mr. McLELAN. We are gathering information as to whether it is better to purchase a steamer and equip and send her out, or charter a steamer for the service, placing different parties along the coast to make observations during the season of navigation. This is a matter still under consideration. We are industriously gathering information from people who have experience in that matter, and we are only taking the necessary sum to cover the expenses this year. This amount is as much as we suppose will be expended during the balance of this year; and we propose to ask a larger vote for 1884-5.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman ought to give us more explanation as to the principle on which this vote is to be expended. It is just possible, by the time the additional sum

will be asked for, we may have determined on the mode of proceeding. This sum will be necessary this year.

Mr. MILLS. For the sake of encouraging the hon. gentleman, I will just read one sentence from the journal of Mr. James, who went into the southern part of the Bay shortly after it was discovered. "On the 14th June," he says, "we had snow, sleet and hail, and it was so cold that the water in the pitchers was frozen indoors."

Mr. McNEILL. That was in June, which is much earlier than the season of navigation. Navigation does not begin till September, and in September and October we expect to be able to navigate the Bay."

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any communication from the Imperial authorities on this subject at all?

Mr. McLELAN. They have declined to take any part in the expedition.

Mr. BLAKE. When was that decision arrived at?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the dates just now.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will lay the correspondence on the Table before he asks concurrence. I observe the question was asked and answered in the House of Commons, not with reference to any obligation on the part of the Canadian Government, but as to whether the Imperial Government would sent out a vessel, apparently on their own motion. A very unfavourable reply was given; not merely a negative, but a reasoned negative, and I was sorry to see the expressions contained in it were so strong. One would be glad to know what the proposals made on this subject were and what the answer was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My impression is that sometime ago a refusal was given to enter into any expense with respect to any such matters, including the Hudson Bay expedition, and the hon. gentleman's recollection is quite accurate as to the statement made there the other day. Mr. Stavely Hill asked the question whether Her Majesty's Government would contribute to the fitting out of a vessel or vessels to examine into the question of the navigation of Hudson Bay. It must have been an Under-Secretary or an officer who represents the Admiralty who replied to the question, and the reply was given that the Government would not undertake any further explorations as, according to the documents and evidence at the disposal of the Admiralty, they considered the Hudson Bay route was not eligible as a commercial route. We know very well that similar condemnations of various waters have occurred in the early history of those waters. We know that at one time the St. Lawrence was considered altogether unfit for navigation, and also the Baltic and the North Sea, until English enterprise found its way to Archangel. Then we have the evidence that for years one or two vessels of the Hudson Bay Company have gone through the Straits and into the Bay, which shows that it is open to commerce to a certain extent, and it is stated by very many parties who profess to have acquaintance with those waters, that a steamer well protected, as sealing vessels and whaling vessels are protected, against the ice, could navigate the Straits during three or four months of the year. Evidence was given to that effect here the other day by persons who have lived in that country and can speak with authority. At all events, it is fitting and right the actual state of affairs should be discovered. There is no doubt that the fisheries are exceedingly valuable, there is little doubt that the mineral wealth is very great in that country. I think my hon. friend can state that an American gentleman offered to fit out a vessel for the purpose, on condition of getting certain rights in the Bay, of getting certain tracts of country and certain advantages in the way of the discovery of minerals, and so on; and this gentleman is a practical man, hailing from the well-known whaling port of New Bedford. We do not think, however, it would be well to hand over to a foreigner large tracts of our country, the fisheries and valuables, and no doubt, as far as the Bay is concerned, there is no difficulty about navigating it; the only difficulty is the Straits. We will require to have a vessel fully fitted for such a hazardous experiment, able to box about the ice, and which will remain in those waters more than one season, for any given season may be an exceptional one, and we cannot ascertain from it really what the navigation of the Straits amounts to. We owe it to our position of proprietorship that we should ascertain what we have got there. This vote is only an estimate. We do not know whether we can get a good vessel, strong, well adapted for the work at a charter, or whether we will be obliged to buy one, so that my hon. friend was obliged simply to put in a sum which ought to cover all that will be required for the present season.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficullty about the case is, that it is not an estimate at all, but simply a guess. I hold that as very early this Session it was announced the Government intended to take steps to send out this expedition, the hon. gentleman might have ascertained what the cost of a vessel would be, and what the charter of a vessel would cost. And he might have obtained some further information which would enable us to judge what the merits are of the plan the Government proposes to adopt for the exploration of the Bay. As to the policy of exploring the Bay, I have already stated that I was very glad the Government proposed to explore it. I do not at all object to that; on the contrary, I approve of it; but I believe at the present time our main subject of exploration must be the subject of navigability. Incidentally, the other subjects which are also of great importance—the minerals, fisheries, and so forth—may come under consideration, but it would be a very great mistake to in any way subordinate the main purpose, which is the ascertainment, first of all, of the season of navigation of the Straits, and secondly, the harbourage and the shore difficulties, because there may be difficulties in getting close to the shore, owing to shallow water and owing also to the existence of ice. I think this also is to be observed, after what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the prolongation of the period of navigation by vessels of peculiar construction, with peculiar strength, that in my opinion the particular commercial value in the present era of steam navigation of this particular navigation will be the period during which, with vessels of the ordinary construction which carry cheapest, you can navigate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. And for this reason, that the season is unquestionably going to be a short one at best. You cannot have vessels of a type that cannot be profitably employed during the longer or the whole period of the year, when they will have to find their market elsewhere. If you have vessels which are to be used for two or three or four months in Hudson Bay, and then to be laid up for eight or nine months you cannot have a profitable trade. To be profitably employed, they must be adapted to the world's commerce elsewhere during the other portion of the year, when they have to earn their freights, and we know that competition is severe, and is getting more and more severe every year in the world's markets, with reference to steam navigation. The question we have to devote our attention to is, therefore, seeing that it must be a short season, how long a season we may expect vessels to be able to navigate that particular route, which are of such a construction and such a type that that they may expect profitable or expense-paying charters for the remainder of the year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course. It would never do to consider this as an eligible water for commercial purposes if it could only be navigated by vessels specially strengthened for the purpose. The waters must be open to the ordinary run of vessels or it will not be eligible; but in fitting out a vessel to go there, that vessel has to run great risks.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course that must be specially strengthened.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there are some whalers peculiar to the Port of Hull which are in the habit of going to the Hudson Bay every year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Vessels of that type would answers the hon. gentleman's purpose very well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And Aberdeen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And perhaps could be chartered at reasonable rates. I am very glad the Government are going to explore this Bay, because it is of moment to know what is the length of the navigation. Can the Government state whether they are advised as to the existence of coal deposits along the shore of Hudson Bay or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the geological reports indicated the existence of coal.

Mr. PAINT. In the examination in the Special Committee on the Hudson Bay navigation, Mr. Bell could give us no information in regard to coal.

Mr. MILLS. Are we to understand beyond all doubt that the Government intend sending an exploring vessel this season?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; beyond a doubt.

Mr. McLELAN. As to the prices of vessels, I have had tenders from New Bedford, where they have steam whaling vessels, and also from Montreal firms, agents for Newfoundland parties, and I have also had enquiries made as to the cost of a vessel in Dundee and Aberdeen, where steam sealers are built very largely. Nearly all the Newfoundland fleet are built in Aberdeen and Dundee. Until these offers are examined by a gentleman who has some experience and knowledge of the value of vessels, I have no information to give to the House as to the cost. The offers vary from £3,000 to £15,000 for the cost of a vessel, and I have offers by the month of from £500 to £800 a month for a charter.

279 To pay to W. F. Allan in lieu of board and accommodation in Rockwood Asylum, from May, 1867, to July, 1874..... $1,000 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the information now with reference to this item which stood over. Allan was storekeeper in the Rockwood Asylum from 1867 to 1874. His salary was $500 a year, but he always claimed that he was promised lodging and board in addition. During the last year the claim was again pressed on the attention of the Minister of Justice and referred by him to the Inspector of Penitentiaries and the Warden of Kingston for investigation and report. Mr. Allan claimed a sum of $300 per annum, or $2,400. After careful investigation, they both agreed that Mr. Allan was entitled to be paid part of his claim, and recommended the payment of this $1,000 in full settlement. This it is understood Mr. Allan is willing to accept. I am informed by the hon. member for Frontenac that he is aware that Mr. Allan's health broke down altogether and he has never been able to work since he left the asylum, in 1874. At all events, this was the investigation and the award on the reference.

Mr. BLAKE. While I cannot speak with any degree of positiveness about this, I have a sort of recollection of Mr. Allan's name coming up in my time in connection with some claim. At that time the Superintendent was Dr. Dickson, who I think is now dead.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was Dr. Dickson's predecessor who employed Allan, and afterwards Dr. Dickson.

Mr. BLAKE. He was employed from 1867 to 1874, and I think Dr. Dickson had been for a considerable portion of that time Superintendent.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Dr. Dickson was appointed in 1868.

Mr. BLAKE. So that from the year following, that in which this arrangement was made, until 1874, that is to say, for almost the whole of the period during which this is alleged to have existed, Dr. Dickson was the person in charge and Mr. Allan had not these accommodations. I am almost certain the claim came up in my time; in point of fact, if it did not, it would be the strongest evidence against its validity, and we are asked to suppose that it was running along under Dr. Dickson's superintendency for 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873 and 1874, and then Mr. Allan, I suppose, left the institution; and then that two Governments had charge of it after that, one from 1874 to 1878, and the present Government from 1878 to 1884; and that it is only now that it is found and established that the claim is a due one, which runs from 1867 to 1874. It is just another of those stale, old, unsubstantial claims that I think ought not to be paid. I think Dr. Dickson was a just man, and I believe, if a subordinate under him from 1868 to 1874 had a just claim, we would have heard of it, and it would have been adjusted during all that time. I do not believe, if it was a just claim, it would have been left over for ten years after this man had left the Service, and now it is proposed to pay it. We have not got the evidence before us, we cannot speak possitively, but an investigation made for such an interval of time as this, which is based upon allegations that there was an arrangement made as long ago as 1867, which the public official did not enjoy the benefit of, during all this time, to 1874, that he was in the service, is almost a farce. I suppose they took Mr. Allan's statement; probably it was the only one they found available, and they said upon that statement he ought to have his claim. Really, Mr. Chairman, during the whole period of 16 or 17 years that I have been in public life I never heard so many old, stale and unsubstantial claims being recognized by a Government, and submitted for votes to Parliament, without any fair evidence of their validity, as I have during the last two years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps we have been too liberal; perhaps we ought not to have paid Mr. Oliver Mowat for his services in connection with the Northern Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose that vote is all right, for I am quite sure if it was not the hon. gentleman would not have put it there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken; perhaps I may have been misled by kindness.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's public utterances with reference to that gentleman quite convinces me of the truth of that statement.

284 To meet payments to Extra Clerks for services rendered in preparation of returns ordered by Parliament..... $5,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think we asked for that the year before. It has lapsed, I think. There were $3,000 or $4,000 paid out of the regular appropriation, and this is for the current year.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is unfortunate that the arrangements made on this subject are such as they have been. Some important returns were moved forearly in the Session, from one of the Departments, and one of the officers came to me and pointed out it would be impossible to have these returns during the Session. I said: "Why, there is a large vote being granted for extra clerks;" he said all the clerks of the Department were busily employed and could not make out that return, and that there was no money provided for engaging extra assistance.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is to pay for the present year. The attention of the Government was called to the lack of clerical assistance by some of the Heads of the Departments, and to the fact that they had no funds for the purpose, therefore it was considered desirable to bring down this vote. We find that in many cases returns were made in some of the Departments which were not paid for, but where we employ persons outside they receive pay.

Mr. BLAKE. There ought to be some systematic arrangement, so that Parliament may get important returns during the Session, because, as I have just remarked, in one Department I was told that with reference to returns that I myself had asked for, it was impossible to get them because there was no money to employ any extra clerks. Now, if it is to be the arrangement that extra clerks are to be obtained to prepare returns, the Departments ought to know this and the Minister ought to know that if a return is particularly important he is authorized to employ extra services.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There are some returns that can only be furnished by the employés themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. The returns I speak of were of a very simple character, but the lack of ordinary clerical force prevented their being brought forward. I am pointing this out with reference to the next Session. If there is to be a system of obtaining returns rapidly, it should be systematic arrangement, so that each Minister may know that a certain sum is available for that purpose.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There will be no delay in the future.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

RAILWAYS.

285 *Intercolonial Railway*—To pay Mrs. F. C. Ennis, as indemnity for all damages consequent of an accident which occurred on the 4th February, 1878, and where Mr. E. C Ennis was injured $100 00

CANALS.

Repairs and Working Expenses.

286
Lachine	2,264 00
Cornwall	3,212 50
Welland	20,820 00
Rideau	2,850 00
Dredge vessels	1,875 00
Burlington Bay	200 00

PUBLIC WORKS.

Maintenance and Repairs.

287
Telegraph lines and signal service generally (revote of lapsed balance)	7,031 01
Retaining boom and piers, Grand Piles, River St. Maurice	2,000 00

CUSTOMS.

288 To provide amount required to complete the Service 25,860 00

EXCISE.

289
Additional amount required to provide stamps for stamping imported and home manufactured tobacco, and for other expenditure in connection with the securing of the duty on tobacco	13,000 00
To refund to W. G. Reid, of Reid, Goring & Co, Hamilton, the amount paid by him as one of L. D. Birley's sureties, whose property was seized for the infraction of the Inland Revenue Act	3,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The $13,000 is to complete the cost of stamps for the present year, which is $25,000. For 1884-85 only $20,000 is asked, or $17,000 less than under the old Act. With respect to the payment to Mr. Reid. He was one of the sureties of a party carrying on a distillery and vinegar factory in Hamilton. Owing to a breach of the law committed some years ago, proceedings were taken against the firm and the whole business was confiscated and sold, the proceeds going to the Government. Mr. Reid was one of the sureties at the time, but entered into some arrangement to continue the business with some other party; and at that time a license could not be renewed to Mr. Reid, on account of some doubt prevailing as to his being a party to the fraud or not. The license would not be given until he paid in $3,000, represented in the bond he had given. He paid $3,000 under protest, and has repeatedly applied to be refunded the money. I brought the matter up once or twice before the Treasury Board; but it was thought well to let the matter stand over until we obtained the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and upon the report of the Minister of Justice being received, to the effect that the Government had no right to hold the $3,000, they having confiscated the whole property and having sustained no loss, or taken no legal proceedings to recover the amount of the bond it was decided to refund the money, and this vote is to enable the Government to do so.

Mr. BLAKE. As the Government suffered no loss, it is quite clear, as a matter of justice, that the money should be returned. With respect to stamps, perhaps the Minister will explain the reason of the reduction.

Mr. COSTIGAN. One of the results of the Act passed last year was to diminish the variety of stamps and effect economy.

CULLING TIMBER.

290 To pay James Patton amount of salary withheld from him for the month of July, 1882, he having been appointed to office as Supervisor of Cullers on the 30th June, but not having assumed office until a month later. This, he explains, was owing to his supposition that he had to wait instalment, and meantime he had relinquished his former employment $166 66

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

291 To pay E. Miall, as Commissioner of Standards, under authority of the Weights and Measures Act, from 1st January to 30th June, 1883 ..... 400 00

Mr. BLAKE. This is a practical addition to the salary of the officer.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the same amount as was granted to his predecessor.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but we are endeavouring to make improvements under the Civil Service Act. It is held desirable that we should get rid of the very objectionable system of paying officers additional sums for supposed extra work. It is of the first consequence, particularly as regards men high in the Service, that the Government should give them an amount of salary to cover all branches and vocations in which they may be employed. But do not adopt this plan of paying something under one head and something more under another head—a plan which is growing to serious proportions, and which I had hoped the hon. gentleman was not going to bring forward again.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

292 To pay for the license and other forms required under the Act 46 Vic., chap. 30, and for the necessary expenditure of putting the Act into operation $10,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. I thought this Act was not going into operation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this item?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We ask for $10,000, because we know there will be considerable expense incurred in providing the license and other forms, books, &c., which are required under the Act by the different officers throughout the Dominion. The licenses themselves will be a considerable item, being something about $35,000 at least. There is another cause of expenditure, though I cannot tell what it will amount to. The receipts of the different license districts are to go to pay the Commissioners and the Inspectors, and the surplus goes to the local account; but in case of a deficiency, I presume some provision will have to be made to pay the officers who put the law into execution. We have also to provide for officers in districts in which the Scott Act is in force, in which no funds will be collected, although Inspectors will be appointed for the purpose of carrying out the Scott Act. These and other items make up an amount which, of course, we cannot name exactly, but we ask for $10,000 to cover those expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. I think this vote is very objectionable. The hon. gentleman says he has to pay salaries or compensation to officers, but he does not give us any idea of the rate at which they shall be paid, or the principle upon which they are paid. We are simply asked to give him a lump sum, and he is to decide upon the amount. Last Session it was pointed out, when the Act was going through the House, that the mode by which the Commissioners were to be compensated was very objectionable. The First Minister admitted that it was, and he said that he would bring down a measure to provide for the salaries of these officers—not a vote for a lump sum, without any intimation of what the salaries were, or the principle on which they were based. The hon. gentleman mentions two kinds of compensation. He says the local contributors for licenses will form a fund, but that he expects there will be a deficiency in some instances. How can the hon. gentleman say that, unless it is understood what these officers are to get. This is an enormous business, with a great number of Commissioners all over the country, and I think we should not be asked to give a lump sum to the Minister to apply as he or the Government pleases, on no stated principle, no minimum or maximum stated to the Committee, with reference to the rate of compensation. Then, with reference to the question of printing. I suppose a great deal of this printing has been done. If not, there was plenty of time to obtain an estimate of what the printing will be from the Queen's Printer or some other authority, and also a statement of what quantities are likely to be required.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As the hon. gentleman knows, under the Act the Commissioners fix the salaries subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. These salaries cannot be fixed yet; in fact, they cannot be properly fixed until we have before us the returns from all over the country, so that we can fix the salaries at just and fair rates for the different divisions, according to the amount of labour to be done. I have no means of knowing what the cost will be, and this is more of a guess than an estimate. I simply ask for this amount to enable me to pay such expenses as the Department will be called upon to pay under the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but with reference to the salaries: while the Act made this provision Parliament had no interest in the matter as far as the public charge was concerned; because, until this vote came before us, we were told that public moneys were not to be expended in addition to the fees exacted from the license holders—it was simply a question of discretion. The Government asked Parliament to give them authority to check—to approve or disapprove of the action of the License Commissioners—as to the salaries of the Inspectors, and these salaries were to be paid out of locally paid sums. Now we are told that public funds are to be used as a supplement to those local funds, and when we are told that these general public funds are to be so used, surely it is not upon guess work that we should do that. If the Government is to pay salaries out of the public funds, then the Government will have to fix the salaries; they will not allow the License Commissioners to determine what the salaries of the Inspectors are, which are to be paid only partially out of local fees, and partially out of the general fund. It is obvious that those who are to spend the money are to fix the salaries, and if is intended to bring this Act into execution, and appoint this host of officers, and they are to be paid out of the public funds, we should have had before us the plan upon which the Government propose to pay them. He ought to have been able to give us some idea of what the cost to the public would be, and also what principle of fixing the salaries he conceived to be just and proper. Now, this vote is for the expenditure during only three months. As yet, the hon. gentleman has not told us how much is for printing and how much for salaries. Of course, if this is to be the expenditure for three months, it is an indication of a much larger expenditure for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to have the Scott Act enforced in counties of the Province of Ontario where it has been adopted?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There will be inspectors in the different districts.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

293 Amount required to cover the expenditure the year..... $58,500 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of my colleague, the Postmaster General, I may say that the estimates of the Department last year fell short to the extent of this amount. This is for every branch of the Department. It has been found that the printing and advertising have been larger than they were expected to be, as well as the charges for mileage and allowances for night duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This expenditure has been increasing at a very rapid rate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The revenue also increased last year, I think, by $200,000.

UNPROVIDED ITEMS.

296 Unprovided items of 1882-83 (*Vide* Auditor-General's Report of 1882-83, page 41) ...$149,291 08

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. One of the leading items of this amount is $22,000 for charges of management, $12,000 of which was for the printing of $4 notes. The whole cost of printing notes last year was $16,000, which was largely in excess of the previous year. The expenditure of contingencies in excess of the vote is $12,000, which is largely for printing and paper for the various Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the item for police has increased largely.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At the close of last Session, as the hon. gentleman knows, a considerable number of additional police were employed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under the heading of penitentiaries in Manitoba, the expenditure is $1,294, more than the estimates.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a considerable increase in the vote for penitentiaries for Manitoba for next year, and that commenced in the current year. That was largely caused by the increased number of inmates.

DOMINION LANDS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

294	To provide for further amount required for surveys	$50,000 00
	To provide for the payment of Permanent Officers of the Civil Service for the examination of Surveyors' plans and field notes of surveys of Dominion Lands	2,000 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This sum is required to complete the payments earned by surveyors last season, and to enable the Department to make the necessary advances to surveyors going out this season. The Government are obliged to make advances to surveying parties in order to start them on their work. The season of 1883 was an unusually favourable one for the prosecution of surveys. The spring was an early one, and surveyors were able to remain on the field much later in the fall than any previous year in the experience of the Department. Over 1,300 townships were outlined, and 1,220 sub-divided into sections and quarter sections and set out for settlement. This result was in excess of the estimate of the Department, and of course involved a corresponding excess in the expenditure. When the accounts for last year are finally closed, it is expected that the cost per acre of the season's surveys will be less than the average heretofore, while the quality of the work was very fair, considering the area surveyed and the number of inexperienced men necessarily employed. I think I have maps here which would be very interesting to the Committee, only I am afraid we will not have time to look at them to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will those maps be distributed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; they are single maps, to be laid on the Table for inspection by the Committee. As to the $2,000 for the examination of surveyors plans and field rates. The number of experts qualified to examine and determine the accuracy of surveys is comparatively limited, and the demand for them, after the close of the field work of 1883 was, as can be readily understood, abnormal. Many of these men had, during the last twelve years, received permanent appointments on the staff of the Department of the Interior, and had been charged with the performance of duties in other branches; while others still had been appointed to positions in other Department, and under the Civil Service Act these permanent employees were not eligible for extra work and could not receive extra pay except by especial authority and with the sanction of Parliament. The importance of throwing open to settlement lands surveyed during any season, as soon after the completion of operations in the field as possible, cannot be overestimated; and surveys made in the field are of no practical use until examined and confirmed by the Surveyor-General, and the townships plans are lithographed and sent to the agents of Dominion lands. Nor until his work has been examined and confirmed, can a surveyor be paid in full, 15 per cent. of the amount coming to him being retained pending the verification of his work by the Inspector of Surveys and the acceptance of his plans and field notes by the Surveyor-General. Under the circumstances it became necessary for the Minister of the Interior to avail himself of the services of every man upon whom he could lay his hands, whether in the Civil Service or outside, who was known to be capable of examination and confirmation of the plans and field notes; and in order to enable him to pay permanent employees for these extra services rendered in addition to their ordinary duties in the Departments to which they severally belonged, and after the usual office hours, it also became necessary for him to ask for this special vote. It may be added that a very large proportion of the Survey work of 1883 has already been completed, accepted, and the township plans lithographed; and it is expected that fully three-fourths of the townships sub-divided will be open for homestead and pre-emption entry by actual settlers by the beginning of May. The results more than justify the exceptional steps taken by the Minister of the Interior, to give incoming settlers the full and immediate benefit of the liberal appropriation made by Parliament last year for the survey of the public lands in the North-West. That work would be valueless unless done *con amore* by these experts. It is very laborious, and requires great skill and knowledge to read the field notes, look at the plans and decide whether they are regular or irregular, well or ill done, whether they are to be confirmed, or reserved, or thrown for amendment. It is necessary to get the work well done, and as it had to be done by night, you could not expect the employees, who are employed in their usual avocations during the day, to do this night work without extra pay.

Mr. WATSON. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the importance of making surveys of land north of Gladstone, towards Lake Dauphin, west of Lake Manitoba. Many people would like to settle there, and it is important the surveys should be made. It is also important to have the surveys already made properly inspected before the land is taken up. There are a number of settlers anxious to go and settle there as soon as the lands are surveyed. I would also draw the hon. Minister's attention to the importance of having an inspection of the surveys more correctly attended to. There have been some mistakes through the surveyors planting stakes not in line, and I believe in some cases patents have been issued for lands in which the surveys are not correct and there may be difficulty in correcting them later.

Mr. BLAKE. How will the work compare generally in quantity as compared with that done last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will not be more than half that done last year. There was a very large grant last year, and the survey was pushed forward very rapidly, in very considerable excess of any probable demand by settlers.

Mr. BLAKE. The estimate of the Department brought under the attention of Parliament last year was that $58,000,000 in cash would be realized by the Government by the year 1891. I think the hon. gentleman had better push on the surveys if he is going to realize that estimate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD We will try; we will have the money, I think.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, the money we vote you here.

Mr. MILLS. I observe the income of the Government last year was $1,900,000 and the expenditure $880,000, so that the net gain was not very large—something less than $180,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The surveys must be made; you cannot sell the land without surveying it first

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has a large quantity surveyed. In the year 1882, 9,500,000 acres; the previous year upwards of 9,000,000 acres, and the year before that upwards of 4,000,000 acres. In fact, up to the present moment the hon. gentleman has surveyed in Manitoba and the North-West Territories something like sixty-six millions of acres, I think an extent of territory as large as that surveyed in all the rest of the Dominion put together. Are not the surveys outrunning the settlement? We have in other parts of the Dominion upwards of four millions of people. The hon. gentleman has perhaps 200,000 or 150,000 all told in Manitoba and the North-West, and he has more land surveyed than there is in all the rest of the Dominion put together.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Now he proposes to survey 14,000,000 or 15,000,000 of acres this year, in addition to what has been done.

Sir. JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Many of these boundaries, I understand, are obliterated, and the work will all have to be done over again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. A part has been done over again already.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the original surveys; in the sub-divisions there were wooden posts, but now they are all of iron.

DOMINION LANDS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME

295. To provide for expenses in connection with settlement of land claims at Prince Albert, Battleford, Edmonton, &c..... $5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is that for? That, I suppose, is for settlement in regard to lands as to which disputes have arisen? I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a case which will serve as well as another as a type of other cases that have occurred, and I would like the hon. gentleman to state what is the policy of the Government in regard to it. This was a case which I, myself, brought under the notice of the Department a few days ago. In September, 1881, a certain quarter section —I need not trouble the hon. gentleman with the particular quarter-section—was sold by an agent of the Department, and the whole purchase money was paid and the receipt issued. This was subsequently sold, after the receipt was issued, for a considerable advance, to a second party, who paid the money. On applying for the patent, it was found that this land had been promised to be patented to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the Government, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had agreed to sell the land, and the Government repudiated the action of their own agent in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I would call the attention of the First Minister to this question, because it involves a question which may, I suppose, come up in a good many other cases. Now the Government offers to return the original purchase money or to give the party his choice of a quarter section, but he cannot find any quarter section which would suit him, and he has already expended three or four times the amount of the sum which was paid to the Government. It does appear to me that, where a thing of this kind arises by the fault of the agent of the Government, it is hardly fair to put the man off in that way, and that either he ought to get the patent and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and its purchaser should take the second place, or he should be indemnified for the actual sum paid by him in all good faith, on the production of a receipt from the Government agent for the quarter section, in full. The hon. gentleman understands the position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, in ordinary cases I would say nothing. The offer to return the original sum paid or to give another quarter section would be enough, but here the fault appears to lie with the Government, and if they prefer to carry out the agreement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it appears to me they should indemnify the purchaser from the original purchaser from the Crown. The sum is not very large, not more than $1,000 or $1,200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These mistakes do occur occasionally, and a percentage of mistakes must arise almost *ex necessitate*, but I believe the percentage is very small. I suppose the Government had no choice. If this land is within the railway belt and the railway has earned it, of course it belongs to the Company, and it is a case where the Government has unwittingly, or their agent has mistakenly, sold land which did not belong to it. Then the ordinary law is that they are obliged to return the amount of the purchase money, I suppose, with interest. But the Government should do more than that in a case of this kind. They should give land of equal value.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That appears to be out of their power. They cannot give a quarter section of equal value.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They might give more than a quarter section.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If they would do that, I dare say the party would be satisfied enough, but the reply made by the Department was that they would return the money or give acre for acre, would give a quarter section of equal value. They did not propose to give him a half section or a three quarter section, as the case might be, but a quarter section. The case is one of considerable hardship.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is so; yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On the faith of a regular certificate, signed by the Government agent, the man purchased in all good faith. The hon. gentleman knows that in that country it is impossible to wait until patents issue. That might involve a delay of eighteen months or two years. That would be fatal to transactions between parties, and all reasonable precaution seems to have been taken to see that the transaction was fair. Then, I understand that the hon. gentleman would be disposed to recommend a larger allowance of land being made to this purchaser? What would suit him best would be to get his money back as he cannot get his land, but of course thas might involve a principle which would be inconvenient in its application. A man might have bought for a few hundred dollars and sold for many thousands, and I am not prepared to say the Government should lay down a principle which would involve them in considerable liabilities. As to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I have known cases which appear to go on all fours with this, where the Canadian Pacific Railway had *bonâ fide* disposed of property which the Government had previously disposed of, and the Government would not help the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in that case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose that would be under the terms of the Act. The Canadian Pacific Railway Act provides that they shall get all the land at the disposal of the Government, and if the Government had, before the land was earned by the Company, given any legal or equitable title, of course the Pacific Railway Company would have to get their land elsewhere. It was merely a suggestion of mine across the floor, that possibly more land might be given to make the value the same, but I would not like to commit the Department on that point. If the hon. gentleman will send me a memorandum, I will charge myself with it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have already brought it to the attention of the Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he will give me a note of it, I will charge myself with making enquiry into it.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me a reasonable proposition that, where a mistake was discovered which is irreparable, it is only right that the party should get a quantity of land of equal value, because the land might be much more valuable than any that remained at the disposal of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see, as the hon. member for South Huron admits, that it would not be well to lay down any general principle to that extent, because there would be no end of a rush and claim that the land which had been lost was of immense value, and that the person who has unfortunately lost this pecuniary value must get twice the quantity of land elsewhere. Each case would have to be judged on its merits. The Gov-

ernment have no interest but to do what is just and fair to all parties.

Mr. BLAKE. Upon that question, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he will kindly direct the Deparment to get the papers and lay them before us on Concurrence or a little before?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

FIRST READINGS.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally read the first time:—

Bill (No. 136) to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 137) further to amend the Act respecting the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Session, and in relation to Summary Convictions and Orders.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 138) to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1878.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders were called, I called the attention of the Government to the state of public business, and the Minister of Finance said a statement would be made later on. I called the attention of the House, I may say, to the fact that the reported measure to amend the License Act, of which we had got preliminary notice, had been for many days on the Paper but had not been moved, and that we had not the slightest information as to what the form and provisions of that measure would be; that the measure with reference to the Provincial subsidies, a notice of which the Minister of Finance has had on the Paper, had not been proceeded with, nor the first stage taken, and we did not understand as yet what the financial obligations which were proposed to be incurred in respect to that matter would be—because I believe it depends on certain contingencies which were not developed by the Resolution; that we had no information as to the proposed railway subsidies, which we had reason to believe are yet to be brought before us; that the proposition with reference to aid to Quebec, promised last week, and then promised early this week, had not yet been brought before us; that the Supplementary Estimates for next year were not yet brought down; that that condition of public business was one that certainly demanded the attention of the House, and particularly of the hon. gentleman, in view of the statement that prorogation is to take place before Easter. I said then what I now repeat in his presence, that without some little time for consideration of these various important proposals which I have indicated, without some little time to get information upon them, and to receive information from the country upon them, our legislation will be a farce; we will be, to use an oft-quoted phrase, mere registers of the Ministerial decrees; and I invited the hon. gentleman opposite, as I now invite the First Minister, to make some definite statement as to what these proposals are, with reference to the course of public business, and when we may expect to receive and to have some opportunity of considering the details of these important measures which yet remain to be disposed of before prorogation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope to proceed with the Resolution on the Liquor Licence Act, 1883, on Monday, and of course a Bill will be introduced founded upon that Resolution. On Monday, or on Tuesday at the latest, all the Estimates connected with the railway subsides and the Supplementary Estimates for 1884-85 will, I presume, be brought down. I hope that the railway subsidies will be brought down on Monday—or Tuesday at the latest. Government measures are thinning off very much, and Government will press with all convenient speed the consideration of the remainder.

Mr. MILLS. Within convenient speed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With all convenient speed. I do not know whether we can exactly rise before Good Friday, but if not, I have every hope that we will rise early in Easter week.

Mr. BLAKE. I have another suggestion. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has given notice to take next Wednesday, but if he has not, I will gladly second a motion that Government business have precedence on Wednesday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for reminding me of it; I intended to have done it. I move, seconded by Mr. Blake, that next Wednesday Government Orders shall have precedence after Questions.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:50 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 139) respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Beaty).

Bill (No. 140) respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. McLelan.)

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time, and passed.

Bill (No. 131) to amend an Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Steamship Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

SECTION "B" CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN enquired, Is there a Section "B" Board of Arbitrators or Commissioners? If so, who are they? What are their per diem or monthly allowances? Are they allowed travelling expenses in addition? Have they a secretary? Who is he? Who appointed him? What are his salary and allowances?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to hon. gentleman I have to say that the Government has appointed no Commission to make enquiries concerning section "B" of the Canadian Pacific Railway; that the matters in question were referred to the award of three arbitrators, Mr. C. J. Brydges, appointed by the claimants; Judge Clark, by the Government; and Mr. A. L. Light, Engineer of the Quebec Government Railways nominated by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. They are not in the employ of this

Government, and receive no salary, but, are entitled, as other arbitrators are, to receive from the party taking up their award, the usual fees paid to persons acting in that capacity including necessary disbursements. They have had no secretary since the 16th February last, previous to which they had appointed Mr. Hugh C. Dennis, paying him the sum of $100, he bearing his own expenses.

INTERCOLONIAL BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. McMULLEN enquired, Are the several members of the Intercolonial Board of Commissioners still in receipt of pay? If so, who are they? How many days did they sit during the last month? Were any members of the Board absent? If so, who and how often; are they paid only for the days they sit, or by the month, or how?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The commissioners appointed to investigate the claims arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway have finished their work with the exception of details which will yet occupy some days. The Commission is composed of Judge Clark, Mr. Broughton, and Colonel Boulton. Judge Clark and Colonel Boulton are still receiving their usual compensation. Mr. Broughton accepted, about the 1st of February, an important situation on a railway, which prevents his attendance at Ottawa, and since that date he takes part principally by correspondence in the business carried on, which is a statement *in extenso* of their reasons for conclusions previously formed, and for that period he has not been paid for his services, but the Government intend to make him an allowance at a reduced rate. As already stated in returns to the House last Session and this Session, the allowance to the Commissioners is by the month; their business may be and is at times carried on without their sitting together, as the business of courts is, and therefore no record has been kept of the times they meet together, except when it is to record evidence or hear arguments. They have had no sitting for that purpose during the last month.

SUBSIDIES TO SANITARY JOURNALS.

Mr. HICKEY enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to increase the subsidy to *The Dominion Sanitary Journal*, and to subsidize a sanitary journal of Quebec?

Mr. McLELAN. This matter is under consideration of the Department of Agriculture, and whatever subsidy is given to the English journal will also be given to a journal published in French.

WHARFINGERS ON THE LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. AUGER enquired, Whether the question as to the jurisdiction of the two wharfingers on the Lachine Canal has been settled? If so, how?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Some difficulty occurred in reference to the wharfingers on the Lachine Canal, in consequence of a wharfinger being under the control of the Inland Revenue Department, while his duties were mainly connected with the administration of the Department over which I have the honour to preside. Measures are being taken to arrange these difficulties, and to assign the proper duties to each officer in a manner which I trust will entirely dispose of all difficulty in connection with that case.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY CROSSING IN MONTREAL.

Mr. HOUDE, in the absence of Mr. DESJARDINS, enquired, Whether the Government has been informed that the traffic is so seriously impeded by the level crossing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company on Wellington street, in Montreal, as to make it necessary for the Railway Committee to authorize and require the said railway company to carry the road over or under the said street?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The attention of the Government has been called to that matter, and it is now being investigated by the Department.

S. J. ST. ONGE CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CHARLTON, in the absence of Mr. CASEY, enquired, Whether S. J. St. Onge Chapleau, Sheriff in the North-West Territories, has been appointed to or recommended for any other office or employment additional to or instead of his shrievalty? If so, when? What is such office or employment? What salary or allowances are attached thereto? And from what date is it to be paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. S. J. St. Onge Chapleau has been appointed by Order in Council an Inspector for the Department of Public Works in the North-West, and in that office he receives $500, and, when occupied as such, travelling expenses in addition. His office dates from the month of September last.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the appointment been made lately?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

JUDICIAL SALARIES.

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi) enquired, Is the right hon. the leader of the Government correctly reported in *Hansard* as having stated last Session "That if the Minister of Justice was spared, and the Government lasted till the next Session, they would be prepared to submit a measure upon the subject (the re-adjustment of judicial salaries) for the consideration of the House?" Has the Minister of Justice been spared? Has the Government lasted? When is it the intention of the Government to submit the promised measure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no reason to doubt that the *Hansard* is correct in substance. The Minister of Justice has been spared; the Government has lasted; it was the intention of the Government to submit such a measure this Session, but the difficulties have been found to be so great that they have not been able to carry out that intention.

Mr. BLAKE. Does that answer apply only to judicial salaries?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Give notice of that question.

Mr. BLAKE. I will.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES.

Mr. GIGAULT enquired, Whether the Government have considered the report made by the Committee appointed to enquire into the best means of encouraging and developing our agricultural industries, and whether they purpose giving effect to the recommendations of that Committee by providing for the establishment of a Board of Agriculture and of an experimental farm?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report made by the Committee to the House not having been printed, the Government have not been in a position thus far to take up the report and master it, although we have been informed that the report, with the evidence taken, is a valuable one. Therefore, we are not in a position to say whether we can give effect to the recommendation of that Committee by providing for the establishment of a Board of Agriculture and an experimental farm; but the report will come under our notice during the recess, and we shall be in a better position next Session to give an answer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the Government lasts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That goes without saying.

Mr. BLAKE. You say it without going.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. HOUDE, in the absence of Mr. OUIMET, enquired, Whether the Government have received any communication from the Grand Trunk Railway offering to place the North Shore Railway, from St. Martin to Quebec, at their disposal, with a view to an arrangement of such a nature as to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to reach Quebec by that line; and if so, what is the nature of the said communication, and have the Government taken any action in relation thereto?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government as a Government have not received any communication from the Grand Trunk Railway Company on this subject. But I have received a communication from the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in which he informs me that should it be an object with the Dominion Government to secure the control of the North Shore line, he had no doubt that terms could be arranged for its transfer to them; although there is no desire on the part of the Company to dispose of their interest in that railway.

Mr. OUIMET enquired, Whether it is to the knowledge of the Government that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has adopted measures for the acquisition of the North Shore Railway, or that it has taken any steps for that purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to the knowledge of the Government that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in accordance with their determination to obtain connection with the port of Quebec as a summer terminus, are now engaged in negotiations to attain that object, from which they anticipate a favourable result.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU, moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on the Resolution respecting salaries of assistant post office inspectors and others be received.

Motion agreed to, and Resolution read the second and third times and referred to the Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 130).

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 130) to amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883. He said: Before that motion is adopted I might mention a few slight amendments to be moved in Committee. In the second section, after the list of those who are qualified by preliminary examination, will be added "Persons seeking temporary employment in the Department as copyists." The main reason of this amendment is that a certain number of female writers seek employment in the Departments who should not be assimilated to third class clerks because they are not getting any of the benefits of the Act for superannuation or promotion; no person should be employed as copyist without passing that examination because penmanship is one of the first qualifications required. Another amendment will be this: The sixth paragraph of the fourth section reads:

"In the case of attorneys, barristers, engineers, military or civil, officers of artillery in the Militia Department, architects, actuaries, land surveyors and draughtsmen, when employed or when seeking promotion in the line of their profession, the examination may be dispensed with on a report from the Deputy Head, concurred in by the Head of the Department, that it is not necessary."

The following addition will be made to this section: "Nor shall such examination be required for the employment or promotion of Excisemen who passed the Departmental Examination for the special class in the Excise service before the passing of the Acts hereby amended." This amendment is suggested for this reason, that before the Civil Service Act came into force the Excise men were subjected to a special examination, and when applying to be promoted in what was then called a special class, they had to undergo very severe examination in the merely technical nature of which the duties of their office consist. Some of the officers have attained high positions in the Department in their class and are entitled to promotion. Their examinations are not at all examinations of ordinary officers; they have been already examined and were already entitled to promotion after passing those special class examinations. It is proposed to put them in the character of special officers employed in a special line and asking to be promoted in that special line. However the amendment only applies to those Excise men who had their special class examination certificate before the Civil Service Act came into force. An amendment is also proposed to the fifth sub-section of the fourth clause by adding the following words: "And such officer or servant may receive an appointment in the Civil Service, for which he is otherwise eligible, if at the date of his appointment to such temporary or supernumerary office, his age did not exceed 35 years." This applies to supernumerary officers who have been employed for a long period of time in the Department, and who would like to submit to the ordinary examination to enter the service, and as they have been employed a long time their age should be counted from the time they entered the service.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1, sub-section 2,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. By the Act the Examiners are paid $5 per diem for a term of sixty days. They have been obliged this year, by the press of business, to work extra days, and it is not expected the work will be less next year. We propose to amend the Act by saying that they shall be paid for eighty days instead of sixty days, and it is also proposed that the pay shall be $8 per diem for members of the Board of Examiners who are not members of the Civil Service or superannuated.

Mr. BLAKE. It was $5 a day all round.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was $5 a day for sixty days. It is now $5 a day for eighty days, and, if a Board should be composed of those outside of the service or superannuated, it would be $8 a day.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has taken any resolution for this.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think I have.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the resolution applied to the packers and sorters and so on.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, I see I omitted this. I suppose it was thought unnecessary as there was no change in the salary, but only in the number of days.

Mr. BLAKE. But there is a change in the salary.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not in the salary of the present Board.

Mr. BLAKE. It is impossible that the first clause can be carried by you, Mr. Chairman; it is not in order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You can take away this second sub section; that is all.

Sub-section 2 struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether there is any change in the third sub-section.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the same as before.

Mr. BLAKE. And the fourth?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The same as before.

Mr. BLAKE. No alterations at all.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No alteration whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. The sixth you took the resolution for.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I took the resolution for that.

On section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the changes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is no change except that the wording of the Statute was not clear, and it is proposed to remove the obscurity. Every one of those presenting themselves for examination was obliged to submit, first, to what is called the preliminary examination, and the successful candidates in that were qualified for the offices mentioned in that list. But those who were looking for appointment as third class clerks were also obliged to submit to that preliminary examination first, and then had to undergo a second examination. We have divided it, so that those who want to apply only for situations as packers, sorters, mail transfer agents, box collectors, and, I intend to add, persons seeking temporary employment in the Departments as copyists, will have to undergo this preliminary examination, and those who present themselves for third class clerkships will proceed immediately to the qualifying examination. The only other difference is that I want to add persons seeking temporary employment in the Departments as copyists to the list of those who are to pass the preliminary examination.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the amendment which the hon. gentleman proposes is to call on those who are seeking for temporary employment as copyists to pass the preliminary examination?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Exactly.

Mr. BLAKE. Which they do not now do?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is a question. Some interpret the Act as if they are obliged to do it, and some do not. This will remove the doubt. They will have to receive the certificate of preliminary examination except in special cases

Mr. BLAKE. Then, may I ask the hon. gentleman if it is the understanding at present that persons who are seeking temporary employment are not submitted to any examination, that they do not come within the rules as to examination at all?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would not be in a position to answer that at once. I think temporary copyists only wanted to do a pressing job, such as preparing returns to Addresses, have been employed in some Departments without examination.

Mr. BLAKE. So I understood. That was considered a question, and he wanted to make it clear. But I am referring to other persons. We know that hitherto, and I suppose still, there are a number of persons temporarily employed, perhaps in other capacities than copyists. What is the understanding as to the law at present? Are such temporary employees submitted to any examination, either upon their first being employed or during continuance in the office?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the Statute provides that the temporary clerks must be taken from the list of those who have passed the examination, if they are to be found. If they cannot be found, then their place will be supplied for temporary work by persons who have not passed the examination; but practically, in the temporary employment of clerks to prepare returns and so on, it is impossible for that to be carried out. We cannot send from British Columbia to Halifax to ascertain whether young gentlemen or young ladies who have passed the examination can come here and copy papers during the Session, but as much as possible the Act is carried out. If the work is pressing, however, we must *ex necessitate* take the first person we can find who is ready and willing to do it, and capable of doing it. In the Department of the Interior, I believe, there are from twenty to twenty-five young ladies engaged at this moment copying returns, and none of those have passed any examination except one by the Deputy Head to see whether they write a good hand or not.

Mr. BLAKE. The explanation one wants is to ascertain what bearing the proposed amendment of the Secretary of State will have upon the general law. I quite agree that a preliminary examination which, as I understood him a while ago, has for one of its principal points to indicate the capacity of the person to be a good copying clerk is desirable. But if you insert expressly a provision that a preliminary examination shall be necessary for those who apply for temporary employment as copyist, the question is whether we may not be able to find other temporary employés without their being on the list at all; because you are inserting expressly an injunction that copyists must pass a preliminary examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Civil Service Act provides for that. When returns are to be rapidly prepared—and the hon. gentleman has asked for a good many this Session—the head of the Department will not have to look around to find copyists before he can prepare the return. It is not in order to meet the necessity for preparing the returns rapidly that I propose this amendment; it is proposed on account of the difficulty already mentioned, viz., that women asking for employment as copying clerks in the Departments were obliged to be subjected to the same examination as those enjoying all the provisions of the Civil Service Act. As it now exists temporary and supernumerary clerks have to be chosen from the list of those who have passed the examination, and this amendment will give the Department a more extensive choice by providing that copyists will not be obliged to pass the examination for third class clerks. I do not see why women who are only employed as copyists should be subjected to an examination required for a permanent clerkship. They will be required to possess good permanship and to write correctly, and I do not see what should be required of them more than that.

Mr. SPROULE. It appears to me that those holding the degree of B.A. ought to be exempt from passing the examination, and that some relaxation should be made in favour of school teachers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They may write a very bad hand.

Mr. BLAKE. I know some graduates who write very bad hands.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Those who have been most successful in the examination have been school teachers, while good business men have frequently been unsuccessful. If an applicant wants to be only a copyist then he will have to be examined as a copyist, and if he is a school teacher he will enjoy the exemption, which is a change in the law, of being subjected to the preliminary examination, and will come immediately to the qualifying examination.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We all know the story of the eminent English conveyancer of real estate, the head of conveyancers in England. He said that he wrote three hands: the first, that only himself and his clerk could read; the second, that only himself could read; and the third, that nobody in the world could read. These school masters may be very able men, but if they do not write a good hand, all their ability and knowledge, even though they were as

learned as Sir Isaac Newton, would not make them good employés. They must stand an examination, and I do not think that any man can say what he is fit for until after he is examined.

Mr. MILLS. The last hand of which the hon. gentleman spoke might be very useful when the Government wanted to make questionable returns.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks from knowledge; he has had to prepare returns, and therefore he speaks very feelingly. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman followed the example of the English conveyancer when he prepared those returns which he did not wish to be quite true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has a better plan—he does not bring down returns until a year after they are asked for.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The third sub-section alters the present law—or explains it, rather. There was a complaint made that old officers in the Departments were obliged to pass an examination for promotion upon subjects which were quite outside of the circle of knowledge which they were required to possess. It is proposed that the examination for promotion shall be made in such subjects as after consultation with the Deputy of the Department in which the promotion is to be made, shall be submitted to the Board as the best adapted to test the fitness of the candidate for the vacant office; such subjects (and this is the main alteration) being determined according to the requirements of each Department and each branch thereof. It is no material change, but it is explaining that the Board of Examiners shall only take such subjects as shall be submitted to them by the Head or Deputy Head of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. This amendment practically vitiates the whole Civil Service Act. There may be no general examination, and an officer may rise in the Department without being subjected to the same class of test to which another man shall be subjected in another Department. The hon. gentleman has given us frankly the reason. There are complaints from old officers. The amendment is a provision for leniency.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. For proficiency.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think so. The complaint made, as I understand it, is not that the men are examined too little, but too much—that some of the subjects in which they are examined should not be introduced. If the hon. gentleman proposed that, in addition to the subjects which the Board specify, there should be other subjects of examination relating to the special work of the Department, I could understand the proposal, and such would be an additional check on promotion in that Department. The Act states that all those promoted shall undergo the same test; but the hon. gentleman proposes, and he states the reason, that it is not found convenient that officers should be asked the same questions. The hon. gentleman says subjects may be added. It is true subjects may be added, but they may also be omitted, and it is more with a view to omission than to addition that the clause is inserted; but whether there will be fewer omissions or additions, there is no doubt that omissions may take place under it, and, as the hon. gentleman says, they are not unlikely to take place. This renders the test wholly inefficacious. If an applicant for promotion is unable to pass the promotion examination, it is better that he should wait for three months and get up the subjects and then pass the ordinary test examination, than apply to the Head of the Department to be relieved from examination in one or more subjects. In such an event the officer goes through without having passed the regular test.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman will see that practically what is desired has been done. An evil which the hon. gentleman cannot prevent, and what in fact cannot be prevented without this amendment, is remedied. The qualifying examinations are certainly sufficiently difficult, as regards general knowledge, to qualify an employé for the whole of his term in the Civil Service. What is required when promotion is sought is a thorough knowledge of the duties of the Department in which the officer is placed. I will give an example. Take an officer in the correspondence branch of my own Department. He requires to know something about our constitutional laws, about the organization of the Government, about the political history of the country. He should be a tolerably good scholar, and understand everything about the administration of the Department, precis-writing and correspondence, but he does not require some special knowledge needed in other Departments, such as book-keeping and a knowledge of accounts. The best officers in some of the Departments have at the last general promotion examination, passed most successful examinations on all the subjects necessary to the work of their own Departments, but have not obtained a sufficient number of points in perhaps one special subject, which is necessary in another Department, and by the iron rule of the Board these men could not be promoted, though known to be good and efficient officers. I do not deny that the Civil Service Act will have to be looked into and further amended in regard to the question of promotion if it is to be made a perfect Act. It will have to be considered as to whether it is not possible to classify the different examinations so as to attain the object aimed at by the hon. gentleman: so that a general examination for promotion in all classes might be arranged, and then for promotion in certain classes special subjects should be selected. This would require the remodelling of the Act, which we have not had time to do. I have studied a little the system in the United States which goes more in the direction indicated by the leader of the Opposition than we do: where the examination is according to classes and the different duties to be performed in each Department. This amendment does not exclude from examinations for promotion general subjects of information, which would certainly be satisfactory to any one of those who will look at the subjects on which examinations are held. Those general subjects will be retained. Although the subjects will be suggested by the Deputy Head of each Department, the examinations will be carried on under the rules of the Board of Examiners.

Mr. DAVIES. The change proposed is a much more radical one than the hon. gentleman has explained. It seems to introduce a very vicious system into Civil Service examinations. The object of the Act mainly was to afford promotion to experienced and able men, apart from political or other improper considerations. It was laid down that officers should be examined in such subjects as the Board of Examiners should decide, after consultation with the Deputy Heads of the Department. We had the security in that case that the political Head of the Department, for the time being, should not have any undue influence in the matter. The hon. gentleman now proposes to alter the Act by eliminating from the Board and vesting in the political Head of the Department the power of determining on what subjects candidates should be examined and what subjects should be eliminated from the examinations. I submit that the hon. gentleman, by taking away from the Board the power it now possesses of determining what subjects shall be deemed necessary in the examination, and vesting that power in the political Head of the Department, is doing away altogether with the objects of the Act. If this

section is passed the political Head of any Department can dispense with the examination of applicants in any subjects he pleases.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. The other subjects will remain and a minimum of points on them will be allowed, but the requirements for promotion will be special subjects necessary for promotion in the Departments. The Departments have not looked to the political side of their employés; the examinations are open to all those in the Department, or whatever shade of politics.

Mr. DAVIES. I am not accusing the hon. gentleman of introducing this section for political motives, or to advance political friends, but I am saying that that will be the effect of the section. The old sub-section provided that the subjects should be decided upon by the Board and the Deputy Minister. The Board had to consult with the Deputy Head of the Department, but now the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce the Head of the Department, and if a man comes up for examination who cannot pass his examination, the Head of the Department might dispense with particular subjects. I say that the effect of this will be to introduce those elements which it is the object of the Act to keep out, that is, political considerations and personal favouritism.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the clause is not objectionable in that respect. In the sixth sub-section I propose to add to the list of other officers, Excise men who have been in the service before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Secretary of State why officers of the artillery in the Militia Department should be selected specially for note in this clause? It seems to me that there is no reason why they alone should be capable of promotion under the clause.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are, I suppose, exactly the same as others, such as engineers, surveyors, actuaries, whose services would be of a special nature, and it is only when they are seeking promotion in that capacity. It does not prevent them being examined when seeking employment or promotion in any other capacity than their special profession, and it has the effect of preventing them from being made officers by special Orders in Council, as under the old Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think our officers of artillery undergo any very serious professional training, and it seems rather absurd to mention them particularly. I could understand graduates of the Royal Military College being made eligible, because they receive a special and very careful training—a training as good as these engineers.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be better, in describing the preliminary process, in the third sub-section, to make the phraseology the same as in the sixth sub-section, that is to say "shall be in such subjects as by the report of the Deputy Head, concurred in by the Head of the Department shall be submitted to the Board."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That phraseology would perhaps be better.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question in regard to the promotion examination, and it is this: Whether a candidate for promotion, having passed such an examination as would entitle him to rank as a first-class clerk, and there being vacancies only in the second class, would he be entitled to fill a position which might thereafter become vacant in the first-class, without passing a subsequent examination; or whether, in the event of a candidate passing such examination as would entitle him to a first class clerkship, any certificate would be given him to that effect?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There would be nothing just in that; if the candidates have been submitted to an examination for a second class clerkship, they cannot claim a certificate for the first class. If they have to undergo a second examination, I do not think they are badly treated. However, I may say that the Board might make by-laws to secure the object pointed to by my hon. friend.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman not consent to exempt graduates of the Royal Military College, as well as the other classes named in the Bill. I think this ought to be done. We give them few enough privileges after the long course they have to go through. I hope the hon. gentleman will consent to include them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will ask the hon. Minister of Militia what he thinks about it. I would not wish to do it without his consent.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps I can appeal to the hon. First Minister for his influence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not at all sure that it is well to exempt any one. If you want a legal man to fill a position in the line of his profession, you should not subject him to the ordinary examination because it would be inapplicable to him. I am rather opposed to the idea that there is any humiliation in a man going up to this examination. If it is not a humiliation to a farmer's son, it is not a humiliation to a gentleman's son, because he is educated at the Military College very much at the expense of the country, rather than at his father's expense. I do not think there should be an exemption.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think there is any humiliation either; but why should a barrister be exempted, and not a graduate of the Military College? Would the hon. gentleman himself pass an examination?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I would pass an examination in law if the hon. gentleman was the examiner; but if his leader was the examiner, I am afraid I would be plucked in many directions.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the exemption is a favour, why is there any exemption?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because these different classes may be wanted for special services. If a graduate of the Military College is wanted as a military man, to be an officer in the Mounted Police or in the Militia, he does not come within the purview of the Act; but if he is wanted for the Civil Service, that is another matter.

Mr. BLAKE. An engineer, military or civil, or an officer of artillery in the Militia Department may be exempt, while a graduate of our chief institution itself, designed to fit our own people to be military engineers, would have to pass an examination.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because it is quite clear that a graduate, however great his theoretical knowledge, or however honourably he may have passed his examinations, is not capable of being consulted for the building of fortifications. He could not be employed except as an officer in some of the corps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows that civil and military engineers practically create themselves in this country. There are few colleges that give diplomas, and practically any one who happens to dub himself a military or a civil engineer would be exempt under this clause. I do not think they know anything in the world more than men who have been carefully trained by officers of the British service for years, and who have passed a rigorous examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We mean those now in the Militia Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The section says not a word of that, it only says "when seeking promotion." They may be seeking promotion when not employés.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. Minister of Militia who gave me that amendment said it referred only to those who are in the Militia Department now. I may add the words "now employed."

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that graduates of the Militia College at Kingston should be also exempt from examination. The training they have received will render them competent for actual service, and the Government unless they are prepared to vote a want of confidence in their own institution ought to include in this provision those graduates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To my knowledge nothing is more common, both in England and elsewhere, than for men to cram, especially for the purpose of qualifying examinations in the Civil Service; and men of inferior capacity constantly do cram to pass them, but a class of men having had a long training are by no means so liable to cram. A disposition to cram for this particular examination will be encouraged here by keeping the limit so high as thirty-five years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I move that the sixth sub-section be struck out altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has said as to the injurious effects of cramming, and that is one great argument against competitive examinations. I admit the value of a degree given at the Military College and think we might include graduates from that institution.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection; I think the demand very reasonable.

Mr. CARON. I think they should be admitted; after passing the examination they have to submit to in the college, it would be quite right to admit them without obliging them to go through a preliminary examination.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would ask the hon. Secretary of State, if he has not altogether forgotten that there are such individuals as naval officers, whether they should not also be included. There are several already in the service, and I have reason to believe that others would come out, who have retired from the English service, to obtain positions in the Civil Service here, and the day may not be far distant when Canada will find it necessary to have a navy. Naval officers, I think, should be exempt from this preliminary examination. As I have said, there are several in the service already; Capt. Scott is chairman of the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates, the officer in command of the *Princess Louise* was a naval officer, and the assistant in the Toronto Observatory is also a naval officer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Their duties are not at all those required in the Civil Service. Why not also include masters and mates?

Mr. BAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman does not put us on the same footing. Naval officers have to pass a very difficult examination at the Royal College at Greenwich, and surely are qualified in their particular profession. If the words "and naval officers" were introduced, you would make provision for the future.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no reason why we should not also put in clergymen.

Mr. BAKER. They are not like clergymen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know; a good many of them are at sea.

Mr. BAKER. The clergymen you mean?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course; I would suggest that this clause be allowed to pass as it is, and my hon. friend will consider all the suggestions about the Military College and the Navy and bring down the results before he asks the third reading.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the clause is adopted I desire to make a few remarks. In the first place, I am far from being an enthusiastic admirer of the system of promotion, I would now desire to see it abolished. I believe that so far, that system has not given satisfactory results—results which are in the interest of the service. Secondly, if we are to maintain this system, although I am opposed to it, I think that if exceptions are to be made in favour of advocates, civil and military engineers, draughtsmen, architects and others, the exemption from examination for promotion should also be extended to employés who have been at least ten years in the service, and who have fulfilled in a satisfactory manner the duties which have devolved upon them. In my humble opinion, the Deputy Head of the Department, the Deputy Minister, is the best judge of the ability, of the experience, and of the competency of the officials under his charge. He is more apt to know if an officer deserves promotion, and it seems to me, it ought to be left to him to decide whether it should be granted or not, provided that the report of the Deputy Minister should be sanctioned and assented to by his chief. Therefore, I hope that the hon. Secretary of State, who has charge of this Bill, will have no objection to add to the list of exemptions the Government officials who have served for at least ten years in a satisfactory manner, and who have obtained the approval of the Deputy Minister, who is responsible for the public service in the Department of which he is in charge, and who has, besides, obtained the assent of the Minister himself.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) I hold in my hand an amendment which has been suggested to me the effect of which would be to add to the list of exemption all officials who have been fifteen years in the service. I have refused it for the following reasons: I think that the protection given to old employés by sub-section 3 of the Act, is fully sufficient to protect good employés who have been ten or fifteen years in the service. The examinations which they are required to pass will have to be made on such subjects as shall have been proposed by the report of the Deputy Head, and concurred in by the Head of the Department. Thus, they have all the necessary protection, and for this reason: that even if they should be exempt from examination, they cannot be promoted without a report of the Deputy Head, testifying as to their efficiency; and if they are only examined on subjects connected with their office, they certainly have no reason to fear that such an examination will be prejudicial to them. I believe that this protection will be fully sufficient for them. Moreover, there would be another inconvenience; if we should say ten years, why not say nine years, or eight, or seven? I have refused an amendment which only asked for exemption after fifteen years service, because the old employés have all the required protection, by virtue of sub-section 3 of section 4.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon member. My opinion is that the third sub-section will just do the business and will be just as the hon. member for Ottawa wishes.

On section 5,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The first sub-section contains a very slight change. It was provided the money could not be paid unless a special sum was voted for such special purpose. We have made it in this Bill "unless a sum has been placed for that purpose in the Estimates submitted to and voted by Parliament."

Mr. BLAKE. The first sub-section is proposed to remove a most salutary check upon the course of the Administration in departing from the principles of the Civil Service Act. The Act which the Government themselves brought down and which Parliament passed provided, by its 49th section that:

"No extra salary or additional remuneration of any kind whatsoever shall be paid to any Deputy Head, officer or servant in the Civil Service of the Dominion unless such sum shall have been placed for that special purpose in the Estimates submitted to and voted by Parliament"

The result of that was, that if it was intended that these extra payments, which are a great source, in my opinion, of weakness and demoralization of the service, which ought to be restricted as far as possible, which ought to be given only under very exceptional circumstances, fully explained if it was intended that any extra sum should be paid to any employé, the Government had to consider it in Council specifically with reference to that employé, and had to bring down a special vote, making an estimate for that special service, and then the attention of Parliament was specifically directed to this deviation or departure from the general law; the explanations are given, and upon that the vote goes through. Last Session, in contravention of this law or without sufficient regard to it, several votes were brought down, and were not brought down specifically marked; and they were inefficacious. The Auditor-General, as the explanations given in the Supplementary Estimates sufficiently show, indicated that these were not estimates for these specific purposes marked, and so the payments were not made. The votes have been brought down this Session in that way, to John Jones, Thomas Smith or whoever it might be, this specific vote. We have our attention directed to this proposed deviation from the general rule, and we make these enquiries which arise out of that proposal. Now, what is proposed to do is to do away with that salutary provision, and to say "unless a sum shall be voted in the Estimates."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. "For that purpose."

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, for that purpose, but then it is "a sum for that purpose." What is the object of the change? The object of the change is to prevent its being stated "for that special purpose," and the sum, the special sum. What we have at present is this protection, that, if the Government wants to pay to a civil servant more than the law and the general provisions require, the sum they propose to pay shall be specifically stated, and the purpose shall be specially stated. What the hon. gentleman proposes is that, under some general clause in the Estimates, under which, say, $10,000 may be taken for the purpose of paying extra remuneration to officers, he may apply in the course of the fiscal year further sums, special sums, to special officers. I say that the precaution which the Government themselves introduced is an admirable precaution. They thought it was reasonable two years ago, when they passed this measure, that it should be in the law. There is no inconvenience in complying with it. All that is necessary is that they should make up their minds before Parliament meets what sum they are going to propose for each man who is to have more money than the general law gives him, and should say in the Estimates, "We propose that Thomas Smith shall have $300 a year extra." Thus the attention of the Committee is directed to it, and they pass upon it after appropriate explanations have been given. Why not continue that law? It is a perfectly reasonable provision. Why remove it in order that you may take the vote in a more general form, less calculated to give information to the public and to the House, less calculated to provoke discussion, and which may be slurred over, as these special sums, in the past, before this law was on the Statute Book, were slurred over? It is in the interest of the Administration itself that all possible checks should be placed upon these extra votes, and one of those checks is the consciousness and the knowledge that they cannot be proposed without the name of the individual and the sum to be paid to him being specifically stated in the Estimates, thus challenging in the most pointed way the attention of Parliament and ensuring investigation and enquiry before the provision is made. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press upon us this which is not an amendment, but in my opinion a very great deterioration.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is exaggerating a danger which will not present itself at all under this clause. The clause is explicit enough, and the Government and the House are particular enough not to be exposed to the danger that my hon. friend is pointing out. The clause says that no extra salary and no additional remuneration of any kind shall be paid unless a sum shall have been placed in the Estimates for that purpose. If it is not sufficient to say that the sum shall be voted "for the purpose" of the extra salary, or of the additional remuneration of any kind, I do not know what words can mean. If you say such a sum for such a special purpose, instead of doing good, you will put yourself in the difficulty which we have met. I will quote only one instance. A vote was taken last year for a third class clerk, to be employed as shorthand writer, in the Department of the Secretary of State, at $700. I thought there was a sum for that purpose voted by the House, but there was not a special sum for a special purpose, indicating the name of the person and the appointment and the sum could not be paid to the third class clerk who had been appointed shorthand writer, just because the was already in the Civil Service. He was obliged to resign his position in the service and be re-appointed, because the interpretation of the clause prevented his receiving the money, For instance, a Commission is appointed, and $500 or $1,000 is appropriated for the Commission composed of the Commissioner and the clerk. The interpretation of the law, as it was before, would be that such a sum could not be paid, because the respective salaries were not specially mentioned The clause as put here will prevent difficulties which have presented themselves, whilst giving a complete protection against the moneys of the public being squandered under any false pretences, because it is said that no extra salary or additional remuneration of any kind shall be paid unless a sum shall have been voted for that purpose. If that is not sufficient, I do not know what is required, unless we want to put the law into such a shape that the application of it becomes almost impossible. I think the clause is sufficient to prevent the expenditure of money unless it is voted by Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. It is rather extraordinary for the hon. gentleman to say we are proposing to raise difficulties. The difficulties are here. They are raised already. Who raised them? The Government that introduced and passed the Act. It is the law they brought down to us, it was passed by themselves in this way, and what they are proposing to do is to alter and modify the law, because they find it not elastic enough to suit their purposes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps then it is because it is too elastic, and they want to make it more rigorous.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, we want to take away the occasion of a too rigorous and too hair-splitting interpretation of the law, and this is, I am sure, what Parliament wanted when the other law was passed.

Mr. BLAKE. No. We have found it possible to comply with this law. We have been told half-a-dozen times while these Estimates were going through, with reference to such a vote and such a vote, "This vote was put in the Estimates last year, but it was not specifically stated, therefore no effect could be given to it." All that is necessary is to comply with the law as it stands. They did not comply

with it last Session, and they found it necessary to bring down a Supplementary Estimate, which does comply with it; therefore it is possible this Session to comply with the law as it now stands, by stating those cases with that particularity with which they have been stated this Session; and you have got the proof of the evil in the fact that these same votes passed last year were merely because information was not given; but this year in each case there was a scrutiny and that degree of discussion which I say are wholesome and useful in the public interest and are a very good protection for the Government themselves who, I presume, are beset, as other Governments have been before them, with frequent applications for extra remuneration and for a violation of the general principles of the law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The principle is that no person shall he paid either for extra remuneration or otherwise without the sum being previously voted by the representatives of the people. This clause says distinctly that no remuneration whatever shall be given to anybody unless the same is voted for that purpose; and if this is not sufficient I do not understand language.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Let us come to a practical application of the Act. Does the hon. gentleman propose next Session—if he should be in that position—to ask a vote of $8,000 or $10,000 for the purpose of providing for any possible extra salaries?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then why is the vote to be taken?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The vote is taken so that a certain sum shall be placed at the disposal of the Government for the purpose for which it is asked, and for no other. It is only a question of words, and not a question of principle.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Exactly. When he has this vote, every person wanting an extra salary and knowing there is a sum there for the purpose, will be making application, and the hon. gentleman will be beset with applications from his own officers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think there has been any complaint in that respect.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think there has. If there is no complaint why is this change asked for? If the hon. gentleman will put after the word "purpose" the words "in each such case," I will have no objection to support it. But he now proposes to take a general vote without naming individuals, and then ask power to distribute that vote according to circumstances.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The sum must be voted, not for a general purpose, but for some particular purpose, namely, the remuneration of extra services, and the remuneration is proposed to be given in all such cases as may present themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. If there is no change between the views of the hon. gentleman and my own, let it just remain as it was last Session. If not, I have so much confidence in the superior efficacy of the clause as it stood that I shall propose at the proper time to restore it in its pristine vigour.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will agree to put in the words suggested by the hon. member for East York, and to add after the words "that purpose" the words "in each case."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 5, sub-section 3,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is a little change here. The certificate of illness shall only be given by properly authorized persons. It is an improvement.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONADD. The hon. gentleman will see that employés, when they are absent, go to a friend who is a doctor, and get a certificate of illness.

Mr. BLAKE. Quite so—like the Halton doctors and the whiskey.

On section 6,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The inspectors are put on the same footing as the postmasters and the collectors of Customs.

Mr. BLAKE. This proposal will place a very large class quite unnecessarily outside of the operations of the Act. Last Session it was provided that certain first class appointments should be kept as a sort of political prize, and that the ordinary Civil Service Examination Rules should not apply to them, these appointments so excepted being city postmasterships and collectorships. At the suggestion of the Minister of Customs, preventive officers were also excluded, it being stated that these officers in the country could not pass the examinations and that they were engaged in special work. I see no reason why inspectors of weights and measures should be added to this category.

Mr. COSTIGAN. These officers have not hitherto been considered as under the Civil Service Act, and the examination test has not been applied.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see why they should not be compelled to pass the examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. These officers have not been subjected to examinations, and it is to prevent any difficulty or doubt arising that they are exempted.

Mr. BLAKE. That is to say that the law has been violated heretofore, and now it is proposed to altogether change it.

Bill, as amended, reported.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 128) to amend the General Inspection Act of 1874.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. One provision of this Bill is that inspectors may act in other districts than those for which they have been appointed, under certain conditions. It also provides that inspectors, duly appointed, may examine and appoint deputy inspectors, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. It is found that very great inconvenience exists in calling upon the Board of Examiners to make examinations in all cases, as they are not remunerated for their time, and it is difficult to get them to meet and examine individual candidates. We thought it would be perfectly safe to trust the examination to the inspectors themselves, who have been duly examined, and are duly qualified, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, especially as after all they are responsible themselves for their deputies.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the inspector will not be at all likely to examine his son, or his sister, or his cousin, or his aunt?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course the Government will always have the approval or the disapproval of any appointments that may be made. Another amendment which I now propose is to exempt fish oil from the operation of the amended section 64 of the Act.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Under this law will the inspection of herring be as it has been in the past?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As it has been—for the present.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The difficulty is that practically it is impossible to inspect the herrings. Last fall in the city of Montreal 30,000 or 40,000 barrels of herring were brought in for inspection within a period of eight or ten days or a fortnight. The herrings came in very late and it was almost impossible to get them inspected within that time. The result was that last year the herrings were not really inspected. The inspectors jumped at their quality, and made them No. 2 with the consent of all parties. But, really, there was no adequate inspection of the herrings at all.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may here make a statement with reference to the communication of the Montreal Board of Trade. It has been under the consideration of the Government, and, looking at the law which has been acted upon up to last year, we have decided that there is no duty on packages containing oil imported from Newfoundland. With regard to the oil on which duty was collected last year and which was said to be the produce of the fisheries of Newfoundland, it appears that the oil had been shipped to England, and from England it was imported into Canada. But under the law there is no duty on packages containing oil from Newfoundland; that is the first point. It has also been decided to amend this Bill so that the inspection of oil from Newfoundland will not be necessary; that is the second point. Then as to the character of the inspection in Newfoundland it was not reliable at all, and after waiting fifteen months for the authorities of Newfoundland to amend their law, we put our law in force. But we have opened up communications with the Government of Newfoundland with the view of coming to an amicable arrangement with them with regard to the inspection of fish.

Mr. GAULT. It appears that herrings inspected at Montreal—No. 3 or No. 4—become almost spoiled after being turned out. No. 1 herrings that have been inspected have become quite unsaleable afterwards; and I understand that herrings are coming in by Boston and Portland and going to Toronto without any inspection at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad the Minister of Finance has given the explanation he has, because I can assure him that a great deal of feeling exists in many quarters upon this subject. It is a pity that this explanation could not have been given before, as it would have prevented a great deal of angry feeling, not only among gentlemen connected with the Board of Trade, but in various commercial centres, owing to the collection of duty on packages of fish oil from Newfoundland. I endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in Montreal with the inspection of fish at all. Many gentlemen in this House who have experience in regard to pickled fish, know that if pickled fish are put up for market, and after a month are taken out and inspected and repacked, they will not keep. First-class fish under those circumstances become second or third class. I see the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) shaking his head. No doubt he has had a great deal of experience; but he knows a great deal more about cod fish I think than he does about herrings. I am satisfied that we shall never give satisfaction to the trade or to consumers in the country until we abolish the compulsory inspection of fish in the markets where they are sold. We should deal liberally with Newfoundland; it is a matter of vital importance that with a colony that gives us $2,000,000 of trade a year, we should have amicable arrangements; but the Newfoundlanders think that their interests have been outraged and injured in this matter. I repeat my satisfaction at the announcement of the Finance Minister, and I hope the negotiations will result in healing those wounded feelings which are very much strained at present.

Mr. FORTIN. I am surprised that my hon. friend should insinuate that the interests of the fishermen or the herring merchants of Newfoundland have been outraged. I proved in a speech I made at the beginning of the Session, not by assertions but by figures, that it is we who have been outraged; it is we who have been defrauded, not only by the merchants and fishermen of Newfoundland, but by the Government of Newfoundland who used to give commissions of inspectors to the fishermen themselves, who, after packing their fish stamp indiscrimenately, all the barrels containing them as No. 1, without any real inspection, and that not only in Newfoundland, but sometimes on Canadian territory. When those fish came to Montreal last year, and we inspected them as we inspected our own fish, we did not outrage those people. Their fish were inspected by the same inspectors and under the same law as ours; and I would like to know if foreigners, as the Newfoundlanders must be considered in matter of trade are going to get special privileges over our own people. They must be considered as foreigners; they are not under the National Policy; and I call upon the First Minister to sustain the fishing industry under the tenets of the National Policy as well as the cotton industry. It is we who have been outraged. The Government have had reports from the different inspectors, in which it is proved that the Newfoundland merchants, sharp and shrewd as they are, knew that they could not make money in Canada unless they excluded our herrings from our own market; and they have done so. Is that National Policy? I am not surprised that the Free Trade Government of hon. gentlemen opposite allowed the Newfoundland herrings to come here free from inspection. But we are under the National Policy to-day, and I hope the Government will carry out the National Policy in regard to herrings as well as in regard to cottons; because, if they do not, I cannot support them any more. I do not believe in two weights and two measures—one weight and measure for the cotton manufacturers of Montreal, and another weight and measure for the fishermen and fishing merchants of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I know that some of the merchants of Montreal—foreigners, most of them—have been saying that I have been fighting for the last two years for the herrings, because I have been looking after the interests of my constituents. Let me tell these men that the people of Gaspé trade mostly in codfish principally, and do not generally send herrings to Montreal. The people of Magdalen Islands which also belongs to Gaspé used to send herring to Quebec and Montreal, but have been prevented from doing so by the policy of the Government in allowing Newfoundland fish to come into our ports and be sold without inspection, while Canadian fish had to be inspected. Thus our fish has been excluded from our own market, and not more than ten Canadian vessels a year have taken to herring fishing for the last few years on the coast of Labrador. I asked the reason to some fishermen, while on that coast last year, and they said: "What is the use? The Newfoundland fish keep our herring out of the market." What is the consequence? The consequence is that with our National Policy in force, a large number ofour fishermen of the coast of Labrador are, I will not say, starving, (because they are fed by the Federal as well as by the Local Government both of which had to send provisions to them) owing to their not being able to sell their herring as well as Newfoundland on our markets. They ceased to go into the trade and have been reduced consequently to a destitute condition. I am not afraid to expose this state of things because this is a question I have studied, and I appeal to the people of Nova Scotia and to New Brunswick to endorse the stand I take. The people of Nova Scotia are the most interested in this question. The people of Gaspé do not produce much herring; it is principally a Nova Scotia industry, because of 490,000 barrels produced last year, about 200,000 barrels were produced by Nova Scotia,

and I am bound to say that whilst formerly we received a great quantity of fish fromNova Scotia in Montreal and Quebec, that has been excluded by the Newfoundland fish. Let me tell you, Sir, that when that fish, the inferior fish from Newfoundland, was inspected and found not to be up to the mark, what was the consequence? Many merchants in Montreal refused to buy it, and wrote down at once to get good fish; agents were sent down, and they got it at the Gut of Canso. Those are facts, and I am very glad this question has come up, so that I can state those facts to the Government which seems to be inclined to allow the obnoxious clauses of the Act of 1874, and repealed by the Act of 1882, to be revived. I do not see why we should be so good to the Newfoundlanders.

Mr. MITCHELL. We want to keep the trade.

Mr. FORTIN. The Newfoundlanders buy flour in Montreal and Quebec because it suits them better than to go to New York. We know what trade is; we go where it is cheapest. We are under the National Policy, and our fishermen pay dearly to sustain that National Policy, and the merchants in Montreal and the owners of cotton manufactories in Montreal are very glad to get our fishermen to buy cotton, but how can they buy the cotton if they cannot sell their fish in Montreal, if that market is kept for foreigners. The merchants of Newfoundland who came from Newfoundland to Montreal to establish the herring trade said to themselves: "We can only make money by excluding the Canadian herring; if we can do that we will be able to sell our fish at any price we like, and will be able to sell No. 2 and No. 3, for No. one, and make plenty of money." I cite these facts because I am afraid the Government will give way to please those Newfoundlanders who, when our vessels go to trade on their coast, with goods to sell in exchange for fish and with barrels and salt to bring back the herring, send a collector of Customs on board, who, not only make our merchants pay duty on the goods which they land but also on the barrels and salt which are never landed. Documents will be laid before this House to prove that. What more have they done? On two-thirds of the coast of Newfoundland it is Canada which build the lighthouses and maintains them. Only a few years ago they imposed light dues and what did they do? Our vessels were made pay double the dues paid by the New-foundland vessels, although it was we who built and kept these lighthouses.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FORTIN. Before six o'clock, I was stating facts to prove that Newfoundland had been unjust towards our traders and coasters and fishermen. I said that when our traders went to Newfoundland, the Newfoundlanders were not satisfied with exacting Customs duties on goods to be given for fish and landed, but they also exacted duties on the barrels and salt that were not to be landed but were to be brought back in Canada. I will cite the account of a merchant from Quebec who went to Newfoundland with a cargo of goods. This trader had 350 empty barrels and ten tons of salt on board for the purpose of bringing the herring back to Canada, yet he had to pay on the 350 empty barrels $25 Customs dues and on the 10 tons of salt $2, making a total of $27 collected by Mr. J. P. Kearney, sub-collector, Newfoundland. I cite this because this Government has exacted a duty on parcels; and I can tell you, Sir, that I thought it better we should not impose that duty. You see that we can make a comparison between these two ways of dealing, but whilst we impose the duty on parcels used here, you see that the Newfoundlanders were in the habit of imposing a duty on parcels which did not remain in that country. I mentioned also the case of light dues. Not content with charging our vessels light dues, they doubled them, although it was Canada that built and maintains the lighthouses. Whilst our staple products of Newfoundland are imported into this country free of duty, everything we export to them is charged a duty. I do not think that is very liberal on the part of Newfoundland. Now I am going to speak of a question never raised here before, the question of the medicinal cod oil, which is made largely in Newfoundland; we are supplied entirely with that cod oil. Merchants along the Canadian coast have tried to manufacture it, but they cannot compete with Newfoundland, just as our manufacturers could not compete with the English goods until they were protected. If we were to ask the Government to impose a duty on medicinal cod oil in order to protect our manufacturers, we would be taking a step to meet the case. Now, Sir, with regard to the inspection of fish, I have heard some persons say that the inspection of fish has a tendency to injure the fish. I will ask the Government and I will ask the people who are not conversant with the question to ask fish traders and fish packers and they will tell them that the inspection of fish, instead of injuring the fish, is the best mode to keep it for a long time. The compulsory inspection of fish in this country has not been established lightly, has not been established without consulting the whole country, and I hold in my hand here a report of a Committee of the House, 1869, which sat for two years and studied the question of inspection. This Committee sent questions all over the country, in Ontario, in Quebec, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, and in Prince Edward Island, to ask their opinion about the inspection of fish, and the majority answered, "yes, the inspection of fish is necessary and ought to be compulsory;" and the law passed in 1873 was based upon the report of that Committee. I will ask the Government, if they consider the question, to do so with dignity, not through fear of Newfoundland, but to consult the interests of the Canadians and nothing else. I am not against trading with Newfoundland—far from it. I have studied that trade, I have been myself in Newfoundland, and have done all I could to extend that trade; but I ask the Government if they are ready to sacrifice the interests of this country to the interests of Newfoundland. I think they will not do it. In order to show that the recall of those clauses which permitted Newfoundland herring to come here freely was not done lightly, I have here a petition of the Board of Trade of Quebec asking that the obnoxious clauses be repealed, and they were repealed, and consequently they ask that the law remain as it is now; there is a petition of 43 merchants of Montreal asking for the repeal of the obnoxious clauses which permitted Newfoundland herring to come free of inspection, and consequently they are glad that the Government took action and put the Newfoundland on the same footing as ours; and there is another petition of forty-five merchants of Quebec, leading merchants, fish merchants and others, who also asked that the Government remove the obnoxious clauses, which was done, and consequently they are satisfied with the present law. Now, let me end these remarks by giving some figures to this House, so that they will remember the importance of this herring trade. In 1882, the production of the herring industry in Canada amounted to 423,042 barrels of pickled herring, 1,247,231, smoked herring, and 20,527,200 of single herring which were sold in a frozen state, amounting to a value of $2,135,285. Now, by Provinces, Nova Scotia produced 193,361 barrels, amounting to $773,444; New Brunswick, 121,743 barrels, amounting to $486,972; Quebec, 57,640 barrels, amounting to $255,202, and Prince Edward Island, 31,545 barrels, amounting to $126,680; amounting in all, as I have said, to upwards of $2,000,000 in value. Now, I will ask this House and the Government whether they are ready to sacrifice this immense trade, which gave so much work to so many people,

and which causes an immense trade between the Maritime Provinces and Montreal and Quebec and Ontario, for the sake of about 10,000 or 30,000 barrels of herring which come from Newfoundland, because that is the question, there is no other question. If the Newfoundlanders did not want to send their herring into Montreal at a better advantage than the herring of this country, there would be no trouble. If they only wanted to be fair, they would say, "We cannot expect more than you have; your herring has to be inspected, we will submit to the inspection." What the fishermen and the fish merchants in Canada ask is fair play and honest treatment.

Mr. KAULBACH. I quite concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Gaspé, which are applicable not only for his county and the coast along the Gulf, but more particularly for Nova Scotia, whose catch of herrings is far in excess of all the other Provinces of the Dominion. It is all very well for Montreal to encourage a trade with Newfoundland and exchange flour for fish, but it should not be done at the expense of the fishermen of Canada. If we allow herrings coming into Canada to pass free of inspection, whilst our own under the Inspection Act are required to be inspected, we allow the Newfoundlander an advantage over our own fishermen; and an inferior article to be placed side by side with our own at competing prices, thus greatly reducing the price in our own market; and if sold to the merchant for foreign shipment affect the price of ours, a better article, in a foreign market. Newfoundland will not allow us to sell any of our products in her market without a heavy duty, and if we allow her to sell her fish in Canada free of duty, we allow her quite enough, and Montreal should not object to the inspection of herrings when imported from that Island, and I don't think the matter will be pressed.

Bill, as amended, reported.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 87) further to amend the Indian Act, 1880.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first clause of the Bill is new. The Indians, we find, when left to themselves, are easy to manage, but when stirred up for improper reasons by traders, good or bad, or by scamps of all kinds, it is found that great danger has occasionally arisen of actual bloodshed. At Edmonton last year there came very near being a serious collision and perhaps a very serious Indian outrage incited as was known, by whites for their own evil purposes. This clause, therefore, provides that

"Whoever induces, incites, or stirs up, or endeavours to induce, incite, or stir up, any Indian, non-treaty Indian, half breed or other person, to make any request or demand of any employé or servant of the Government, in a threatening or defiant manner, or in a manner calculated to cause a breach of the peace; or to do any act calculated to cause a breach of the peace."

I propose to strike out "in a threatening or defiant manner" and to insert in lieu thereof "in a riotous manner."

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me to be a very wide clause. I do not think I ever saw a clause of this nature in a criminal law. Certainly the proposal of the hon. gentleman obviates some of the objections to the proposed amendment; but the offence which is to be punishable, perhaps, by five years imprisonment in the penitentiary, may be an endeavour to induce a person to make a request in a riotous manner. He is only to endeavour; he may not succeed in inducing the person to make a request in a riotous manner, What is the nature of the proof to be of this grave offence—an endeavour to induce a person to make a request in a particular manner—in a "threatening and defiant" it was, and now in a "riotous" manner?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A *routous* manner.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know what that is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It depends upon one's acquaintance with criminal law.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not profess to be much acquainted with criminal law, but I do not think the hon. gentleman will find any precedents for that which seems to me to go far beyond any criminal law of modern days. An endeavour to induce a person to make a request in a riotous manner is to be punishable by five years in the penitentiary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh no, it may be only one week.

Mr. BLAKE. And it may be for five years. He may not succeed, the request may not have been made, yet he is to be punishable, and may be imprisoned for five years. The proposal, though somewhat improved by the hon. gentleman, is of a barbarously wide character. It is not confined to Indians; it is general. It is "any Indian, non-treaty Indian, half breed, or other person," so that if I was to endeavour to persuade somebody to make a request in a riotous manner of the hon. gentleman I should be liable to five years imprisonment. Now, it is barbarous, the hon. gentleman will agree, as applied to white men, at any rate. It is outrageous to expose white men to these penalties for making such suggestions to Indians as are mentioned in the clause. If it is to be a criminal offence, it ought to be so when results follow. Conceive the evidence to support this case. The Indian may never have made the request at all. He may not have made it in a riotous manner, but yet it is alleged by some rival trader that a white man endeavoured to stir up Indians to make the request in a riotous manner. The clause is of a barbarous character and liable to great oppression.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must admit that this provision would not do in a settled community. But if hon. members will look at the legislation connected with the Indians, especially with the Indians of the North-West, they will find there is exceptional legislation, and there ought to be such. If hon. members consider that the country is in a wild state, that white men are going in there and that there is great danger of collision between whites and Indians, that white men for their own purposes, especially traders, stir up Indians to resist the authorities—hon. members will admit that it is not sufficient to say that a man shall only be punished when an insurrection occurs, because no one can tell what the result will be. No punishment can be too great on white men who work on the feelings of the Indians. The hon. gentleman says there must be some result. If there is a riot, an Indian war, a massacre of the whites—that is in each case the result. The hon. gentleman says we must wait for the result. I say no. If the Indian acts on that incitement, the parties are liable to punishment for five years. If it is proved the parties tried to incite, they are in the same position; and a party is liable to be tried for conspiracy even if the conspiracy does not produce the desired results. I must appeal to the Committee, considering the exceptional state of the country, to arm the authorities with the power given in this clause. Cases will not be tried except by court of competent jurisdiction; they will be tried by a jury, and proper punishment will be meted out.

Mr. BLAKE. The clause says that if a white man endeavours to stir up Indians to do an act calculated to cause a breach of the peace, he is to go to the penitentiary. What is to be proof of the nature of the act; second, what amounts to stirring up or inciting; and third, is the act

calculated to cause a breach of the peace? These are all important matters. The hon. gentleman has intimated that the Act will not be used unless the inciting produces results. If so, why should we arm the authorities with power to use the Act before results are produced. If the law is not to be used, do not enact it; if it is to be used, let us consider whether the law is one which should be enacted. I never heard of or read of such loose legislation as this—of legislation which gives an opportunity for so much oppression as this does. I do not remember precisely at this moment what the present position of the law is, as to the mode of trial of criminal offences in the North-West. There is considerable summary jurisdiction placed in the hands of the Stipendiary Magistrates, and there is some provisions for a small jury. But, however that may be, we considered when framing the law that we must provide for a somewhat expeditious and summary mode of trial of offences. Some exception was taken to the fact that the safeguards which exist in more civilized communities were not placed around the administration of Justice in the North-West. We have provided summary jurisdiction and trial by a very small jury—and there is no Grand Jury there. This makes it all the more necessary, that the Criminal Law which is to be administered in that way, should be plain and simple, and define the offences with as much exactness and precision as possible. I say there is in this clause no definition of the offence, and a few words ill-reported, perhaps incautiously said, may have the effect of condemning a man to prison. The hon. gentleman has said, that the circumstances of that country are wholly exceptional and that great difficulty has been found. If there has been great danger—I will not say on a single occasion, because I do not think that is ground for passing a Criminal Law of such a character as the present one—those circumstances should be stated plainly to the Committee, so that hon Members can judge by the facts as to whether the state of things is such, as to justify such extraordinary and wholly exceptional legislation as that proposed.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The next clause is a new one. It provides that persons selling ammunition to Indians shall incur a penalty of not more than $200, or shall be liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than six months, or to both fine and imprisonment. This matter was discussed a short time ago on another Bill. Formerly the North-West Police were able to prevent the selling of ammunition to Indians; but since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways, this has been found to be impossible.

Mr. BLAKE. I asked the hon. gentleman for an explanation which was not given before when he alluded to this subject. He said the North-West Mounted Police were able to control the traffic before. Under what provision of the law do the North-West Police control the traffic?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Simply by stopping it.

Mr. BLAKE. But under what law?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say that it was under any particular law.

Mr. BLAKE. Were they authorized from Ottawa?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As a matter of general police they did it.

Mr. BLAKE. But were they ordered to do it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I cannot say.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think they were.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not remember as to that, but at all events they did so as a matter of police regulation.

Mr. BLAKE. I notice there was a statement in the newspapers the other day to the effect that an attempted landing had been made at Metlakatlah, or some such place in British Columbia, and that resistance was made by the Indians with some kind of weapons—I do not know whether they had fixed ammunition or not, but they were formidable enough to prevent the proposed step being taken. Is it proposed to deal with the Indians of British Columbia in this regard at all?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; this does not deal with the Indians there. There was an unhappy state of things at Metlakatlah. And Mr. Powell, Superintendent of Indians, went to the place in a ship of war, accompanied by the gentleman who was appointed to act as agent. The Indians had destroyed a church on the plains near Metlakatlah; and they had resisted every attempt to introduce law or order among them. They had set up a law of their own, and altogether there was an exceedingly unfortunate state of affairs. There had been a semi-religious war between Mr. Duncan, who was formerly the Missionary, and the Bishop of Caledonia. Churches and other property were destroyed, and Mr. Powell went for the purpose of attempting to introduce order, and place Mr. Mackay, who was to act as agent, there, but they were resisted and obliged to leave. There were some 300 men carrying arms of some kind, and they refused to allow anybody near the place. With regard to these unhappy circumstances I may say that I have been in communication with the First Minister of British Columbia, Mr. Symthe, who is now here, and we hope to introduce into Parliament a measure on the subject. He has engaged to appoint a Stipendiary Magistrate, and we hope to be able to suppress the lawlessness which has arisen, and which, unless put down, it is feared by those who know the coast, will extend all along the north-west coast of the main land.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed to deal at all with the supply of fixed ammunition and ball cartridge to the Indians of British Columbia?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is impossible, I fear, to do that, as the coast is open to ships and traders of all kinds.

Mr. BLAKE. Then what is the principle in this clause? I could understand a clause which would prevent the supplying of Indians with fixed ammunition or ball cartridge, but this clause simply prevents anybody supplying to Indians fixed ammunition or ball cartridge, except with the written permission of the Superintendent-General, so that it can be made permissible to sell these arms to the Indians. This might result in one or more persons having a practical monopoly of the supply; it might result in some one or more Indians having fixed ammunition and ball cartridge, while others had not. What is the principle on which the Superintendent-General is to grant permission? Is it to be a permission to such persons as he confides in, as to their soundness of judgment in exercising the power to sell ammunition to the Indians? Is it to be a permission to sell to particular named Indians, or to particular bands of Indians, or what?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is for the purpose of enabling a small supply of fixed ammunition to be given to those Indians who have weapons especially adapted to fixed ammunition and ball cartridges, for the purpose of shooting game. That is, the *rationale* of the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course this ammunition and these cartridges would be of no use except to those Indians who had weapons adapted to them. Some time ago the hon.

gentleman told us of a plan he was devising by which the Indians were to be induced to exchange their Winchesters for the old Snider rifles, or something of that kind. Has the hon. gentleman succeeded in beguiling the wily red men of the forest into making that change?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; not yet.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a new clause for the purpose of putting down the Indian festival known as the "potlach" which is the cause of a great deal of misery and demoralization in British Columbia. The representations made to the Government on this subject, not only by the Indian agent but by the clergy are very strong. They say it is utterly useless, especially on Vancouver Island, where the "potlach" principally exists, to introduce orderly habits while it is in vogue. They meet and carry on a sort of mystery; they remain for weeks, and sometimes months, as long as they can get food, and carry on all kinds of orgies. It is lamentable to read the accounts given by the clergy of British Columbia, and they urge that some legislation on the subject should take place. It was suggested by the clergy there that it would have some effect if the Governor General should issue a proclamation, warning the Indians against this unhappy custom, and though it did have some effect, it was not at all commensurate with the expectations which were founded upon it, and so it is proposed to introduce this clause. I have here a number of statements from both the Catholic and the Protestant missionaries, showing the awful effects of this custom, but I need not trouble the House by reading them.

Mr. BLAKE. I think anybody who has read descriptions of this feast will not doubt that it has a very demoralizing tendency in a great many ways. I have had accounts of men of apparently very considerable financial and commercial power among the Indians of British Columbia, some of whom I believe have accumulated considerable wealth, and it is all dissipated in the insane exuberance of generosity which seems to be encouraged by these meetings. But the custom is a very old and a very inveterate one amongst them; and without at all saying that the case is not ripe for the passage of such a clause as this, it seems to me that one should be very cautious in attempting suddenly to stop, by the harsh process of the criminal law, the known customs and habits of these tribes. I would therefore strongly recommend the hon. gentleman, with reference to the minimum punishment of two months, to alter the clause, so that for the first two years an almost nominal punishment might, if the authorities thought it expedient, be imposed in the first instance. The point to be attained is to the getting the Indians gradually to see that this practice is contrary to the law; and by the force of the trial and a very trifling punishment the first time, with a warning that would spread amongst them that a much severer punishment might be inflicted on the next occasion, would perhaps repress the practice. But the necessity of inflicting two months' punishment might turn out to be a calamitous necessity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion and strike out the words "nor less than two," leaving the maximum, but not the minimum.

Mr. BLAKE. I have another suggestion with reference to the extreme looseness of the provision making those liable to indictment who directly or indirectly encourage an Indian to celebrate the festival, and liable to six months' imprisonment. This is certainly a very vague offence to bring a man for six months to gaol.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know whether this practice prevails universally in British Columbia?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It pervades some of the tribes—I think not all; but Vancouver Island is the chief scene of these disorders. Mr. Lomas, who is a very intelligent agent on the west coast of Vancouver Island, says:

"The two customs are intimately connected, because without a donation (potlach) of food, a dance is never held, and these dances have been sadly on the increase during the present winter, and many young men have impoverished themselves and their families because they had not the moral courage to oppose the customs. Indeed this want of courage or inability to withstand the sneers of the old people always forms one of the greatest drawbacks in the advancement of the native races on the coast. But in the event of any law being passed, it would be advisable to allow a fixed time for its coming into force, as potlaches are in reality a spending of a certain amount of property which has to be returned at an uncertain date with interest, or rather with an additional amount, which at some future date has also to be returned either by the recipient, or if he be dead, by some of his sons. Thus, young men themselves opposed to the custom are often drawn in it, but besides the expenses of the potlach, *i.e.*, food, firewood, and attendance on the guests, a large amount of property is always thrown away, to be scrambled for by the invited guests. Local traders derive a benefit from these gatherings, and often encourage the Indians to keep them up, forgetting that were these Indians working their lands, they would be a constant source of profit instead of being, as now, only an occasional one. A few days ago I called a meeting of all the leading men of Cowichan, Chemainus, and Saanich bands, on the above subject, and the matter was well discussed, but I regret to say only a few had the courage to stand up and say they would give up both customs, and do their best to influence their relatives to do so. Since that time several others have been to request that their names may be added to this list; and as several of these have had land allotted to them, I would suggest that they be supplied with their location tickets at once."

The clergy are exceedingly strong on this subject. Mr. Donckele, the Catholic priest at Cowichan says:

"For many years I entertained the hope that these heathenish practices would have disappeared as soon as the young people adopted the habits of the whites, and applied themselves to the pursuits of various industries; but now I am sorry to state that many of the young men, who for years had improved their fertile lands, built houses and barns on them, and made for themselves and their families an almost independent life, have abandoned their farms and become again the adepts of superstition and barbarism. The evil reached its climax last winter, when some of the most prominent dancers insulted some of their Indian Chiefs, because they insisted on their subjects assuming the habits of the whites and giving up the savage life of their ancestors. With a view to ameliorate the condition of the Indians and provide them with comfort and happiness, I respectfully request you, Sir, in the name of the civilized Indians, to beg the Indian Department to have a law to stop the disastrous practice of potlaching, and especially dancing, as it is carried on by the Indians of Vancouver Island. I am thoroughly convinced that unless stringent measures be taken, every effort will be fruitless; for parents bring up their children in such a way that it is impossible for anyone to inculcate in their minds any moral, social, or industrious knowledge. The only training parents bestow upon their children is concerning the potlaches and dances. During the whole winter, schools are deserted by all those children whose parents attend the dances. When the winter is over they have squandered all their summer earnings, and are compelled to leave their homes and roam about in their canoes in search of food, and thus neglect cultivating their lands and sending their children to school. In the summer they leave again for several months, working abroad to earn a few dollars, in order to give a dance in the winter, and spend in one winter's night the earnings of a whole winter. I have lately visited the Indians residing between Cowichan and Nanaimo, and in every tribe where dancing is kept up there was general complaint of sickness; and, alas, how could it be otherwise, when for about two months they hardly take a night's rest, and when they indulge whole days in ceaseless vociferations."

His statements are very grievous with respect to the chief dances, and I think we must have stringent legislation to put them down.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Not only is it the wish of the clergy that these dances and potlaches should be done away with, but it is the desire of a large number of the Indians on Vancouver Island. Last year I presented a petition to the right hon. the leader of the Government from several hundred Indians on Vancouver Island, expressing the wish that the Government would take some steps to do away with these potlaches, as they were demoralizing in the extreme.

On section 4,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This seems to be a new clause. I would ask why it is introduced, or rather why it was that according to the old Act an Indian desiring to withdraw

from a treaty must sacrifice any annuity he may have received. That is struck out, and now he must give his signification in writing, and the forfeiture is done away with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been represented to the Department that it is desirable that half-breeds who are able and willing to support themselves should be allowed to give up their treaty relations with the Government, and by taking away the annuity, as provided in the old Act, the Government considered it was a bar to enterprise, for the half-breed would not have the same inducement to become self-supporting if obliged to give up his annuity.

On section 5,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is an amendment to the 20th section of the present Act and gives the right to the Indian, a right repeatedly applied for, to devise his property under certain restrictions. The provisions of the present Act will be retained in the case of the Indian who dies intestate, with the proviso that the widow, to be entitled to one-third of the property, must be of good character and have lived with her husband up to the time of his death.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There are two points which are new in this clause. The power given to devise property is new, and it may perhaps be well to give such power. In devising property, however, the consent of the band is required to the Indian making the will. If an Indian dies intestate, the band has nothing whatever to do with the disposition of his property, but the law directs that one-third shall go to his widow and the remainder be devided equally among his children. In the clause giving power to will property, there is no proviso that the widow must have her third, and the Indian under it could devise his property and leave his wife without anything.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If an Indian makes a will, he must get the consent of the band, and then the approval of the Superintendent-General, who would, of course, see that if the woman was a person of proper character and living with the husband at the time of his death, she should get her share.

Mr. PATERSON. But if it is provided that the widow shall get a share when there is no will, should it not also be provided when there is a will. Is it not the common law of the land that the wife shall have her dower?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If an Indian makes a will and it is a reasonable and proper will, subject to the consent of the band as a whole, and to the approval of the Superintendent-General, the will will be made good; and I think, surrounded by these restrictions, the band having an interest in seeing that the widow and children are not thrown on the band, and the Superintendent-General, being the responsible officer, there is not much danger of the children and widow not being protected.

Mr. MILLS. How does the hon. gentleman suppose this clause will be worked out? If an Indian applies to the Superintendent for leave to make a will, must he say how he intends to dispose of his property before he can make the will?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. That would be the will of the Superintendent. If that is the intention of the Government, it should be expressed in the Bill. What the hon. gentleman's intention is would be considered undue influence in the case of anybody else.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does not agree with the hon. member for Brant, who thinks the liberty given the Indian is too great, and that there should be a special provision for the widow to get her dower notwithstanding any will. My hon. friend says the Indian should have no such restrictions.

Mr. MILLS. I do not say that. What I want to know is, what power the hon. gentleman intends to give the Superintendent-General? In Ontario, at least, it is not in the power of a proprietor to devise it in such a way as to deprive his wife of her dower. The difficulty is this: supposing an Indian made a will completely devising all his property and granting a certain specific sum to the wife in lieu of her dower, the Superintendent General might put her in possession of the property no matter how the law may dispose of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I think I will alter that clause to read in this way:

"Any Indian who holds, under location ticket or other duly recognized title, any parcel or parcels of land, &c., may devise the same by will, provided that after his death the said will is consented to by the band owning the reserve, and approved of by the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The understanding of that is, then, that he may make a will such as is proper to him, and after his death, if it is not suitable to the Government or to the band, it is of no avail? That is the intention to let him make such a will as he pleases, but before it can be proved or acted upon the consent of the band and of the Superintendent must be had?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. There is a good deal in what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says. If the Indian cannot make the will without the consent of the band and the Superintendent-General, it will be practically the band and the Superintendent-General who make the will. The thing is to encourage the Indian to assume the responsibility of property. He will make the will with the understanding that it cannot go further out of his family than a second cousin. Then he dies, and if it is a reasonable will, of course the local agent will see that the Indians are impressed with the idea that the will should be adopted.

Mr. PATERSON. Then, supposing the will is not approved, would you not require a clause stating that in that case the rule of property affecting an Indian who dies intestate should apply?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is a very good idea. We might insert:

"In case the will is not assented to and approved as aforesaid, the Indian shall be held to have died intestate."

Mr. PATERSON. I think the third ought to be reserved, but I suppose the Superintendent-General will see that it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, I think so.

Mr. PATERSON. Is there not a danger that the greatest difficulty the Department will experience in the future is in reference to this matter of the holding of lands by Indians? I do not know what this "location ticket or other recognized title" amounts to; I scarcely know what records are kept, but I am aware they have a system of transfers among themselves, and that some of them become possessed of large property and some do not. I suppose the Department are not bound to recognize that, but if it came to a question of the enfranchisement of the Indians, the whole question of the holding of property would be one of the most difficult the Department would have to deal with, and it is a question whether this will not give them a firmer holding than they have now.

Mr. MILLS. I am still of opinion that the Indian ought to have, after a certain time and on certain conditions, the power of dealing with the property to a limited extent, but that the law of real property, as applied to Indians, ought to be so guarded that an Indian could not jeopardize his whole interest at any moment by any mistake he might

make. My observation upon reservations—I do not know how far the hon. gentleman has given attention to the subject—is that there is great inequality in the holding of property amongst the Indians on their reserves; and I believe that a measure somewhat radical in its character will have yet to be adopted with a view to the redistribution of property, to give them all an opportunity of again making a fair start. Then, after that, I think I would give them an opportunity of putting their property in jeopardy for their debts or other obligations, or of renting or disposing of it for a limited period of time, say for five, or six, or seven years, with a provision that, at the end of that time, the property should be free from those obligations, and should again revert to the Indian, if he were living, or in case of his death, to those who, according to law, as the Department thought best it should be provided, would be his heirs. In that way Government would be protected from the possibility of a large number of Indians being left without any visible means of support, or without having any opportunity of earning for themselves a livelihood. When the time comes for their absolute emancipation then they could be put in control of their property the same as the white population, but so long as they are kept as wards of the Government, it seems to me that some opportunity ought to be given them for improvement, but the opportunity ought not to be of so wide a character as to enable the Indian to lose all his possessions. I think it would be well for the Government to deal with the subject from that point of view.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The idea of the hon. gentleman is well worth consideration—not give them the absolute control of their property, because sometimes the Indian, when you give him a momentary advantage, and he feels himself a free man, the first thing he does is to waste his property. However, the idea I shall consider. Of course, I cannot well take it up at this moment. If the Indian has got his location ticket, and thereby shows that he has got individual property, as he must have before he gets the ticket, then he could cumber it or alienate it for a limited period.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 6,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is amended in this way: The old clause provides that if any person or Indian, after having been removed or notified, returns to settle, or hunt, or reside upon, or occupies or uses any of the lots, &c., shall be liable to fine. But in addition to that, it will now run that "any person or Indian, after having been removed or notified, as aforesaid, or after any cattle or other animals owned by him or in his charge, have been removed as aforesaid," &c. Then if the Indian is turned off the reserve and his cattle are put off, we allow his cattle to come back.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice all the words in the first part of the clause are stated again in the convicting portion of it. Now, the hon. gentleman is inserting other words, other things that constitute offences on the part of the Indian in the first clause, and it seems to me it is requisite to have them re-inserted in the convicting part, or else he would not be liable for his cattle; that is, a charge could not be made against him for letting his cattle go back because it would not be in that part of the clause.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. You are right, and we will attend to that.

Mr. MILLS. There ought to be some provision to allow the Indians to sell the surplus products of their soil for the year. The hon. gentleman knows that at present an Indian cannot legally dispose of his grain or cattle without a license or permission from the Superintendent-General, otherwise his sale will be invalid. That is found to be very inconvenient. The clause is impracticable, because the Indians must sell sometimes. With those provisions there is no means of practically carrying the law into operation, because if he applies to the agent how is the agent to know whether he is selling too much or too little, whether he is acting providently or improvidently? Everything must depend to a large extent upon the judgment of the Indian himself, and when you say no one shall sell to him, and that he shall not dispose of his property, it seems to me this clause sufficiently protects him. If you are ever going to fit him for habits of self-reliance you must entrust him with the power to dispose of the surplus products of his industry.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must draw a distinction between the Indians of the North-West and the Indians of the older Provinces. The latter Indians always do sell. The Indians on the Brant settlement always sell what they raise, do they not?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. They sell, but the man to whom they sell takes the risk, and of course deals with them as if he were insuring himself against loss.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can assure the hon. gentleman this clause is absolutely necessary as regards the Indians in Manitoba and the North-West. They did a little last year; they will do it largely this year.

Mr. MILLS. What about the furs?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not as serious. We know well that they sell a great deal of their furs to the traders.

Mr. MILLS. But they get rid of them illegally.

On section 10,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause is for the purpose of empowering the Indian Council to pass rules regulating the attendance at school of children between the ages of six and fifteen years. The Council have general powers to enforce all their laws.

On section 11,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This section is to amend the 75th section of the old Act, by adding thereto the following words, "and no taxes shall be levied on the real property of any Indian, acquired under the enfranchisement clauses of this Act, until the same has been declared liable to taxation by a proclamation of the Governor General, published in the *Canada Gazette*." Experience has shown that many Indians have been prevented from taking advantage of the enfranchisement clauses from fear of being subjected to taxation.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What rights have the Indians under this enfranchisement. If they acquire the same rights as their white brethren they should have the same responsibilities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have not the same rights after they are enfranchised. They have not the right of alienation.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does this confer the right to vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot confer the right to vote, as this power belongs to the different Provinces. An Act was passed by the Ontario Legislature the other day disfranchising all Indians who receive anything from the Government in connection with their reserve.

On section 12,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Grand Indian Council have repeatedly strongly protested against the state of

things under which an Indian, on being convicted of a crime, is not only punished but his annuity is stopped. It seems rather hard that this should be the case, especially as the magistrates do not consider the additional punishment. It is proposed to remedy this state of things.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In this section I think the word "may" should be changed to "shall," in regard to costs being defrayed by the Superintendent-General. Heavy costs have to be paid in some counties in respect of Indian cases, and it seems only a matter of justice that when so much time is taken up with their trials, and when large expenses are involved, the costs should be paid by the Superintendent General. Does not the hon. gentleman think this is a great hardship, as the Indians do not contribute anything to the municipal funds.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should not like to make the change without giving it grave consideration. It might have a prejudicial effect on the Indians themselves.

Mr. MILLS. As my hon. friend says, take a county like Brant, for instance, where there are 7,000 Indians, where the expense is very great, where the lands owned by the Indians are not subject to taxation, it is, no doubt, a burden imposed on the county which they should not be called upon to bear, any more than in any other portion of the country at large. Perhaps it might be regarded as something like a hardship if the annuities belonging to our Indians in bands should bear this burden, but it is not so great an injustice as the imposition of the burden on the white population, who already suffer not a little by having the Indian lands wholly exempted from taxation. I think the law should go to the extent of making the annuities liable for the cost of the trial. I think after the discharge from the gaol he should not be longer deprived of his annuity, unless it be for the purpose of paying the costs the country has been put to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the adoption of that suggestion would make too great an alteration in the law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). While I would be sorry to do anything unjust to the Indians, yet I would point out that the court is taken up one-third, or perhaps one-half its time, with the trial of Indians. If the hon. gentleman looks at the section, he will notice that it is only when a conviction is secured that the Governor General may do this, and I think when the hon. gentleman has drawn the line at that, it does seem to me that it should be made imperative on the Department to pay them in that case. I do not ask the hon. gentleman, as I have urged in days gone by, that all the expenses of the trial of Indians should be treated in that way, but I think it would be only justice to insert the word "shall" instead of "may."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot, without consideration, agree to the amendment. However, I will consider it, and if there be no objection to altering the clause, so that in case of conviction the costs will be paid out of the Indian's own annuity, or may be paid out of the funds of the band, I may adopt it. I wish to get the Bill through, in order to send it to the other House; and if I come to the same conclusion as the hon. gentleman, I dare say I have influence enough to have it introduced in the Senate.

On section 13,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose an amendment to the 95th clause of the existing Act, providing that any person giving the Indians liquor, or an order, verbal or written, shall be liable to the same penalties as if he sold it without such order; and also providing that any person found drunk in any house, tent or wigwam, upon a reserve, if he refuses to leave after being requested to do so by the agent or a constable, shall be liable to the same penalties as if he had supplied intoxicants to Indians, the fines and penalties to be recovered under a similar process. It is also proposed to amend section 95 of the old Act by making a tent or a wigwam used for improper purposes the same as a "house," which is the word used in the Act.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It also makes the frequenter liable as well as the keeper?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

On section 14,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 14th clause is simply to add to the 97th clause of the Act the usual clause on summary convictions—that no conviction shall be quashed for want of form or be removed by *certiorari*, &c., provided there is a good and valid conviction. The 15th clause is an amendment of the 99th section of the Indian Act regarding the enfranchisement of Indians, with the view of facilitating the same. One of the obstructions to enfranchisement is that the majority of the band do not like an intelligent Indian to become enfranchised. Under the present law, an Indian has to obtain the consent of his band to be enfranchised. The amendment provides that the probationary ticket may issue on the authority of the Superintendent-General, after enquiry as to moral character and intelligence; and an Indian admitted to practice law or medicine or who has entered holy orders, &c., may, as already provided by the Act, *ipso facto*, on petition to the Superintendent-General, become enfranchised and receive an allotment from the lands of his band; and a proviso is added that such Indian, if he is not the recognized holder of a location on the reserve by ticket or otherwise, shall first obtain the consent of the band and the approval of the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs to such allotment. This appears to be a proper provision, as it is scarcely proper that he should obtain the allotment without the consent of the band.

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to see that this enfrachisement clause is a step in advance. It is an improvement on the old Act, in so far as it makes it easier for an Indian to become enfranchised. I am afraid, however, that it will still be very difficult for Indians to become enfranchised under this clause, they have to be such a length of time on probation, and have to go through so many formalities, which Indians do not usually understand, and which it is very difficult to make them understand. I think when Indians live like other people, acquire property, build houses, pay taxes, and live as other people do, I think they ought to be considered as enfranchised. Now, the Legislature of Ontario legislates for this Dominion in the matter of elections. At present the law of Ontario is the law of the Dominion. During the last Session, the Legislature of Ontario were legislating in regard to the Indians. In one respect their legislation is very liberal and very just; in another respect, it is very much the reverse—it is very narrow and very unjust. Here is a clause relating to Indians in the Election Act passed at the last Session:

"Indians, or persons with part Indian blood, who are entitled to vote where there is no voters' list, shall be the following, viz: All Indians, or persons with part Indian blood, who have been duly enfranchised; Indians or persons with part Indian blood who do not participate in the annuities, interest, moneys, or rents of a tribe, band, or body of Indians, and do not reside among Indians, subject to the same qualifications, in other respects, and to the same provisions and restrictions as other persons in the electoral districts."

Now, that is a very liberal provision, with the single exception that it excludes Indians who draw annuities from the Government. It cannot be supposed that Indians drawing payment would be under political influences. My experience with Indians is, that they are just like other people—part of them are for a candidate, and part of them are against him. I believe that very few Indians have so far been enfranchised. The Dominion Act so far has not

worked well. I express the opinion now, as I have expressed it before, that it is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, contrary to the system existing throughout this wide Dominion, that there should be such a large number of people as the Indians without representation in this Parliament. The Indians may not on all occasions have a Superintendent-General so devoted to their interest as the distinguished gentleman who now occupies that position; and it probably reflects greater credit on the right hon. Superintendent-General himself than many other great things he has done, that he is taking the part of a people who are not in a position to take their own part. There are several hon. members of this House who deserve great credit for the interest they have taken in these poor people; but I think the Indians will never be properly taken care of until they have, in some shape or other, parliamentary representation, like other classes of Her Majesty's subjects.

On section 16,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not quite understand the reason for this section, which provides for giving the Indians their patent. The old section gives them the patent at the expiration of three years, whereas under this section they will not get it for thirteen years. The old section does not prevent an Indian doing as he pleases with his land. The new section does not allow him to sell, lease, or otherwise alienate his land, unless with the sanction of the Government. In that case why hold back the patent for thirteen years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with the hon. gentleman. I will strike that out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As to whether it is in the interests of the Indians that they should have their lands in fee simple without these restrictive powers preventing their selling, leasing or alienating them, is a question difficult to decide. We are still keeping them in the position of tutelage, and the enfranchisement may please the Indian a little, as the power to will his property may. After all, it seems to me the Indian will only recognize he is a man when he is made to assume the responsibility of manhood. We will have to come to that point in time, that when he becomes enfranchised the lands ought to be his, to deal with as he pleases. I know there is great danger that the white man will get the better of him, but the position of tutelage will prevent that development of manhood in which we can see the only solution of the Indian question applied to settlement in the country. Even the heirs do not get the land in fee simple. There is no provision that they or their heirs shall at any time have the land in fee simple. Would it not conduce to the well-being of the Indian who is enfranchised if his lands should be liable for debts incurred? He wants to make improvements; he feels the impulse of greater liberty; he wants to have a greater right of manhood conceded to him; he wants to make extensive improvements on his lands, and he will be restricted in doing this because his land is not liable for the debts incurred in making these improvements. I have struck a subject in which the Superintendent-General will not agree with me, and I am afraid to urge it too far, but after all I think the Indian will have to have these rights and responsibilities thrown upon him when we give him the other privileges.

Mr. MACKENZIE. However much I would like to see the Indians independent, they must submit to a sort of tutelage system for a long time to come. If they were allowed to dispose of their lands, their lands would soon be taken out of their hands, as they are naturally reckless and improvident in incurring debt, and would be thrown on the community for support. So very few would be fitted to exercise this responsibility, that we could not make the law applicable to the whole.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The safety would lie in the fact that an Indian could not become enfranchised unless by the consent of the Superintendent-General, and supposing a half dozen out of a thousand families were in a position to enjoy those rights, they could not obtain them under this Act.

Mr. MILLS. We can adopt the principle of the survival of the fittest and apply it to the Indians or adopt a tentative policy, one to secure their progress without putting in jeopardy all their possessions. If we adopt the first principle, the vast majority would soon be left without means of subsistence; but I think we have in the history of one people a system upon which real property may be held by the Indian population. In the history of an old and nomadic people taken from the desert, put in possession of real estate, allowed to control it for a certain limited period, with the right of reversion, we find they succeeded in maintaining a Federal Democratic Government extending over a period of over 500 years, although surrounded by a population having a despotic Government and institutions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What case is that?

Mr. MILLS. The laws of Moses applied to the people of Israel. The redistribution, after a certain number of years, secured a Democratic Government amongst them, and prevented the growth of pauperism. I do not see any reason why the same system would not produce similar results among the Indian population. It would be the best experiment the hon. gentleman could try with the Indians. The Indians could rent property for seven or eight years, and would be responsible for their own improvidence; the property would come again into their possession after a certain length of time, and the hardships they endured while out of possession of the property would be a lesson to them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps the Superintendent-General would object to coming under the Mosaic law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am opposed, at all events, to the exodus that the hon. gentleman has been preaching so much about. I am afraid this would not do. I quite agree with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He is quite right in saying that, even if we enfranchise the Indians, it is not likely that 5 per cent of them would keep their property for ten years. The experiment has been tried. It is true that not many have been enfranchised, but there have been some in various parts of the country. The experiment has not been a success. They have lost their property. I have before me another description of people than the Jew—in the Egyptians. There is a nomadic race. They have never had any property. They are vagabonds and wanderers over the face of the earth, and our Indians would be deprived of all property and would be wandering, Egyptian-like, over this continent. I think we must, by slow degrees, educate generation after generation, until the nature of the animal, almost, is changed by the nature of the surroundings. The present law enables an Indian, after the expiration of three years or such longer period as the Superintendent-General deems right, to obtain the issue of letters patent granting him the land in fee simple. That is deemed to be premature. The Indian has not got far enough advanced.

Mr. PATERSON. Have there been any Indians enfranchised under that, and have the evils flowed from it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So it is reported to me. This is more carefully guarded, that, after this patent is issued, the parties shall not alienate the land without the sanction of the Governor in Council. If the Government ascertain that a particular Indian ought to get his patent free of the restriction, he will get it. It seems desirable that the final right of the enfranchised Indian to sell should

only be given by the Governor in Council, which would be after investigation into the facts, and after report to the Superintendent General, and by him.

Mr. PATERSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman to strike out the word "lease." That will not allow the alienation of the lands, but will give the Indian some control over his land, and I do not see that any evil result would flow from it. The enfranchisement should carry some privileges with it, and that might be one. I think it is an advantage to have white people living among the Indians, though the whole Indian law and the action of the Department are against it, I know. It is only disreputable people who rent Indian lands now. Perhaps that is too strong a term, but people renting lands from the Indians do it illegally, and the best class of people will not do it. But, if it were legal to rent their land, there are good farmers who would rent it, and farm it in a way which would show an example to those about them. The Indian would get pay for it, and might be working, perhaps, off his reserve. Thus, a double benefit would be secured, for I hold that it is an advantage if you can induce an Indian by any means to leave the reserve for his own benefit. When the Indians increase, as in my county they do, at one one per cent. per annum, and you have only 54,000 acres there, with an ever increasing population, there is the problem: there will not be land enough for them, and any legislation which will encourage them to leave the reserve and spread out and engage in mechanical pursuits, or prepare themselves, by a course of study, for some of the higher walks, is desirable. I cannot see any objection to giving the enfranchised Indian the power to lease, or at all events the Superintendent-General should not divest himself of the power to allow it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He does not.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported.

SUPPLY.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

IMMIGRATION.

	Salalaries of Immigration Agents and Employés:	
	Agent, Quebec	$1,700 00
	Assistant do	1,100 00
	Clerk do	1,000 00
	Norwegian Interpreter, Quebec	660 00
	Messenger, Quebec	365 00
	Agent, Montreal	1,300 00
	do Ottawa	1,300 00
	do Kingston	1,300 00
	do Toronto	1,650 00
	do Hamilton	1,250 00
	do London, Ont	1,000 00
	do Halifax	1,050 00
	do St. John	1,000 00
	do Manitoba	2,400 00
	do Brandon	1,400 00
49	do Qu'Appelle	1,400 00
	do North-West Territory	1,400 00
	do Prince Arthur's Landing	1,000 00
	do Victoria, B.C	1,000 00
	For Interpreter's salary, Winnipeg	800 00
	do do Qu'Appelle	800 00
	do do Brandon	800 00
	Salaries in London, England, office	6,500 00
	do of Agents in Europe	6,900 00
	Contingencies of Canadian and other Agencies (not European)	30,000 00
	Travelling expenses of Agents in Europe	7,300 00
	Aid to Women's Protection Immigration Society	... .
	Towards assisting Immigration and Immigration expenses	450,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what system is the hon. gentleman proceeding in granting these increases?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. McLELAN. Length of service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it intended that the salaries shall increase at the rate of $50 a year?

Mr. McLELAN. The increases have been given on length of service, after full consideration of each case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is not the intention of the Government to increase the salaries year after year?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are any agents employed in Germany or France?

Mr. McLELAN. One is employed, Dr. Hahn.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Out of what amount is he paid.

Mr. McLELAN. Out of the bulk sum for immigration purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. It is always a very difficult thing to unravel the immigration vote, as some salaries are paid out of the bulk sum and some out of special votes. I desire to enquire whether any different system will be pursued this year in regard to continental immigration, consequent on the report of the High Commissioner.

Mr. McLELAN. The system proposed to be pursued is very much the same as that which has been followed hitherto, namely, that of distributing immigration literature and agents' work in the different localities in which they are placed.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I desire to draw attention to one or two circumstances in connection with the European branch of the immigration business. On turning to the Auditor-General's Report for last year, I notice that in every case there has been an over-expenditure in connection with the salaries and expenses of the various agencies. Take for instance the salaries of the immigration agents in Europe. $18,700 was granted, while the expenditure was $24,000 and a fraction. So it is all the way through, both in London and on the continent of Europe. In regard to contingencies, there is an increase from $24,000 to $30,000. In fact, on the expenditure on agencies, for which $61,000 was voted, there was an over-expenditure of no less than $23,000. At that time the vote devoted to immigration purposes was $250,000, and in anticipation of an increased immigration, $25,000 was voted in the Supplementary Estimates, and in consequence of the withdrawal of certain aid from Ontario, $29,000 more was voted. While $23,000 additional expenditure was made by the agencies, the increased immigration did not come, because the amount voted for transportation expenses were not taken up, only $3,000 or $4,000 being used out of a total vote of $29,000. I think there is an opening for explanation in regard to these items. We are rapidly approaching the time when it will be necessary to revise our whole immigration system. We are drifting in the direction of receiving an inferior class of immigrants and spending a great deal more money upon them.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand the gross sum of the vote has not been exceeded; that the expenditure on some particular departments has exceeded what was estimated, while in others it has fallen short of the amount

Mr. BAIN. (Wentworth). I would draw attention to the fact that last year the vote was increased very considerably. I referred, however, to the remarkable fact that the salaries and contigencies had increased so much more rapidly than the figures relating to the transportation of immigrants, showing that we did not receive corresponding returns.

Mr. McLELAN. The salaries have not increased within the last year, but in previous years there has been an expenditure paid out of the bulk sum, of which the hon. gentleman speaks.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). There is another item which the hon. gentleman will find by turning to the expenditure which is made for the general expenses of transporting immigrants. There is about $19,000 for special and exceptional travelling expenses, entirely separate from the vote which is taken for those expenses. It does seem to me that our agents are spending a good deal of their time in going back and forth at the public expense.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman explain why Dr. Hahn, of Reutlingen, is paid out of the bulk sum, instead of the sum appropriated for agents?

Mr. McLELAN. Because he is a temporary agent.

Mr. BLAKE. How long has he been an agent?

Mr. McLELAN. About three or four years.

Mr. BLAKE. At an annual salary?

Mr. McLELAN. At a nominal salary of $500.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, if a man is three or four years in the Service, and is still in the Service, and likely to remain there, I do not think the circumstance that his employment is called temporary is any justification for not paying him out of the vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that Dr. Hahn is a gentleman of very high standing, character and ability, in a very important district, and there is no doubt that his services have been extremely useful. At the same time, his salary is really only nominal. It is a nominal compensation for services which are considered very important, and still it was not considered desirable to put him in the same position as the permanent employés of the Department, because it was only paid to secure the aid and co-operation which has been zealously rendered, both as a public writer and as a gentleman whose position enables him to exercise a wide influence on a very large number of immigrants, whom it would be impossible to reach in any other way. I had the pleasure of meeting with him and discussing the subject very fully, and I have no hesitation in saying, that in so far as I was able to judge, it would be a great misfortune at present to lose his services for the small amount expended.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not objecting to his employment. We have no means of judging whether his employment was wise or foolish, whether his services are good or not. I only pointed out that we have a vote for the salaries of agents in Europe. He is not paid out of that vote; the vote is not made large enough to pay him, and he is paid out of the bulk sum. I object, on general principle, to there being proposed a bulk sum of $450,000, of which an indefinite amount is used for the payment of salaries of officers. I say that whether his compensation is $500 or $5,000, if the sum asked for the salaries of agents is not large enough to cover his salary, it should be increased, and we should not have salaries paid out of other votes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman, on general principles, is perfectly right, and it was because these matters on the continent are, to a certain extent, inchoate and experimental, that it was not thought desirable to embrace him in the list of regular employés, at least until these matters had assumed a more permanent and definite character. There is no doubt that we should show what are the salaries of all these employés, and it would be better to embrace them in the one vote.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, this arrangement has lasted three or four years; and I am sorry to say we are given no names on this list, and we have always great difficulty in reducing this vote to anything like order. All we have is a general statement for European agents, and when we enquire if that is to pay for all these agents, we are told it does not, because one is paid out of the bulk vote. Will the hon. gentleman say who are the agents who are paid out of this $6,900, and what is paid them?

Mr. McLELAN. There are John Dyke, Liverpool; Thos. Grahame, Glasgow; Chas. Foy, Belfast; Thos. Connolly, Dublin; and J. W. Down, Bristol. There is also a Scandinavian agent, $1,200.

Mr. BLAKE. Where is the Scandinavian agent?

Mr. McLELAN. That office is not filled yet.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it a new office?

Mr. McLELAN. It is proposed to vote that sum to pay for agents in Scandinavia.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any other salary which is not included in the vote for salaries, except Dr. Hahn?

Mr. McLELAN. Not in Europe.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the continental work as I mentioned before, the Commissioner states in his report numerous points to be attended to and arrangements to be made, for the purpose of improving our condition with reference to continental immigration. I should like to know whether anything, and what has been done in the direction indicated by the Commissioner, with reference to the immigration for this coming spring?

Mr. McLELAN. I believe no arrangements have been completed.

Mr. BLAKE. The Commissioner says:

"I may add, in conclusion, that in my opinion the objects to be aimed at in order to obtain a fair share of German immigration, are a treaty between Great Britain and Germany, under which immigrants to Canada shall enjoy the same immunity on visiting Germany that those have who become American citizens."

That is one point; then he says:

"Obtaining from the Prussian and Bavarian Governments concessions to the leading Canadian lines of steamers, to enable them to have agencies and book immigrants in Germany."

That is the second point:

"To induce the North German Lloyds to put on a steamer monthly from Hamburg to Montreal."

That is the third point:

"And to secure a rate of passage from New York to the Canadian North-West, not higher than that to the Western States."

That is the fourth point:

"It would also be very desirable, if practicable, for a time to set apart a tract of land where German emigrants might be associated together."

That is the fifth point:

"The same thing applies to Swiss emigrants."

That is the sixth point.

Mr. McLELAN. No definite action has been taken on any of these points.

Mr. BLAKE. On none of these points.

Mr. McLELAN. None.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, dear. Well, does the hon. gentleman expect to get a share of the emigration from these places, because the hon. Minister says that in order to get that these things must be done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that these points are all being dealt with by the Department. The effort that was made—and it was considered very important to obtain

concessions by which the Allan Line and the Dominion Line of steamships should be allowed to book passengers in Germany, has failed. That is a subject which one does not want to discuss at very great length, because the communications were to some extent confidential; but I need not say to hon. gentlemen opposite that the German Government are very much opposed to any emigration at all. They do not favour it in any way; on the contrary, they are very unwilling that people should leave Germany, and every obstruction is thrown in the way of their doing so. The German emigrants are a very valuable class, and we are very anxious to obtain such numbers of them as can be induced to come to this country. They are hardy, well adapted to our climate, industrious, frugal, and in every way a very desirable class. But the feeling in Germany is not only opposed to emigration, but is every day becoming more hostile to it. Every effort has been made to obtain concessions from the German Government, and I may say that I have had the hearty co-operation of Lord Granville and the British Government in these efforts. The concession that was given to the United States, or rather to an American line of steamers, to have agents in Germany and to book passengers is, I believe, the only concession of the kind that has been granted to any foreign line of steamers or any foreign country. While I was in the country, I found that a very stringent order had been issued by the Prussian Government prohibiting even the exhibition of placards pointing out the desirability of emigration to Canada. The Government are making every possible effort to overcome that restriction, and to obtain that for Canada which has been so advantageous to the United States— the means of advertising. No large number of emigrants can be obtained, in Germany at any rate, except through the medium of agents. The steamship agents have practically the control of emigration from the country upon any large scale. With reference to the question of naturalization, or rather denaturalization, people leaving Germany and going to the United States under the treaty between the United States and Germany enjoy advantages which emigrants leaving Germany and coming to Canada have not. Under that treaty, the naturalization in the United States gives them immunity from the obligations that otherwise would devolve upon returning emigrants, which does not exist in the case of persons who come to Canada. There have been, of course, a great many difficulties in connection with it, because parties are naturalized here after three years' residence, whereas in the United States they require five. There was a great deal of difficulty in obtaining that treaty on the part of the United States, and I suppose there will be great difficulty in extending it to Canada, unless the same period is adopted for the purpose of naturalization in Canada that has been adopted in the United States. With reference to the lines of steamships—the North German Lloyds—the United States have a very great advantage, in the fact that they have a first-class line of steamers, recognized by every intelligent person in Germany as a first-class line, sailing direct from Germany to the United States, and of course that gives them very great advantage. It is impossible for a smaller line of steamers, with less complete arrangements, to at all compete, especially owing to the circumstance that the agents of lines of steamships coming to Canada have not the advantage of booking emigrants to this country. These are all points of importance that bear very directly upon the question of obtaining immigrants from that country, and no efforts have been or will be spared in endeavouring to carry this scheme to a successful termination. I am obliged to be, to a certain extent, reticent, because the negotiations had between the representatives of the German Government and myself are, to a certain extent, confidential, and the information obtained in that connection such as would hardly have been obtained if it was intended that it should be made public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has explained fully that nothing at all has been done as to the treaty and the concessions to the Canadian lines.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that nothing was done, but nothing has been brought to a successful issue.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, nothing has been accomplished. He, however, has not stated what steps have been taken with reference to the North German Lloyds placing a monthly steamer on our route.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The difficulty is, that it would probably require a very large subsidy, but that matter has been a subject of discussion between the North German Lloyds and the Government of Canada, and I attach the greatest possible importance to an arrangement being effected by which one of the steamers will be despatched monthly direct to Canada. If that should be obtained, I am quite sure it would enable us to take hold of a very large number of immigrants from Germany, that would not probably be obtained in any other way.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any progress been made in that line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a mere question of amount. By giving a sufficient sum, of course we could obtain a monthly steamer.

Mr. BLAKE. The next question is, as to securing a passage from New York to the Canadian North-West, on terms not higher than to the Western States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has practically been accomplished. Recent arrangements have been made, by which emigrants coming to New York can obtain a very reduced rate of passage and be carried into the North West on quite as favourable terms as to the Western States.

Mr. BLAKE. What about the question of having separate tracts on which German emigrants might be settled.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a very great objection on the part of this Government to isolating particular nationalities in sections of country. We do not consider it desirable to bring together large numbers of persons of a particular nationality in a single district. It is much better for the general development of the country that parties should be freely intermixed. In the next place, it is difficult to do this, because the only means by which it can be done is to isolate a section of country and practically lock it up for settlement, except to a particular class. A great difficulty has occurred in that way; still it has been met to some extent by enabling parties to make application six months in advance for a certain limited district, and in that way a large number of people may be brought out from one section. I find that in Switzerland, in Holland, in Germany, there is a very strong feeling that we could promote the bringing out of large numbers of useful and valuable emigrants, by giving them the prospect of being in the one neighbourhood, and having intercommunication with each other after they came into the country. I represented that strongly, and measures have been taken to accomplish it to some extent, by enabling agents to make applications for certain districts six months in advance, so as to give them an opportunity of holding them until they can bring out the parties they had arranged to settle on them.

Mr. BAIN. I regret to hear the statements of the hon. Minister in reference to German emigration. For the last five or six years it has been a matter of interest to the Immigration Committee here, how to secure a share of that immigration. When I look at the report of last year, I find we have expended nearly $5,000 in agents' salaries and travelling expenses to secure that continental emigration, and yet when we look at the numbers who reach our shores, we cannot help seeing that our expenditure is not yielding us any return. The most effective agents of German immigra-

tion are the Germans settled here, who encourage their friends to come out; and considering the difficulties that surround German emigration, I was in hopes we would have secured a share of it by this means. After five or six years steady labour, the whole returns of German emigrants who landed at the port of Quebec, our chief immigrant port, including those who went to the United States, show altogether but 1,500. The Scandinavian emigration makes a still worse display. Last year but 4,700 continental immigrants landed at Quebec, a number of whom went to the United States; the year before 9,600 and the previous year 7,000 landed at Quebec. These figures show very unsatisfactory results for the large expenditure of money we are making on the continent. Our expenditure in connection with the agencies in Europe last year was over $16,000, not speaking of Dr Hahn's special services and some other allowance not included in that. It is high time to consider whether some other means should not be attempted by which we might more effectually accomplish the object we have in view. I think we are simply throwing away our money in trifling expenses there and elsewhere on the continent, with very unsatisfactory results.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying—first, that this is a very desirable class of emigration, and secondly, that the most successful emigrant agents that you can possibly have are the persons in the country, who write to their friends at home as to the character of the country. My hon. friend will see that in that statement he has given the key to the whole difficulty. The fact that the United States have for many years had a most attractive country, presenting to emigrants means of establishing themselves in successful and prosperous homes, and creating hundreds of thousands of the best class of agents, shows my hon. friend where the advantage is, and why it is that they should have the means of attracting so many more persons from Germany and Scandinavia than is possible to Canada, which only yesterday, as it were, was able to present equal attractions to those presented by the United States. My hon. friend will see that it is a matter of slow growth to draw people into the country and to obtain their aid and co-operation. Until that is done, until we have the opportunity of obtaining that influence which will always be a widening and increasing influence, and with the great disadvantage we labour under, of having no line of steamships that is allowed to expose advertisements for emigrants to come to Canada or that dares to book them in Germany, we must always have greater difficulty in obtaining that class of emigrants than the United States, and we must be content to move slowly; but I hope surely, by taking every opportunity in our power of presenting the advantages that Canada possesses as a field for emigration, drawing, if we cannot large numbers, small numbers into our country, and thus obtaining their aid and co-operation in the communications that they will send back to their friends. I can tell my hon. friend that last year, small as he considers the results to have been, we have had the most gratifying evidence that large numbers of communications have been sent back to Germany, to Switzerland, to Norway, to Sweden, and to Finland, from successful emigrants who have come to this country, and have written back in the most glowing terms to their fellow-countrymen, that no country in the world presents greater attractions than Canada; and I have no doubt that every year, making such progress as we can, greater numbers of these people will be attracted to our country. But we have been, as I have pointed out, under great disadvantage, and we cannot expect to obtain very great results in a very rapid manner until these disadvantages can be removed.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I certainly agree with the Minister when he says that, so far as the German immigration is concerned, while the growth is slow, it is a growth There is a little increase for a number of years, although it is very slow from German ports. With reference to the news, the good news, the glowing reports that may have been sent home to their friends by the Scandinavians who have immigrated into this countay in former years, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to the report of the immigration from the Scandinavian countries. In 1881, it was 9,600; in 1882, 8,200; in 1883, it had fallen to 4,700. There may be exceptional circumstances that do not appear in the report to account for the decrease, but I should hope that that decrease would not be an index of the nature of the reports which have been sent home to their friends from this country.

Mr. HESSON. My hon. friend might have gone a little further. It might have encouraged the Committee in the work they have in view, which is to expend a little, as I think the evidences are fairly in favour of a very reasonable growth. If my hon. friend had gone a little further back, he would have found that the Scandinavian immigration in 1876 was 1,157; in 1877, 1,004; in 1878, 1,538; in 1879, 2,873; in 1880, 7,402—it appears as if we were getting something for our money—in 1881, 9,600; in 1882, 8,279. It is true that, in 1883, it had fallen to 4,763.

Mr. BAIN. Will my friend explain that, please.

Mr. HESSON. Still it is more than in the very best years previous to the expenditure in that direction. Now, if we deal with the German immigration—and I am sure my friend is equally anxious with myself and every members of this House to have that immigration encouraged as much as possible, as that of a very desirable class—I think we will find much to encourage us. In 1876, the number of German immigrants arriving at Quebec was 104; in 1877, 84; in 1878, 238; in 1879, 349; in 1880, 307; in 1881, 530; in 1882, 1,024 and in 1883, 1,434. Now, I think these are very gratifying figures, and my friend might as well have given the Committee some encouragement, by showing that it is gradually improving, and that the very work he has, I am sure, as much at heart as we have, is very encouraging. I hope the expenditures are not unfairly expended in the interests of developing that very desirable class of immigration.

Mr. McLELAN. The information in the Department is, that in no year has there been so large a remittance of money from the Germans and Scandinavians in the Dominion for the purpose of bringing out there fellow-countrymen as in this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the increase in the contingencies and other agencies, not European, caused by?

Mr. McLELAN. For some eight or ten years the sum had been put down at $24,000 and the balance paid out of the lump sum. In conformity with the request of the Auditor, the amount has been put in that has been expended during the past year as the estimate for next year.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the general nature of these contingencies?

Mr. McLELAN. Working expenses of all the agencies, not including salaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is rather vague.

Mr. BLAKE. Does it include any disbursements for services, any printing expenses or travelling expenses—what is the general character of it?

Mr. McLELAN. No printing expenses. General expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it travelling, then?

Mr. McLELAN. At all the agencies where the immigrants arrive there are expenses connected with the care of them. It is expenses of this nature.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it virtually food and clothing bestowed upon these immigrants who arrive, or what is it?

Mr. McLELAN. Meals furnished to immigrants on the other side, as well as upon this, but no clothing.

Mr. BLAKE. It is principally for food supplied to immigrants on the other side?

Mr. McLELAN. Largely that.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion of the whole $30,000 is for food?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not in a position to state what proportion that forms of the whole.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It certainly cannot be bestowed on the other side of the Atlantic, because I find in the Report it is expended in Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Kingston and all the rest of the places here, and that the sums put down for contingencies amount to $29,957 for those on this side of the water entirely. Is the hon. member sure that travelling expenses do not form a large part of this—that these immigrants are not forwarded on?

Mr. McLELAN. This is made up of the general care of the offices in connection with the arrival of the immigrants —with cleaning of the offices, and all the minor expenses connected with all the agencies throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, Mr. Chairman, we know about as much as we did before. In point of fact, the Minister's explanation is that contingencies are contingencies. How is the amount of $7,300, for travelling expenses of agents in Europe, divided up? Is that the continental agents, or the English agents travelling on the continent, or what?

Mr. McLELAN. This is the expenses of the English agents.

Mr. BLAKE. Travelling in the United Kingdom?

Mr. McLELAN. Their general travelling, both on the continent and the United Kingdom.

Mr. BLAKE. How much is supposed to be expended in continental travelling?

Mr. McLELAN. There is no particular sum limited for the Kingdom or the continent, but it is made up of an average not to exceed $4 a day. The expenditure in the Liverpool office last year was—Mr. Dyke, £1,114; Mr. Grahame, £509; Mr. Boyd, £435, and so on.

Mr. BLAKE. Are these all pounds sterling?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the scale?

Mr. McLELAN. Not to exceed $4 a day.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that the allowance besides the moving expenses, or what?

Mr. McLELAN. That includes all the expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. Including railway fares, and so on?

Mr. McLELAN. That is the total allowance, including railway fares.

Mr. BLAKE. How much was Dyke's?

Mr. McLELAN. £1,114 4s. 6d.

Mr. BLAKE. How many days are there in a year?

Mr. McLELAN. He made a special journey to the continent and therefore it is a larger sum.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the sum of £5,000.

Mr. VAIL. Is there a resident now in Germany, or is Mr. Dyke in the habit of going over to Germany from time to time?

Mr. McLELAN. He goes over from time to time, under the directions of the Minister. Dr. Hahn, in Germany, is not on the permanent staff.

Mr. BLAKE. How is it that such a large sum appears to be spent in travelling expenses on the part of two or three of these persons? It does not cost more to travel on the continent than it does in England.

Mr. McLELAN. As I said before, special expenses were incurred by Mr. Dyke in travelling on the continent, and then there was Mr. Grahame's office expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see how a man could expend $15 a day all the year round in travelling.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that Mr. Dyke is an extremely valuable officer: he is most energetic and painstaking, and early and late is engaged in every possible way in advancing the interests of Canada, and I think it will be found that his expenses embrace the employment of a clerk. If my hon. friend were to visit Mr. Dyke's office, and see how multifarious are the duties he has to perform, the persons with whom he has to communicate, and the great correspondence he has to carry on, I think my hon. friend would be the last to complain of the remuneration he receives. I do not believe there is an officer of Canada who renders more valuable service for the amount of money he receives than Mr. Dyke.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Dyke's salary has been voted, and I presume it is what the Government think his services are worth. No one objects to that. Then we ask what the contingencies are, and we are told those contingencies of $30,000 are for travelling expenses. I ask what is the scale for travelling expenses, and I am told they are not to exceed $4 per day. Then I ask what is the amount, and I am told one officer gets £1,095 in England, a year, for travelling expenses. Then the Minister says there were special expenses. Now, Mr. Dyke, who has so much to do, cannot be travelling all the time when he is at work in Liverpool. Therefore, there are fewer days, and therefore the rates of travelling must be still higher—unless he travels all the time. The question is, how does he spend all this money.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in saying he expends all this money.

Mr. BLAKE. I have it from the Minister.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no such amount as $30,000 paid for travelling expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. I am speaking of this £1,095 paid to Mr. Dyke.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It includes office expenses; there is a very large office, and an enormous amount of work to be done. There is an important office in the heart of Liverpool to be maintained; it is thronged with people from Monday morning till Saturday night. Various products of the country are displayed in it, and there is an enormous amount of literature distributed, which requires the employment of assistance. This is not an unreasonable sum to pay a clerk and the travelling expenses of Mr. Dyke when he is obliged to visit the continent on business with the agents there.

Mr. BLAKE. We must take the information as we get it. I asked what this £1,095 was for, and I was told it was for travelling expenses. I asked how it was that there was special expenses, because Mr. Dyke was under the Depart-

ment, and now the hon. gentleman says it is partly for the office. We want to know how much for one, and how much for the other.

Mr. McLELAN. I spoke before I had received all the information regarding Mr. Dyke's special service on the continent. Afterwards I learned that another portion of the sum was used in expenses for the office. We have the details of all that money, and can show them to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. VAIL. I would like to ask what sort of information is given to the immigrants on the other side—whether any inducements are held out for them to come to the Lower Provinces, or whether they are all advised to go to Ontario and the North-West. The reason I ask is because a letter was written on this subject by a gentleman in England addressed to one of the papers of Nova Scotia, and as it is very short I will read it. It is dated 26th of February, and it says :

"Allow me to trouble you with the correction of an error on the part of the printer of the letter I wrote to the Colchester *Sun* on the subject of immigration to Nova Scotia. The mistake unfortunately is a serious one, as it makes out Mr. Colmer to have said what he never said at all. The correction is as follows : In place of my having written 'yet as a friend (not as a friend, as you will imagine, of Nova Scotia, but of me) he advises no one to settle in Nova Scotia' I wrote 'Yet as a friend (not as a friend as you will imagine of Nova Scotia, but of me) he advised me not to settle in Nova Scotia.'

"This describes what actually took place, and fortunately my wife was present with me so that my version of the affair does not rest upon my unsupported testimony. The fact speaks for itself that we went to the Commissioner's office that day, thinking only of settling in Nova Scotia, and so completely were we influenced against such a step that we immediately wrote off to Galt, Ontario, to friends there, about staying with them while we took steps to settle in Ontario. However, shortly after, very providentially, we made the acquaintance of the Hon. P. C. Hill, at Ilfracombe, Devon, and after conference with him reconsidered our decision.

"I will only trouble you with one word more. I am at a loss to understand why an enquirer, visiting the Canadian Commissioner's office in London should have given to him a voluminous catalogue of farms for sale in Ontario, whilst no such inducement is held out with regard to Nova Scotia."

I read this letter so that the High Commissioner may take a note of it and make enquiries, because it seems to me that if immigrants desire to settle in Nova Scotia, they should have information furnished them as to whether they will have an opportunity, after arriving there, to purchase farms or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for bringing up this matter, which I regard as one of very considerable importance. The moment I saw a statement made by a member of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, in which he gave the letter which the hon. gentleman has just read, I addressed a letter to Mr. Colmer, enclosing the hon. gentleman's statement and asking him for an explanation. I may say that the interview in question took place before I had the honour of holding the position of High Commissioner. It was held, a considerable time ago, I think in 1882; and in reply to my communication, Mr. Colmer stated he was unable to remember the interview. When I tell hon. gentlemen that in the course of a week, as many as hundreds of persons have interviews in regard to immigration matters, at my office in London, they will see that it is not very easy to remember all the personal details of a conversation that took place more than a year ago. Mr. Colmer stated that he did not recollect what had taken place, but he forwarded to me the letter which he received from this gentleman, and the answer which he had sent to him. Certainly there was nothing in the correspondence of which to complain. Before Mr. Colmer received my letter he saw in a newspaper reference to this matter and he had voluntary explained it. Subsequently he received my letter, and made that communication an official reply, which I shall have great pleasure in laying on the Table of the House, together with the other letter. It is quite possible that in conversation Mr. Colmer may have dealt somewhat more emphatically and enthusiastically on one section of the Dominion than another. I am free to inform the Committee that if there is not more complete and authentic information in regard to Nova Scotia at the disposal of the High Commissoner in London, I think the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) is very much to blame for it. What has Ontario been doing? She has sent her agents abroad. When I was at the the Royal Agricultural Exhibition at York, I found an energetic agent of the Ontario Government availing himself of every opportunity to place literature in the hands of the public who visited the exhibition of Canadian products, and of pointing out the enormous advantages possessed by Ontario over those of any other Province. If the hon. member for Digby, who occupied an important and responsible position in the Nova Scotia Government, and who has long been recognized as one of the leading members of his party, that party which had control of the Province since Confederation down to the present day, with the exception of a short period—if they had followed the example of Ontario in distributing information and pointing out the great advantages of the Province—and Nova Scotia undoubtedly possesses enormous attractions and great natural advantages—if those hon. gentlemen had done their duty to the Province there would have been no ground for complaint. Because the High Commissioner's office, instead of containing an old pamphlet published years ago, containing a very meagre description of the Province, justice would have been done to that most important section of this great Dominion. I therefore think the hon. member for Digby is greatly to blame. He will find, however, in the pamphlet just prepared, which has the great advantage of bearing the *imprimatur* of the Imperial Government, a pamphlet prepared by Mr. Colmer under my direction, that every possible justice is given to Nova Scotia—and this is the only pamphlet published for general circulation—and the great attractions and advantages which that Province presents are depicted in the most striking light. This result has been largely accomplished through the energy and enterprise, not of the Government of Nova Scotia, but of a private individual, Mr. Wm. Prior, one of the most intelligent and able citizens of Halifax, who sent me a pamphlet in which he detailed all these various advantages; and having culled from it a number of its most important and attractive features, the pamphlet itself was forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture, and is now in the press, to be published by this Government for the purpose of giving Nova Scotia the benefit of having its advantages portrayed by one of its own citizens in the most glowing colours warranted by the opportunities presented to immigrants. I am glad to be able to give the hon. gentleman this evidence that the Government are not wanting, that the High Commissioner is not wanting, and that Mr. Colmer is not wanting, in efforts to attract the emigrant to that most important field for emigration, Nova Scotia.

Mr. VAIL. I did not intend to find fault with the management of the emigration office in London. I was merely calling the attention of the High Commissioner to this letter, written by a gentleman who is a reliable man and a barrister of Lincoln's Inn. No doubt it will be very gratifying to the hon. gentleman to know that so long as I had anything to do with the Government of Nova Scotia, we kept a paid agent in England, and succeeded in obtaining a considerable number of emigrants for Nova Scotia. But instead of that course being taken by the present Government, they dismissed that gentleman, who was paid a certain sum for acting as agent for Nova Scotia as well as agent for the Dominion, and Nova Scotia has not had an agent there since. I can well understand that Ontario, a rich Province, is able

to keep an agent in England and distribute literature there. It is not so with Nova Scotia. Up to a certain time the Dominion Government granted to the smaller Provinces a certain sum from the Dominion Treasury, to be expended for immigration purposes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You stopped that.

Mr. VAIL. That was withdrawn; and in consequence of the straitened circumstances of the smaller provinces they were not in a position to keep immigration agents on the other side of the Atlantic. Now, I do not hesitate to say that the immigration which we want there is of a very limited character, and of a limited class. We do not want mechanics, nor do we want artisans to any extent. We want a certain kind of agriculturists, who are able to bring a little money into the country to purchase the farms of the people who have been obliged to leave the Dominion of Canada, in consequence of the course pursued by the Dominion Government, and take the place of the people who have been driven out. I say we want people of that class to a limited extent. Now, it is a very easy matter for the Immigration Office in London to inform people, when they go there asking for information with regard to Nova Scotia, to tell them that there is every advantage offered in that Province for that particular class of immigrants; and all I desire of the High Commissioner is, that when people go to his office who want to come to Nova Scotia, and who desire information with respect to that Province, he should be prepared to give them the same information with regard to that Province as he gives respecting other Provinces, to those who think of emigrating to them. I do not think that is at all unreasonable, considering that he is a Nova Scotian himself; and I hope that in the future the interests of Nova Scotia will be quite safe in his hands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What does the hon. gentleman want? The other day, fault was found because immigrants were sent to Nova Scotia.

Mr. VAIL. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the statement was made that Nova Scotia was not a place for immigrants. Just now he has said that the people of Nova Scotia were starved out, in consequence of the policy of the Government, and had to go away. He claims that we did not encourage emigration, and still we are starving out the people so that they go away. The honesty of the plan of the hon. gentleman is exhibited in this way: he says the people are starved out, but he wishes the people to come from England to take their places, and be starved out, too. That is the statement. In the first place, he objects that the Dominion Government do not work hard enough to bring immigrants into Nova Scotia, and then he says that those who are there already are being starved out and are going to the United States, and he wishes us to bring out new men to take the places of those who went away to avoid starvation. Then he also says we drove away the immigration agent who was there in his time, Mr. Annand. Now, how much did Nova Scotia pay of his salary? Did it pay anything?

Mr. VAIL. I think, $2,000. At all events, he received a certain sum from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which I think in the aggregate amounted to $2,000 or else Nova Scotia paid that amount alone.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says also that the Government of the Dominion had formerly contributed to the expenses of immigration in the different Provinces, and he complains of that. He did that; his own Government, Mr. Mackenzie's Government, are to blame. We paid until we went out in 1872; and when we came back, we paid the balance which the hon. gentleman declined to pay when he was there. You may judge of the justice of the hon. gentleman's statement from that fact.

Mr. VAIL. I was not complaining of this money being withdrawn. I was only giving it as a reason why it was not continued on the other side. Now, the hon. gentleman thinks it strange that we should say that we want people to come into the country and take the place of those going away. Why, Sir, that is the way the Government have been acting all the time, bringing people into the country to take the place of those who have been going from Ontario and the other Provinces, to the United States, and they have scarcely been able to supply their places. All we want in Nova Scotia is a few, at any rate, to take the places of the great many who have been driven out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fact of the matter is, that for the last ten years, for every four or five immigrants you have bought into the country and paid for, you have not kept one. That is shown by the Census return. I say that the Census return of the last ten years, as laid on the Table, show that conclusively. If the hon. gentleman chooses to look at them and study them, as he never has done yet, he will see it for himself. We brought in 342,000 odd in the last ten years, and the Census shows that we have not kept more than 80,000 or 90,000. That is the result of the Census returns. Does the hon. gentleman doubt it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let the hon. gentleman take the Census returns of 1881. I will give him the details if he likes. Does the hon. gentleman admit them, or does he want them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall be glad to have them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman does, I will give them, though I doubt it considerably.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is hardly parliamentary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said I doubt; I do not deny. The fact was that in our old Provinces in 1871 we had a foreign-born population of about 593,000. We got 342,000 into Canada between 1871 and 1881 and even if you choose to allow 120,000 deaths among the foreign-born population, which is a very large number, you find that in 1881 we had 27,000 less, by these returns, in the old four Provinces; so that, practically speaking, of these 342,000, whom we paid for and brought into the country, we only succeeded in keeping about 90,000. Now, those figures are taken from the Census returns of 1871 and 1881.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How many went to Manitoba, and how many died?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Only 18,000 or 19,000 Europeans went to Manitoba, and I have allowed a reasonably large death rate. We have 27,000 less in 1881 in the four Provinces of foreign-born population than in 1871. That is the result, after nominally bringing in 342,000. That shows that the whole system is rotten and defective to the base. I hope the hon. gentleman representing the Minister of Agriculture will be able to give some more intelligible account than his report gives of the 133,000 people they say they brought into the country last year, and of whom I do not believe 20,000 have stayed here. I would like to ask what is going to be done with this sum of nearly half a million, which is to be spent towards assisting immigration and immigration expenses.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not suppose the system will differ very greatly from the system pursued in past years. The money will be expended in the transport of immigrants in assisted passages and in the publication of literature setting

forth the claims of the Dominion to intending immigrants. The question was asked what are the instructions to the immigrant agents. I may say that written instructions are given to present the attractions generally of the Dominion. If enquiry is made regarding any particular Province, information is given respecting that Province. The Province of Ontario had an immigrant agent at the Fisheries Exhibition. He applied for a stand, and I allotted him one for the distribution of his literature. It was brought to my notice that he was presenting the attractions of Ontario at the expense of the other Provinces, and representing that Ontario was the only Province of the whole Dominion worth visiting. When I heard of this, I gave him to understand that he might present the attractions of Ontario alone, but that he must not disparage the other Provinces, and that if he wished to take that course he must leave the building. The instructions we have given to the agents have been to present the claims of the Dominion at large, and to give information of the different Provinces when asked for it. It is not probable that there will be a very large amount of money spent this year on assisted passages. An arrangement was made last year by which there was a considerable expenditure on this account. Major Gaskell, who represented the Irish Commissioners of Emigration in the Dominion, made an arrangement with the Government of Ontario that that Government should receive the emigrants sent out by that Board and find them employment if they were delivered at Toronto. He then came to the Department and communicated the arrangement that he had made with the Government of Ontario, and the Dominion Government agreed to give to that class a certain amount in assisted passages. That swelled the expenditure on that account last year very considerably. The Ontario Government, however, have found that 15 or 20 per cent. of those sent out by Major Gaskell from the unions and workhouses remained in the city of Toronto as subjects of the charity of the public. The Ontario Government have therefore withdrawn from that arrangement, and of course the Dominion Government will not be called upon to pay any more assisted passengers for that class of emigrants. So that the amount will this year be largely reduced, and it will be confined to agricultural labourers and female servants. Otherwise, there will be no great change.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what the arrangements were for assisted passages last year. I think that the different classes last year were £2 10s., £3 and £4.

Mr. McLELAN. The rates of assisted passages were £2 10s. for the Irish emigrants and £3 for servant girls and agricultural labourers; the £4 rate has been hardly ever in practice.

Mr. BLAKE. What portion has the Government contributed to each of these rates?

Mr. McLELAN. Many of the arrangements with the steamship lines are confidential, and without their consent ought not perhaps to be made public.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not asking about any particular steamship line.

Mr. McLELAN. About £1 was contributed to the £2 10s. and the £3 rate.

Mr. BLAKE. What about the £4 rate?

Mr. McLELAN. That was practically unused, and the proportion contributed by the Government would depend upon the rate charged by the steamship company.

Mr. BLAKE. How much money was used in assisting passages last year?

Mr. McLELAN. About $50,000.

Mr. BLAKE. How much does the hon. gentleman expect to spend this year?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot tell exactly. When the Ontario Government withdrew from that arrangement the question was asked of the Dominion Government if they were prepared to continue to receive that class of emigrants, and the answer was no.

Mr. BLAKE. So that the £2 10s. rate will not be in force?

Mr. McLELAN. The £3 rate is in force for domestic servants and agricultural labourers. But the £2 10s. rate will not.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a proportion, I suppose, for children, besides.

Mr. McLELAN. The children's rate is £2.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, what about the £4 rate?

Mr. McLELAN. The £4 rate is practically abandoned. The rate depends on the rates of passages of the steamship companies.

Mr. BLAKE. A £4 rate will not involve any cost to the Government, but the hon. gentleman intends to keep the £4 rate in force, so that if the rate is higher the passage will still be given at £4. But to what class of passengers?

Mr. McLELAN. General labourers.

Mr. BLAKE. All sorts.

Mr. McLELAN. General labourers of all sorts.

Mr. BLAKE. Mechanics.

Mr. McLELAN. Not to mechanics. General labourers, agricultural labourers and female servants; during the past year also to the union people, but that has been struck out under the arrangement of the Imperial Government.

Mr. BLAKE. The £2 10s. rate is off and the £3 rate excludes all but agricultural labourers and general servants; the £4 rate applies to general labourers, I suppose, not agricultural labourers. It would include navvies, I suppose, to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also labourers in the trades, such as hod-men—industrial labourers.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; the hod-man is a labourer.

Mr. BLAKE. No person above the rank of an industrial labourer, such as the hod-man, shall get the advantage of it.

Mr. McLELAN. In particular cases the agencies may be imposed upon by individuals representing themselves to be labourers, but the understanding is that mechanics shall not be assisted, as they have the means of paying their passages.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state about how much he expects to pay for assisted passages this year?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot make a close estimate of that.

Mr. BLAKE. The number is an average. Strike out the £2 10s. rate and you can find the average at £4 and £3.

Mr. McLELAN. These are not separated in any returns I have before me; the amounts expended in each are not separated.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the Department does not keep its accounts in such a way that it is able to tell the assisted passages of the different classes. Are there not, besides the ocean passage from Liverpool to Quebec, other expenses incurred in connection with assisted passages on the other side of the water.

Mr. McLELAN. No; during the past year the practice was that where emigrants arrived at the port of Quebec and had not the means of paying their fare to the other parts of

the Dominion, assisted passages were given them to the nearest points at which there was known to be labour. The Ontario Government paid the passages of female servants and agricultural labourers from the port of Quebec to Toronto, where they were distributed.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that intended to be continued this year, as far as the Dominion Government is concerned?

Mr. McLELAN. That has been the system in operation almost since Confederation.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a very large question, on which we have had general information, but on which details require to be furnished as to the rate from Quebec to the North-West, and also the details of the arrangement for a low rate from New York to the North-West.

Mr. McLELAN. An arrangement has been perfected by which a rate will be had from Quebec to the North-West, for about $30, and in the same way from New York.

Mr. BLAKE. Those interesting facts, in the bald form in which they are now stated, have been published for some time, but how far the Government contributed to the Quebec rate and how far to the New York rate we do not know.

Mr. McLELAN. There is no arrangement with the Government to contribute anything.

Mr. BLAKE. There has been no expense to the public in this direction?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. How is the arrangement as to the picking? Is it to be arranged by the steamship company or by the Government, who should be assisted?

Mr. McLELAN. The arrangement is that the Government shall decide on the parties entitled to receive cheap rates. The agents at Quebec will choose those who will get the $12 rate.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the railway company carries them but the Government does not pay?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. How is it the Government has to decide, then?

Mr. McLELAN. That is a matter left entirely with the Government agent, to determine what European emigrants are to receive the $12 rate.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the arrangement for deciding that with reference to New York? Who determines that?

Mr. McLELAN. The emigrants have certificates from the other side that they are going into the North-West, and are emigrants.

Mr. BLAKE. What arrangements have been made with reference to repatriating our own people?

Mr. McLELAN. It is understood the same rates apply to them.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the Government anything to do with the selecting or the certificating of these?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government agent in the New England States gives the certificates.

Mr. BLAKE. What will the rate be from Worcester?

Mr. McLELAN. The arrangement is $10 from Montreal, and the Vermont Central will give them reduced rates to Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. They are got at a reduced rate from the Eastern States to Montreal, and then?

Mr. McLELAN. And then go on by the Canadian Pacific Railway, at $10 from Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to understand from the Minister in charge where these 133,000 persons are distributed. Apparently 9,000 come to British Columbia; apparently 21,000 or so, Americans and Europeans together, although that is probably an excess, come to Manitoba; by a return which was brought down the other day, 37,000 are alleged to have come to Ontario. Is that correct?

Mr. McLELAN. Whatever is stated in the book is correct?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it follows, if whatever is stated in the book is correct—and I suppose the hon. gentleman knows whether it is or not—that we have the statement that about 67,000 people have been brought in, chiefly from Europe, in the last year, and settled in the Maritime Provinces and in Quebec. Is that the statement the hon. gentleman makes? Are those 67,000 in the opinion of the Department, immigrants who have settled in the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces; and, if so, in what proportions?

Mr. McLELAN. The account is that they are settled in the different Provinces stated in the several reports.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see any statement as to the proportion, for Quebec or the Maritime Provinces. Where is it? The only statements I have as yet seen refer to British Columbia, Manitoba and Ontario, and these collectively amount to 67,000. There are 132,000 to be accounted for, and I wish to know whether the Minister supposes that these 67,000 have come within the last year to the Maritime Provinces and to Quebec, and in what proportion?

Mr. McLELAN. The numbers of the immigrants are taken at the port of entry, and they are not traced and kept sight of so closely as to give the hon. gentleman the information he desires, but at the port of entry the different numbers of immigrants arriving there are stated, and these are held to be correct in so far as that they are published as the correct return of the immigrants arriving at the several ports. They may pass from one Province to another, and settle in another, or they may pass through one or two Provinces, but they are held to be correct in the main, as to the numbers entering at the different points and settling in the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt the Minister is stating accurately enough what is supposed to be the case, but I call his attention to this, that it seems scarcely humanly possible that there can have been 67,000 immigrants settled in the Maritime Provinces and in Quebec in the past year. The total number of those of foreign birth in those Provinces is very small, and it would be utterly out of the question that such an enormous immigration should come into them without everybody being acquainted with it. I would like to know from my friends in Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and Quebec, and Prince Edward, whether they have seen many thousands of immigrants during the past year.

Mr. DAVIES. Not one in the Island.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps my friend from Digby could tell us of the number in Nova Scotia.

Mr. VAIL. I have not seen any.

An hon. MEMBER. There was one in New Brunswick.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There must, I think, be something seriously astray in this matter. The return laid on the Table by the Department a few weeks ago showed clearly enough that, according to the information in the hands of the Department, about 37,000 had come to

Ontario; the others we had, and it leaves unaccounted for about 67,000, who are supposed to have come to Quebec and to the Maritime Provinces. My own impression is this: It may be or it may not be that the accounts are accurately kept, and that 133,000 persons came here alleging themselves to be immigrants, but I am perfectly certain, from the evidence of the Census returns, that of those who come here and who are paid for, more or less, by this country, an enormous proportion do not stay here. They go through, but do not remain in Canada. If they do stay here, it would be only evident that the displacement of our own people would be even larger than any of us have supposed it to be. I am quite sure that of these persons, it would be very difficult to trace the 67,000 immigrants who are not accounted for to the several Maritime Provinces and Quebec.

Mr. BAIN. While we are discussing the question of the numbers who have arrived in these Provinces, I would call the attention of the Minister to two statements furnished to us officially. One—I dare say most of the members of the House have seen it—appeared in the Toronto *Mail*, under date of January 10th. It was headed "From he Capital;" and the total immigration for the month of December into the Dominion, including Customs returns, was set down as 7,139; previously reported, 175,000; which, with the additions to it, made the total immigration into the Dominion 183,105. The statement then went on to give the proportions that had passed through the American side, showing that 2,500 had gone west in that month, leaving, with those previously reported, a total of 72,851, and the report finished up in this fashion:

"There remained in the Dominion of the total movement of population during last year 110,284, against remaining in the country in 1882, 99,218, showing a clear gain of a fraction over 11,000."

Perhaps the Minister would explain the subsequent sources of information by which that number was increased from 110,000 to 133,000.

Mr. McLELAN. The returns were not perfected—the returns from some of the outer agencies—and it was from the information as to the numbers at that period. Subsequently, the correct returns were put in, and the figures corrected so as to be those found in the report.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). But the Returns that were published in the journal on that occasion go very much into detail. For instance, we have the entry by Halifax of 523 for the month of Dec.; Montreal, from various United States ports, 422; Suspension Bridge, 2,564; Emerson, from the United States, 176; Gretna, 193; various agencies, 189; Customs returns, 3,072. Now, if I understand this report correctly, these are the monthly returns, made by the various agencies, and you will observe that this report covers all the main points of entry into our Dominion, with the exception perhaps of St. John, which is not included. Now, it does seem to me that, when this return was presented to the *Mail* on the 10th January, ten days after the December returns had been completed and sent in, and they are in this detail from all these various ports, including not only that but the agencies, which I may say are the various inside points, such as Toronto and Kingston and several other points where parties pass back and forth, and make Custom house entries or entries in connection with the agencies, it shows that all these points had reported for the month of December, and it seems extraordinary that there should be this large discrepancy between 110,000 and 133,000.

Mr. McLELAN. It is extraordinary that a newspaper should get an incomplete report of the figures I had in my office at that time. As I said before, when the *Mail* procured that from the office the returns from all the agents had not been received and not been made up.

Mr. BAIN. I have already drawn the Minister's attention to this fact, that the returns are given for the month of December for all the ports with the exception of St. John.

Mr. McLELAN. Not from the Province of British Columbia, where there were 9,000, which were not included.

Mr. BAIN. Would not ten days be sufficient to get information from British Columbia? I observed, in looking over the returns brought down on motion of the leader of the Opposition, that they had been expeditiously furnished by some of the agents who telegraphed them weekly. For instance, here is a telegram from Winnipeg, dated 28th June, 1883, to John Lowe, Department of Agriculture:

"One hundred and eighty-seven, *via* Port Arthur, week ending 16th.
(Signed) "W. C. B. GRAHAME."

I admit that it is not very distinct, but it is the first telegram sent down of the number of passengers that went into the North-West by Port Arthur. The next one makes it a little more distinct:

"June 28th.—Number of passengers, via Port Arthur, ending 23rd inst., 284 souls.
(Signed) "W. C. B. GRAHAME."

Now, some of these agents were so careful as to make weekly returns, and some of them made regularly monthly returns; for instance, the agency at Emerson covers each month *seriatim* in succession, and the same can be said of the agency at Montreal, and also at Halifax and St. John. The returns with reference to the port of Quebec are not quite so distinctly given. I am at a loss to understand why the returns were not all in, when some of the agents were so careful as to make weekly returns. With the exception of the agent at Coaticooke, who made quarterly returns, they appear to have been all made from month to month, with the exception of the British Columbia return, which appears to have been made in a lump on the 31st of December. That one reports 9,000 immigrants—6,000 whites and 3,000 Chinese. I do not know whether our friends in British Columbia will give the Government much credit for the importation of those Chinese; I do not know whether the Minister could tell us what agent it was that secured those Chinese. There is one comfort in it, and that is that the year before, the Chinese immigration was over 7,000, so it appears to be diminishing. But I complain of the report as not reliable.

Mr. HESSON. You are depending upon newspaper reports?

Mr. BAIN. But I take it from the paper which is recognized in Ontario as the official organ of the Government. It is dated from the Capital, and gives the returns in detail from the various ports. If they will tell us that these figures are the guesswork of the *Mail* correspondent, then I will accept the statement.

Mr. HESSON. I think the Minister has given all the information in his power. The report is very clear. There is a certain number set down as coming into the country; where they are a month after arrival, it is difficult for the Minister to say. He may be able to trace those who make entries at the Custom houses, and we find that some 35,000 of these were distributed through the various Provinces, but beyond that it is difficult for him to say where men who have entered to-day will be a week hence. I do not think we ought to be called upon to answer newspaper statements in dealing with a question of this kind. I am sorry the Minister cannot give better information, but I am sure that if it were in his power he would gladly do so.

Mr. McLELAN. I may say that in addition to the 9,000 in British Columbia, the Algoma return was not in at that time, which amounted to 15,000. This number brings up the total to nearly 126,000. There were some other points from which the returns were not completed, which would make up the 133,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has just alluded to a matter that deserves consideration, as showing the probable value of these returns. There are about 10,000 alleged to have come in at Algoma, and I think at Prince Arthur. Now I take it those are all American navvies who were brought in by the contractors, and were in no sense immigrants. They are brought in for a particular work, just as they were brought in during the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway through Winnipeg to certain portions of Manitoba, and as soon as their work was done they took their money and went back to the United States. So I presume these 10,000 will in all human likelihood do the same as soon as the work on the Canadian Pacific Railway is over. Now, the Minister will hardly say that this class of people are immigrants in the ordinary sense and acceptation of the term.

Mr. McLELAN. You cannot tell how long these immigrants will remain in the country, but the labourers who came in to work on the railway will no doubt remain until it is completed, and then employment will be given to a large number of them in working the road. I have no doubt that valuable agricultural lands will be occupied by them; these men will take up farms and become residents there, and in one way or another a large proportion of those who went to Algoma will be absorbed and remain as residents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I greatly doubt it, and I may remark that those returns I quoted from were brought down by the Department, and if it be as the hon. member for Perth says, that the only returns that are of any value are those made through the Customs, as showing the destination of the settlers, it is a pity the Department brought down these returns if they are so unreliable. It is clear the Department have very little means of checking who those emigrants are, where they come from, or where they are going. Now, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps are really taken to ascertain who are the settlers coming into Manitoba. I have been in Manitoba several times, and never saw yet one of his agents attempting to take the numbers of people who were passing through in any train on which I have been.

Mr. McLELAN. They saw the hon. gentleman, and as they did not think he was a good settler, they did not put him down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They knew as little about the matter as the hon. gentleman who is now undertaking to pass this estimate, and took as little pains to ascertain the true number of settlers. The fact of the matter is, that the immigration statistics are worthless, in the most emphatic sense.

Mr. BAIN. In the report, Algoma is credited with 6,185, and north of Lake Superior with 4,250. I admit the difficulty under which the Department is placed. These immigration figures are made up to the close of the year, and while other Departments have from 30th June last to compile their returns, this Department is obliged to compile them between 30th December and the meeting of the House This report has been in our hands less than two weeks; it only reached the distribution office on March 25th, and the return asked for by the leader of the Opposition for a monthly statement was furnished only on Thursday. That only goes to demonstrate the importance of the agents being compelled to furnish their monthly returns. In speaking of the class of immigrants who have gone to the north shore, I find the information is furnished in some correspondence dated Toronto: Ontario and Quebec Railway, December, 1883. The first letter is from Mr. Ryan, who had the contract for the eastern section of the road, and his letter appears to have been a reply to a letter written by the Department here. He said:

Mr. McLELAN.

"ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.
"TORONTO, 12th December, 1883.

"Hon. J. H. POPE,
"Minister of Agriculture.

"SIR,—I beg to inclose a statement from Mr. John Scully who acted as agent in procuring labourers and mechanics, principally stone cutters and masons, for the work of construction on this line. * * * *

"The works on the West Shore Railway being nearly completed in the early part of the season, a great number of men were thrown out of employment and came to Canada where wages were higher for that class of labour than in the United States, and these are a portion of the men referred to in Mr. Scully's letter.

"I have, &c.,
(Signed) "HUGH RYAN."

Mr. Scully wrote as follows:—

"CONTRACTORS' AGENCY, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY,
"TORONTO, 5th December, 1883.

"HUGH RYAN, Esq.,
"Superintendent of Construction,
"Ontario and Quebec Railway, Toronto.

"*Re* Labourers from United States.

SIR,—In reply to your enquiry as to the number of railroad labourers I shipped to your works on the Ontario and Quebec Railway, east of Toronto, I find from my books that 4,250 men were imported from the United States who found employment in this section of Ontario, chiefly on your line."

Further on:

"I forwarded 5,000 men to the Canadian Pacific Railway, Algoma and Lake Superior Sections; many of them shipped *viâ* Buffalo and Collingwood, and Detroit and Sarnia.

"I purpose going to England, Ireland and Scotland in January next, to advertise for good navvies, rockmen &c., for next year.
(Signed) "JOHN SCULLY."

That compares closely with the 4,250 credited as having gone north of Lake Superior. On Mr. Scully's statement as to the labourers is the basis for these two items which figure in the report, and I confess that I think they go to explain the increase in numbers between the official returns and the return, which looked like official, published in the *Mail* in December. In regard to the question of navvies becoming settlers, general experience shows that these men follow railway construction and nothing else. They do not take any interest in local politics, but simply want to know where railways are going to be built, and as soon as they have completed one they move off to another road. So, the probability of any reasonable proportion becoming settlers on the rocky region north of Lake Superior is exceedingly remote. Mr. VanHorne writes as follows:—

"CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY,
"MONTREAL, February 16th, 1884.

"Hon. J. H. POPE, Minister of Agriculture.

"SIR,—In reply to your enquiry as to the total number of passengers, including children, arriving in and departing from Manitoba by railway during the year 1883, I have to report that the number arriving was 61,426, and the number departing was 22,458. The latter figure, however, includes about 2,400 men going to Port Arthur to work on the Lake Superior section of the railway, and about 2,200 were returning to the States from our main line work, west. The greater part of these workmen came into the country in 1882.
(Signed) "U. C. VANHORNE."

If the fertile plains of the North-West offered no inducements to those men to settle, what hope can there be of their settling on the rocky shores of Lake Superior, with the absence of good climate and anything like cultivatable soil. These figures have no business in the report, and I cannot help thinking, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) has said, that the statements in the *Mail* are a good deal nearer correct than the report of the Minister.

Mr. HESSON. I never said the *Mail* was unreliable; but I said that its statement should be accepted.

Mr. BAIN. I am willing to accept it on this occasion, because it commends itself as being nearer correct than the Minister's report.

Mr. HESSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will suggest some means of making those men permanent residents in the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am at a loss to know what the hon. gentleman is driving at. Can he tell us what the objects of his statements are? Are they made in the interests of Canada? Is the hon. gentleman working in the interests of Canada or in the interests of the United States? No other construction can be put on the statements in which hon. gentlemen opposite have indulged, than that they are determined to do their best and their worst to keep people out of this country. No greater attraction can be presented to people in the over-populated countries of Europe than the fact that statistics show that this country is attractive enough to induce a large number of settlers to come here. Every word the hon. gentleman has said is intended to have the effect of discountenancing the statistics of this country, which are statistics compiled with the utmost care and with the utmost honesty, and with a view to show the world the important fact that Canada is a country that possesses an inviting field for people who are seeking homes in the new world. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that with all the advantage which the United States possesses, all the enormous advantage of having for years and years possessed a great fertile prairie district, which offered an easy means of providing a competency, or providing bread for a man's family, while we have had no such prairie country, while the man who came to Canada had to attack the forest with his axe, and strive against natural difficulties for ten or twenty years before he could hope to have a competency and rear his family with comfort and supply them abundantly with bread; the hon. gentleman knows that we have only had for a comparatively few years the means of proving to the world that we have a country which cannot be surpassed by any portion of the United States, by any portion of America; a country that is incomparably superior to a great portion of the prairie districts of the north-western portion of the United States, and that now that we have that advantage, and have the means of offering inducements to immigrants, certainly equal to any portion of the world, and have the means of showing that, notwithstanding the advantage of older settlement, we have the attraction presented by that best of all classes of immigration agency, the communications from successful immigrants to their friends in the old world, and that by these means Canada stands to day in the proud position, that notwithstanding that there has been a great decrease in the immigration to America during the past year, the volume of immigration to Canada is greater than ever. And what is the result? It brings us to this conclusion—and a proud and gratifying conclusion it is to arrive at, to every man interested in the progress of this country—that at last the great advantages which we possess are telling in the scale, and that we are likely to draw into this country, year by year, a greater and always increasing number of that class of people who are necessary to build up our nation, and make this a great and progressive country. And what are hon. gentlemen opposite doing? Why, Sir, if they were in the pay of the land companies of the United States, if they were the paid enemies and rivals of Canada, they could not work harder, they could not use more persistent efforts, to decry our country and shut out people from coming to it. What is the danger that the hon. gentleman presents to-night? He says that if the fertile prairies which we boast about in the North-West do not induce people to come into our country, what can we do for the barren and rocky wilderness north of Lake Superior. Let me tell him that year by year we are disabusing prevailing ideas about this barren wilderness north of Lake Superior. Year by year are we not only offering as an inducement to the people of Europe the magnificent fertility of our prairie land of the North-West, but we are opening up, north of Lake Superior, a comparatively unknown country, possessing forests of timber, and arable soil for cultivation and possessing other attractions, independently of the enormous mineral resources which are known to exist in that district. Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman's whole aim and object is to prove that nobody is coming to this country; that it is a lying delusion which is being palmed off on the old world, that we have such a country; that there are no attractions here, no country to which any man would come, and if he does come into it, it is only for the purpose of getting his wages and going out of it as soon as he can. I say, Sir, that this is too bad. I say that there is no party object which ought to be of sufficient importance to induce hon. gentlemen to do such a thing as that. What is the great advantage—the greatest of all—which the United States has had, and it has had enormous advantages; it is, that from one end of that great and magnificent country to the other, wherever you find an American, you find a man heart and soul devoted to his country; you find a man ready to use all the powers he possesses, all the ability God has given him, to exalt his country in the estimation of the world, and draw everybody into it whom he can. And why? Because he knows that it is by that means that the great American Republic has been built up to be the great power that it is; that it is by that means that its power has continually strengthened and increased; and Sir, I say that Canada must suffer gravely and deeply at the hands of her own sons, while any number of them can be found to decry the country, notwithstanding the evidences on every hand that there is no country in the world which at this present moment presents so many attractions—attractions felt so largely everywhere, and to such an extent that they are every year becoming more and more potent in drawing immigration into this country. The hon. gentleman talks about navvies, and gives a most emphatic contradiction to the statement made in this country that there is no dearth of labour here. I want to know, if there was no dearth of labour here, what compelled the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to send men down, and pay them well to go, into the United States, after ransacking this country—after sending agents through Ontario and Quebec, and offering labourers high wages—and what did they find? They found that the demand for labour in these older Provinces was so great, in this present condition of the country, that they could not get labour, and they were compelled, at large expense, to offer high wages to men in the United States, in order to get sufficient labour to operate their railways. So that the statement of the hon. gentleman has this advantage, of giving an emphatic and complete contradiction to the story circulated persistently by parties in this country, that it was no use for labourers to come here because there was no work. He asks if these navvies never remain. Why, Sir, I had a letter sent to me by twenty Finns, who were sent out by Mr. Dyke. That gentleman ascertained that they were coming to America, by the Port of New York, and he went to these people and gave them descriptions, in their own language, of the attractions of Canada, pointing out the advantages this country possesses, pointing out the demand there was here for labour. He cabled the Department here, and the Department sent an agent to meet the men on their arrival, brought them here, and sent them north of Lake Superior. I read the letter of these men, twenty of them, who came in with their wives and families and went to work on that road. And, Sir, if you compare the glowing descriptions that these men gave of the comforts they enjoy, and the advantages of the exchange they made, from their own country, of the great wages they were getting, and of the employment their wives obtained in connection with the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of the fact that they ascertained that when the road was completed they could get land of their own to settle down upon, with the money they saved, and make themselves prosperous—I say that if we compare the statements of

these men, who spoke from the heart and from their own experience, with the statements we are compelled to listen to to-night, they should bring a blush of shame to the face of any hon. gentleman who feels that these honest and fruitful statements, made by the men who were brought into this country; and who have found the advantages it possesses — any man who feels that these men are infinitely better off than they ever were before—I say that comparing these statements with the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, we must blush for our country, to know that any man or class of men in it, any party in it, can so far forget what they owe, not to party, but to Canada, as to stand here night after night, using all their powers in advancing the interests of a foreign country and decrying their own.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What we owe to Canada Sir, is to see that the money of the people of this country is not squandered and wasted by men on whose statements we cannot rely. That is our duty; and I tell the hon. gentleman that if he imagines that all this fustian rant is going to impose upon gentlemen on this side of the House, he never made a greater mistake in his life. Sir, we were not Canadians only yesterday; we have as great a stake in Canada as hon. gentlemen opposite, and greater; and I tell the hon. gentleman that if he dares to take that stand, if he dares to talk to us, on this side, of patriotism, or of regard for the honour of our country, I can tell him, Sir, that the record of their disgrace is stamped for the last ten years on every public record of Canada. Sir, they had better not bring us to talk of what we owe to the honour of Canada. We, on this side, have not been found bribing; we have not been found breaking our oaths; we have not been found placing ourselves in the hands of those very contractors to debauch the electorate, as I have told them again and again. Not one argument did he advance, not one truth did he utter to break the facts which my hon. friend presented to the House. Are the 130,000 men who are said to have come to the country accounted for? Are those 38,000 that the Department said came into Ontario—are they there? Sir, I would like to know where they are. We know from statistics, compiled by themselves, that ever since these hon. gentlemen came into power there has been an enormous emigration from the Province of Ontario and the other Provinces; we know that this is largely due to the impolicy of these hon. gentlemen; and we know that if these emigrants have come into the country, as they say, there has been even a larger displacement than we had supposed of the people of Ontario and the other Provinces. Though we are trying to-night to drag some little explanation from these hon. gentlemen of what they have done with the $400,000 they spent last year, and what they are going to do with $450,000 this year, we have not had one word of intelligible explanation to-night of where this money has gone. We are told that 130,000 immigrants have come into Canada; but when we come to analyze these returns, we find that these hon. gentlemen have no information to give us that can be at all relied on. The navvies which the hon. gentleman spoke of are a class of men who never do settle, but who do follow the railway; and it is preposterous nonsense to put these 10,000 men as emigrants to Canada. I have here the London *Economist*, which states that all the emigrants who came to us from British ports last year were apparently 44,130. I do not know where these all went to. I do not think the American ports supply any great number; we know that they do not. The fact of the matter is, that although it may be true that a certain number of people have come into Canada, all that we have heard through this discussion tends to show that we have no proper means of checking the influx of people into this country or the influx from it either—that we have no means of knowing at the present moment whether 20,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 or 100,000 of the people who have come into the country are residing here; but the evidence of these gentlemen's own Census returns shows us that of the great number of immigrants who are reported as having come into this country, by far the majority—probably four-fifths, certainly three-fourths—have not stayed with us. Now, our objection to these gentlemen's policy is this: we see them bringing people here whom they cannot keep. I think that these Europeans, if any number go to Manitoba, probably stay there; but I do not think the bulk of the men we bring into the old Provinces do remain here, and I base that statement upon the hon. gentleman's own statistics and the evidence before us. Now, as I said before, if these statements which have been brought down by the Immigration Department are true, there has been a very large immigration into Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. Now, every man knows that that is not the case. I do not suppose that there is any gentleman who will get up here and say that he believes that there has been a larger immigration into Quebec and the Maritime Provinces last year than for several years past; and if they have gone to Ontario, they simply turn out a number they found there. All these are facts that have to be faced. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not faced the Ontario statistics, probably because they had no statistics to face them with. If these are to be relied upon, it is perfectly clear that we have lost 250,000 people from Ontario alone, and I protest, while that movement goes on, against spending the people's money for bringing to the country people whom we cannot keep, but who go away, and when they do necessarily injure us, because they become anti-immigration agents where they have gone. Now, I do not believe there is any use of bringing into this country people of the professional class, artisans or mechanics. There is room for farmers, for people of capital, and for a certain portion of domestic servants, but that is all. I doubt exceedingly whether we are doing wisely in continuing these assisted immigration passages at all; but if we are, we ought to confine them strictly to those particular classes, as the Minister rather intimated that they intended to do, but as they do not appear to have done; because men have been brought to our towns and cities during the last twelve months who do not belong to those classes, but are a burden on the charity of the people. Now, all these things we have a right to look into in the discharge of our duties, and we are not going to be put down by being told that we are unpatriotic, because we put questions and do not get the answers that we have a right to receive.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman complains that people have been brought into Ontario to be a charge to the people of Ontario. I have already pointed out to the Committee that that was an arrangement made with the Ontario Government, and for which they are responsible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They deny that.

Mr. McLELAN. The Ontario Government entered into an arrangement with the Irish agent, that they would take these emigrants and give them employment if the Dominion Government would give them assisted passages; and under that arrangement these people were brought out, and became a charge on the charity of the people of Ontario. While the whole blame rests upon them up there, and when the Ontario Government withdrew from that arrangement, the Dominion Government was not prepared to continue it or to undertake it. The hon. gentleman has endeavoured to show that only 42,000 immigrants are reported as having come into Canada. He should bear in mind that that is only the number reported as sailing to Canadian ports; from the ports of the United States we received a large number which, added to the 42,000, will make up our immigration. The hon. gentleman said we bring them in and they go out again, and referring to the railway navvies, said we have no right to count these. But the hon. gentleman

will take good care to count them when they go out of the Dominion, and will spread the report that the people are leaving by the hundreds of thousands, when these navvies return to the United States. A large portion, however, of them remain here. He said that we had no right to count 20 Finns who came out as navvies, but those 20 Finns have sent a very large portion of their own earnings home to bring out others to settle in the Dominion, so beneficial do they find the change. The hon. gentleman questions our expenditure, but if we go back to the year 1876, when he was responsible for our emigration policy, we find that the expenditure then was $264,880 for an immigration of about 25,000 people, so that it cost this country $11.12 per head to bring this people in.

Mr. BAIN. How many Chinese? There are 3,000 of them this year.

Mr. McLELAN. It did not matter whether they were Chinese or not. They left the country. The hon. gentleman was bringing people in at $11.12 per head to leave the country; whereas we, in the past year, expended but $3.15 per head.

Mr. DAWSON. I shall only add a single sentence to this animated and interesting discussion. The district I have the honour to represent has been mentioned in this discussion, and it is very desirable that hon. members who refer to the district of Algoma and the north shore of Lakes Superior and Huron, and the emigration of people from that district, should inform themselves a little before they attempt to make speeches on these subjects in this House. The facts are the opposite to what the hon. member for North Wentworth set forth. So far back as 1871, there was a Census taken of the whole population of Algoma, which then amounted to 7,018 souls. At the last Census in Algoma it was found that, not going beyond the height of land, there were 21,000 people in the district, showing that the population had trebled in ten years. The ratio of increase has been very much greater since then, and I believe now there are not less than 40,000 people in Algoma, including the disputed territory. As to navvies following railway construction and not becoming permanent settlers, I believe there is a class which always follows railways, but there are others, a great many of whom settle in the country; if you go to the Island of Manitoulin you will find that the people there are all happy and well off and that they include a considerable number of navvies who settled around Thunder Bay, at Vermillion Bay, Rat Portage and Rainy River. With regard to people living in Algoma, there could not be a greater misconception nor a more unguarded statement of the situation. The people of Algoma are now doing very well, and I do not believe there is a more thriving community in the whole Dominion. Of late years, since the railway commenced, they have got out ties, money has been abundant, and they are beginning to export wheat from that country, where it was supposed the climate was so bad that it could not be raised.

Mr. IRVING. Disparaging statements are being made all around this House to-night, but I have never heard a more disparaging statement made of any country than that which has been made by the hon. Minister of Railways, with reference to the Maritime Provinces. I heard a letter read to-night, from a gentleman in London, who recommends settlement in Ontario in preference to any of the other Provinces, but the hon. Minister of Railways to-night stated that we had not suitable land in the Maritime Provinces as they had in the North-West, where a man could settle upon the prairie and not have to toil for ten or twenty years to clear it, as on timber lands, before he could make a competency or livelihood. Could a more damaging statement be made with reference to the Maritime Provinces? Have we not millions of acres of good land in New Brunswick, good settlement lands of a most favourable character? The most inveterate enemy of New Brunswick could not make a more damaging statement than that which the hon. Minister has made. Is it possible that he wishes to depopulate the Maritime Provinces in order to fill up the North-West? No paid agent of this country, no paid agent of the Ontario or Dominion Government, in London, could make a more damaging statement in reference to the settlement lands of New Brunswick than the hon Minister has made. We have excellent farming lands and well timbered lands, and a man can make a better livelihood in the woods, where he has timber to build his house and supply him with fuel, than on the prairie lands of the North-West. The hon. Minister has abused hon. gentlemen on this side, and charged them with making statements derogatory to this country, which were published in the newspapers of the United States; but does he imagine that the statement he has made to-night will not be published far and wide throughout the country? And does he not know that he has made one of the most damaging statements in reference to the settlement of the lands of the Maritime Provinces? No paid agent could make a worse statement, and the hon. gentleman should retract and apologize.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not at all surprised that the hon. member for South Huron should have adopted the *rôle* he has adopted to-night. We know very well that these hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have for the last three or four years been endeavouring to convince the public, both in this country and the older countries, that there has been an extraordinary exodus from Canada.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. During the present Session of Parliament the Committee on Immigration and Colonization have taken up that subject very thoroughly, and I think the hon. gentleman will see, when the evidence comes down to this House, that the statements they have been making in reference to the exodus from Canada during the last few years have been very thoroughly exploded. Knowing, I presume, that that evidence would be submitted to this House very shortly, they have changed their *rôle*, and instead of showing that there has been an extraordinary exodus from Canada, they are trying to controvert the figures of the immigration into Canada, so that they are working at both ends of the stick, and endeavouring first to show that we are losing a large number of people from Canada by an exodus to the United States, and then endeavouring to prove, if it be possible to prove, that the figures given to us by the Department of Agriculture, in regard to the immigration into this country, are fallacious and unreliable.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman attempts, by the figures he has given to this House, to prove that, because, according to this statement a certain number of immigrants are shown to have come into the Province of Ontario and a certain number into the Provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba the balance; it is impossible that the 66,000 which he says are still to be accounted for should have settled in the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. But the hon. gentleman forgets, as has been stated by the Minister in charge of this Department, that the Department of Agriculture does not attempt to follow the immigrants to their respective locations after they are entered at the ports in this country. Is it possible for the Department of Agriculture to trace all the immigrants who land at Quebec to their respective locations? I think the hon. gentleman himself will admit that that would be almost an impossibility, and yet he attempts to prove that these figures, given to us under the authority of the Department of Agriculture, collated carefully from the different ports in this Dominion, are wholly fallacious. Why does he attempt to show that?

Does he attempt to do it for the purpose of advancing the interests of the people of this country, or for the purpose of advancing the interests of Canada? There can be no such reason as that for the attempt the hon. gentleman has made here to-night; and let me tell him, and the hon. gentleman who has made the statement that navvies who work upon railroads in this country never settle in this country, that that statement is wholly and entirely fallacious. I know of my own knowledge, in my own county and in the district of Nipissing which adjoins it, that considerable numbers of these people who have worked on the railways and have earned enough money to settle in the country, have settled and are becoming some of the best settlers we have in that locality. And, with reference to that, let me tell him that in my own county, where Germans have been settled upon the poorer lands in the county, those who have been there for a number of years and those who have gone to that locality recently have been sending money, large sums of it, during the last two years to their friends in the older countries. Why did they not send moneys to their friends in the old country to enable them to come out, or to induce them to come out here during the time those hon. gentlemen opposite held office? It was because the country was in such a state of destitution that they were unable to collect a sufficient amount of money to send for their friends, and that they could not induce them, and dared not induce them, to come to a country in such a state as this country was in at that time. But, since the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury Benches have attained to office, all that is changed. The country is prosperous. They are not only in a position to induce their friends to come to this country, but are in a position to send them the funds to enable them to come here; and the result is, that a very large immigration has come into my own county, I know—and I presume the same operation has been going on throughout other parts of Canada—during the last three or four years, through the exertions of the people who have been located there for some time past. They have been bringing out their friends as fast as they could collect money to assist them to come, and those people are prosperous and contented; and notwithstanding whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say, I venture to express the hope that the Department of Agriculture will use every means in their power to induce more settlers to come from the old countries and settle on the unoccupied and untenanted lands of this country. If they do, I believe they will merit the approval of the people of this country and, notwithstanding what may be said by my hon. friends opposite, they will have done what will be in the best interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for South Huron must shut his eyes to the facts by which he is surrounded every day in life, or he would scarcely have the audacity to make the statements that immigrants are not coming into the country in large numbers, and that those who do come are not settling in the country.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. In the section of country from which I come, they have been coming in in large numbers during the last few years, and have been settling and doing well. I do not think it is a fair comparison to take the Census of 1871 and compare it with the Census of 1881, because we know that from 1873 to 1878, when these hon. gentlemen were in power, the people were leaving the country in large numbers, until the population had been materially reduced. Then the country commenced to be built up again and people to come to it in large numbers. This was going on when the Census of 1881 was taken. I know this to be the fact in my own county. I know that, in 1878, I only paid $1 a day, and that the other day I had to pay $2.75 for plasterers, and yet the member for South Huron says we do not require mechanics in the country. I paid $2 a day for carpenters, and very poor ones at that.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. And in 1878, plasterers only got a $1 a day?

Mr. SPROULE. No; I said carpenters, not plasterers. I went to Toronto and paid $2.75 a day for plasterers, and could not get them unless I paid their fare out there and back again. I paid $2 a day for carpenters and found it impossible to get them. I was asked by farmers to send to the agent there, Mr. Donaldson, to get hands for them, and out of twenty-five I managed to get three. As another evidence that the country is being rapidly settled up, and that the prosperity is increasing, I take the valuation of our county. It was made five years ago, and last year it was made again for the purpose of equalizing the assessment over the county. During those five years the county had about doubled in value, for the assessment was only a little over $12,000,000 five years ago, and last summer it was a little over $25,000,000. If that is not an evidence that the country is increasing in prosperity, I do not know what is. I know that, in our part of the country, there is a great dearth of agricultural labourers, a great dearth of servants—in almost every line, mechanics, farmers, or servants—almost every line; we find it impossible to get a sufficient number of people to supply the wants of the country, notwithstanding the fact that they are going in in large numbers and settling there. I could count them by dozens in my county—immigrants who have come from the old country and settled and done well within the last few years. When I went over the Pacific Railway through Manitoba and the North-West, I found Englishmen, I might say in hundreds, who had come from the old country and were doing well. I found Irishmen who had taken part in building the railway and have settled down and are doing well. I found Scotchmen in the same position. Another evidence that we have, which is one of the most unmistakeable kind, is that we have such men as Mr. Scully, who was allied with hon. gentlemen opposite, who was paid for every man he could bring into the country last summer, and he has been unable to supply the demands for parties to build the railway and to supply the wants of farmers and others through the country. He has been scouring through the United States and he has sent to Ireland and England and various other countries in Europe, and notwithstanding the number he has employed in his agency to bring men to this country, he was unable to supply the great demand at his office for men in the country during the last few years. They are not going away from the country, because we find that around Lake Superior 8,000 are employed to-day, and yet the word comes down that they want 4,000 more. I visited Manitoulin Island last summer and I can corroborate the statement made by the hon. member for Algoma, that large numbers of those who were engaged on that railway are settled down there and doing well. The same is to be found along the Sault, around Lake Superior; and if you go to Manitoba and the North-West, you will find the country occupied by settlers all the way from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to call attention to the fact that the returns I have frequently asked for of the monthly railway transport into and out of Manitoba and the North-West are defective. I asked for a monthly return.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have to apologize to the hon. member for Algoma, for I did not intend to say anything disrespectful with regard to that large territory, and I am proud to say there is no man in the House better pleased than myself to learn that the population is growing so rapidly. But we are dealing with solid facts to-day, if we can get at them,

and with all respect to the brilliant statements made by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I say they have not given us one solitary fact upon which to base a fragment of information with reference to these statistics. It did occur to me that when the Minister waxed so eloquent in compairing the return between the present period and the period of the Mackenzie *regime*, that he furnished us, perhaps, as effective an explanation how this 133,000 was figured up as it was possible for them to furnish us. I would like to know if those who are navvies have not been counted in to increase the apparent number and reduce the cost per head to $3.15. But these assertions do not bring people into the country, and we must not shut our eyes to the fact. It is idle to make glowing statements about these men who have come into different Ridings of Ontario; they offer us no basis as to numbers. The hon. Minister of Public Works asked how we could have the assurance to get up and decry this country. I want to tell that hon. Minister, so far as my interest in this country is concerned, I do not stand one iota behind him. I wish to say to the Minister of Railways that we are not going to be bullied out of our rights in this discussion, by his taunting us with being unpatriotic. Not one man on the other side of the House has attempted to face the facts as to whether this immigration is overstated or not, and it is impossible for them to back up by facts and figures that 133,000 immigrants had come into this country the past year. If my parliamentary experience had not extended a few years back further than the time the hon. Minister of Railways last came into office I should have been misled by his glowing statements, and supposed he was so patriotic that he always stood up for the interests of this country, and never stated that a Government could mismanage or that the country could go wrong. The hon. member for Renfrew presented us with a sample of the diatribes that were raked up by the *Mail*, and now, forsooth, because everybody does not drop into their groove, they are unpatriotic. What were the actions of these hon. gentlemen when they were in Opposition? How did they stand by the country then? Nothing was too strong for them to say with reference to the administration of affairs by the Mackenzie Government, but as soon as they get into office again then everybody must quietly stand by and accept every statement they make with reference to the attraction of immigration into this country. I say, in the interests of truth, it is desirable we should have the absolute facts. If we cannot attract immigrants to this country by making a fair statement of facts, I say we had better give up the business, because I do not believe we can ever overtake our American cousins in the matter of over-statements unless we are all able to reach that magnificent height of exaggeration the hon. member for Cumberland has reached. With reference to the difficulties with pauper immigrants in Toronto, I can only say the Ontario Government deny they are responsible for that. I will read a little paragraph from a newspaper, with reference to the difficulties with immigrants who do not go to Ontario. The paragraph is written by a party who knows whereof he speaks, being connected with the Department, and he writes from Winnipeg and says:

"They can get work and I could get it for them, but they won't take it. Only the other day I got an order for a number of farm labourers, and out of the whole lot I could only get one man to go. I could get them all situations as farm hands, at wages averaging from $25 to $30 per month, with their board. * * * * They are living at the sheds free of charge, and with nothing to do but amuse themselves, and I guess they think they have too much of a soft thing to throw it up. * * * I think on Monday I will get passes for them over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and ship them west to either work or starve. These men are are no use for anything on earth. They even quarrel about which of them shall go for a pail of water to make tea with."

I am sorry we have not a monopoly of this class in Toronto, but some have drifted away to other points. This is not a *Globe* slander, but one published by a journal which has taken special interest in the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Montreal *Hereald*. I presume, in drawing a large number of immigrants to any country, we are liable to get some unfortunate louts. I endorse heartily the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture last Session, when he deeply deplored the idea of adding to our immigration to a large extent from unions and workhouses of the old country, for the purpose of filling up the great North-West. Nothing could be a more serious mistake. While we may sympathise with those persons at home, what we want here are men with sufficient self-reliance to take hold of the first job and make a success of it by sticking to it, and I believe in obtaining that class which have pluck enough to pull up stakes and leave the old land and try their fortunes here, rather than a population from the poorhouses of an overcrowded country, where circumstances beyond their control almost crush the manhood out of them. I am sorry to say that even this discussion of the figures does not satisfy me that our statements with respect to immigration to the North-West are correct. This is a matter in which we are deeply interested. We have held up the North-West as a great country to which the European population are to be attracted in large numbers. Out of the whole population which came in from Great Britain and other countries last season—55,000—only 10,000 had declared their intention of going through to Manitoba when they landed at our ports. It is plain to me that the great bulk of the people which make such an apparently large show in the movement of population to the North-West, were from the older Provinces, and the return for our expenditure on immigration when these are deduction are very unsatisfactory. We largely increased the grant for that purpose last year, and comparing the figures with the previous year, we show an addition of less than 4,000, all told, from Great Britain and Europe. A large proportion of the number which goes to make up 133,000 are made up of the moving class. I should be glad if I could believe, with the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), that we obtained 34,000 people from the American side; that we kept all our own population and lost none. But I do not think it is possible that any man can calmly look at the facts and arrive at such a conclusion. There is a large migration backward and forward over the boundary, and whether the American figures are exaggerated or not, there is no doubt there is perpetually a large number of people leaving the country. It may be treason to this country to say so; I suppose it is treason to this Government to say so; but I draw a wide distinction between what I owe to my country and what I owe to hon. gentlemen opposite One word in regard to Manitoba figures. After a careful comparison of the figures, I should be pleased to know where the population comes from that enters that Province. The returns are made in this fashion: Manitoba and North-West, settlers entering at ports other than those above enumerated, and other than those from the old Provinces, namely, Emerson; 12,119; Gretna, 1,879; *vid* Port Arthur, 3,415; and Duluth, 2,200, and across frontier from Gretna to Benton, 1,406, total, 21,019. The following note is appended:

"The total number of persons who went into Manitoba and the North-West in 1883 was, in round numbers, about 51,244, ascertained as follows: Reported at Emerson, 44,233; along the frontier, from Emerson to Fort Benton, 1,406. The nationalities were as follows: From Europe, 8,339; from Canada, 25,301; from the United States, 13,998. Of the total number, 51,244, apart from the 1,406 along the frontier, from Emerson to Fort Benton, deduct 17 per cent. for floating population (8,472), making total settlers in Manitoba and the North-West, 42,772."

I desire to present to the Committee the following as the result of my deductions from the figures I have quoted: Reported at Emerson, 44,233; frontier, 1,406; Port Arthur, 3,415; Duluth, 3,200; total 51,244. Deducting 17 per cent. on 49,838, which amounts to 8,472, leaves a net total of 42,772. There were Canadians, 25,301; Americans, 13,998,

The proportion of 8,472 of 25,301 Canadians gives 5,454 to be taken off. The same proportions of 13,998 Americans gives 3,018; leaving the net number of Canadians 19,837, and of Americans, 10,980. Across the frontier from Gretna to Fort Benton there were 1,406, whom I will also call Americans. From Europe there were 8,339; *vid* Duluth, 2,200. The number of immigrants entered for Manitoba at Quebec, Suspension Bridge, and eastern ports was 10,122. The net gain to Manitoba and the North-West from American citizens was 12,386, instead of 21,109, the over-estimate being 8,633. It would have been a much more pleasant duty to have accepted the figures as stated; but we are here for the purpose of getting at the facts, and if this discussion secures us another year regular monthly returns, and a carefully prepared return at the close of the year, I will accept all responsibility of bringing forward this matter, and I will think very lightly of the charge of denouncing the country with which I am so closely connected. We can appeal to the common sense of the community, and I am satisfied the community will agree in saying: first, let us have the truth and the facts, and afterwards we can add the decorations as they suit ourselves.

Mr. HESSON. One word with regard to some figures which I think the hon. gentleman has omitted. It appears to me that the question really before the Committee is the distribution of the immigration which came into the country last year. We endeavoured to point out that it was impossible to say exactly where these immigrants are now; that all we can know is, that they arrived at certain ports, and that they remained in the country. According to the reports made by the agents, a certain number had declared their intention of settling in the country. The arrivals last year were as follows:—

At Quebec	26,084
Suspension Bridge	7,247
Halifax, N.S	7,484
St. John, N.B	29
Portland, Me	.....
Montreal, *vid* Boston and New York	4,455
Manitoba and North-West, settlers entering at ports other than those above enumerated, and other than those from the old Provinces	21,019
British Columbia	9,000
From United States.	
At Algoma	6,185
Coaticooke	470
Ottawa, Toronto, Kingston, London	1,538
Prescott	876
North of Lake Superior	4,250
Reported with settlers' goods by Custom Houses	34,987
Total settlers	153,644

Now I wish to point out that the hon. member for Went worth (Mr. Bain) has never complained, nor I believe has any other hon. gentleman opposite complained, that the system pursued in getting these returns and publishing the reports in the years from 1874 to 1878 were found fault with by the hon. gentleman, as being incorrect. I presume the Department pursues the same system still, and I will trouble the House with a few figures of those years, which will show the House whether or not the work which has been pursued by the Immigration Committee has prospered in our hands. I say that we have simply pursued the policy of the late Government in getting these figures from our agents, and if they will point out agents who have not done their work well, or if they can indicate a system which would secure better results, I think they would be doing the country a service. The immigration for the years 1874-78 was as follows:—

1874	39,373
1875	27,382
1876	25,633
1877	27,082
1878	29,807
Total	149,278

Under the same system, and with the same agents, we have the following results for the last five years:—

1879	40,492
1880	38,505
1881	47,991
1882	112,458
1883	133,624
Total	373,070

So that we have a total of 373,070 for the last five years, against 149,278 for the preceding five years. I wish to point out further, what was evidently overlooked by the hon. member for Huron, in making his statement, comparing the population to-day with the figures as shown by the Census, contending that we had not gained anything in our population, and that is, that he omitted the operations of two most important years, because he evidently has not embraced in his calculation the year 1871 and the year 1882-83, which accounts for 246,183 which could not have been included in the Census report which was taken in the spring of 1881; consequently, we would have over a quarter of a million added to the population distributed throughout the country. We cannot pretend to deny that some of our people are going away; we cannot prevent that sort of a movement. We endeavour to prevent it by providing employment for the people, and holding out inducements in the shape of liberal land regulations, and if these are not sufficient to retain our people, I think, if the hon. gentleman could suggest some remedy, he would be doing the House and the country a very great service.

Mr. WOODWORTH. On word with regard to the statement made by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that the reason—as I understood him to say—that he was so earnest in his objurgations against the Government to-day was, that while those who are the members of the Government were in opposition, during the five years of the Mackenzie Government, they had also objurgated, and shown that the country was going to the dogs, to use the hon. gentleman's own expression. I say in my place in Parliament, that that statement was incorrect and untrue. I say that if any people in this country, or any portion of the people of this country, ever decried Canada while they were in power, it was the Government from 1874 to 1878. Everybody knows, who reads the papers, and who reads *Hansard*, that you can hardly read a line of them that does not show that they contented that this country had a gloomy outlook before it, and that it was completely depressed in all its industries. The ex-Minister of Finance was asked to take the duty off tobacco, and he said he could not do it. He said that it would take $500,000 out of his revenue, and he did not know how he could replace it, except by direct taxation. He said, on the floor of the House and in the presence of the whole world, that Canada was in such a state of depression that if he had taken off $500,000 duty he could not replace it except by direct taxation. Then the hon. member interrupted the Minister of Railways when he was speaking, to tell him that every corporation that ever invested a dollar in Canadian railways had lost that dollar. That stands to-day in *Hansard*, and how can these hon. gentlemen rise to-day in Parliament and say that we decry the country. He showed that the country was under a shadow, in a state of great gloom and depression while they were in power, and they themselves were showing it day after day. What was said by the members of the Government, from 1874 to 1878, was repudiated by the Liberal Conservative party, and

was shown to be untrue. That party told them, it is true you may be depressed at the present moment, but if you alter your hand, if you shift your policy, we can show you that by a truer administration of public affairs, and by a re-adjustment of the Tariff you can induce money to come into the country, you can build up the country, and it will not be going to the dogs. That was told them every day, until in the year 1878, the people took the power out of their hands, and returned the Liberal Conservative party by an overwhelming majority. Sir, from the beginning of this Session until the cannons boom and the drums beat announcing the prorogation, but one long wail has come from hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. They opened with a cry, they are pessimists from their leader to the bottom; they think that this country in not worth living in. They employ scribes to send to the newspapers of Chicago, of Philadelphia, of Buffalo, of New York, of Boston, to every American newspaper that will publish it, anything that can be said disparaging to Canada. And then they have the face to get up here, as the hon. member for North Wentworth did, as his great sense of justice and fair play and honesty and veracity compelled him to get up, and declare that these things are true. Why, Sir, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), the man most interested in the North-West, coming from a county that is an agricultural county pure and simple, stood on his feet, after three days of incubation—after the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) read from the Reform papers that he had always supported, and had read from his earliest days, from the *Globe* newspaper and the London *Advertiser*, diatribes against the country—the hon. member for Marquette, after three or four days of nursing on the part of his leaders, got up and pronounced - what? a eulogium on the country? no, a jeremiad—one long wail on the disastars that had overtaken it. Why, he told us that in that country men had to go 30 or 40 miles for wood. Someone interrupted him—I think it was the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Ferguson)—and asked him where. He said, at Regina; but he did not tell the House that coal at Regina was down to $6 a ton, and that a ton of coal was worth three cords of the poplar wood of the country. He did not tell that, because it would bring immigration into the country, which would have the effect of keeping the Conservative party in power, and that would be disastrous to the country. He did not state that the coal was $6 a ton, and that next summer there would be other mines opened and a plethora of coal in the country. And these are the gentlemen who say that during the five years of their misrule the Liberal Conservative party decried the country. It is not true; it is they who have decried the country. It was their Finance Minister who stated that every corporation that invested a dollar in railways in this country lost it, and when he was asked to take the duty off tobacco, amounting to half a million dollars, stated that he could not replace it except by direct taxation; and ever since they have been uttering one long, doleful, dismal wail that Canada is a country not worth living in. And the only men in this country who had hope in the future, who said that by a readjustment of the Tariff and a proper administration of affairs, prosperity would return to this country and Canada would become as it is to-day, despite the protestations and the maledictions of hon. gentlemen opposite—the only men who did that were the Liberal Conservatives who never ceased to hold up Canada as a good country for immigrants to come to. I say that the Liberal Conservative party to-day have not their enemies outside of this country so much as they have them in the country. They are building the walls, sure enough, with the trowl in one hand and the sword in the other. Since Parliament opened, I ask if one of them has risen on his feet to say one word in favour of Canada. I ask them if they can point to a member of the United States Congress, who puts in his paper or says in any city or place that the United States is not a fit place for immigrants to go to; and yet we hear of Cincinnatti riots, and Ohio floods, and frosts in Minnesota, and all that sort of thing. Do their papers state that because of these frosts and floods the United States is not a country fit for people to emigrate to? No, Sir. No matter whether they are Republicans or Democrats, they all agree that 2,000 people from the continent of Europe should land every day at Castle Garden and be distributed throughout the country. They agree in getting all the immigrants they can; and yet here in Canada, with half the American continent under our control and only 4,000,000 of people to occupy it, we find a party whose lines are demarcated as clearly from the people as the waters of the Gulf of Mexico are distinguished from the Atlantic Ocean by the murky colour of the stream—a party that declares to the world that nobody should enter Canada who wishes to find a home and to prosper. The hon. member for Bothell has done this often in his paper; and of all the hon. gentlemen opposed to the Government who are sitting there confronting me, not one of them has ever risen in his place and proclaimed Canada a home fit to live in.

Mr. IRVINE. None of us has got as well paid for it as you.

Mr. WOODWORTH. When the hon. gentleman says that, he says what he knows is not true, or he is too ignorant to know what is true. I give him the charity which is accorded to him by his friends, of believing he is not overcrowded with common sense. Not an hon. gentleman opposite, since I have had the honour of a seat here, has risen in his place to show that Canada was a home to live in. Not one of them could repeat Scott's familiar lines, "Breathes there a man with soul so dead—." The moment he would attempt to say it, the words would choke him. Imagine one of them giving away to a patriotic sentiment—he would have paralysis of the brain or the heart. They have got into the groove of saying this country is not a fit place to live in, and it will only become fit to live in when they get into power. There must, of necessity, be two great parties, but with a paucity of population, compared to our great extent of fertile area, we cannot afford to have two great political parties opposed to each other on national grounds; we cannot afford, while one side is trying to build up the country, to have an opposing party which never losses an opportunity to seize upon any small tittle of fact or of ficton that they can find in the papers and give utterance to in Parliament to keep emigrants from this country. Let the two parties oppose each other on some other ground, but let there be at least a national feeling in this country. I tell the hon. member for North Wentworth that he is mistaken when he says that the Conservative party ever decried this country. I am not sure if he was a member of this House from 1874 to 1878, but if he was not, he should have read the *Hansard* and the newspapers, or if has really read them, he has read them with but little profit, when he states that this Government, when in Opposition from 1874 to 1878, had decried the country. He stated also what we all know to be untrue of his own party. We all know that Session after Session, down in Nova Scotia, whenever Parliament would open here, we would ask what was the news from Parliament. And though they would put in the Governor's mouth, in the Speech from the Throne, everything to help themselves, it was all blue ruin, and the only hope for Canada seemed to be in the Liberal Conservative party. Instead of decrying the country, the only hope for the country lay in our party, and everyone who has studied Canadian history knows that the statement of the hon. member for North Wentworth is utterly unfounded in fact.

Mr. BAIN. I only want to correct the hon. member with reference to my period of existence in political life. I had the honour of being here when his political friends, on

the occasion of the Pacific scandal, did not dare to face the House, but fled without facing a vote.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The hon. member for North Wentworth expressed doubts about the correctness of the figures as to the number of immigrants sent to Manitoba, and based his doubts on the ground of being unable to find them in the country.

Mr. BAIN. In the report.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think more of the country.

Mr. BAIN. I was thinking about the report; I was not up there.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will not take the trouble of giving detailed information, but will simply refer the hon. gentleman to a speech of one of his friends who sits immediately behind him (Mr. Cameron, Huron) made a few evenings ago. If the hon. gentleman was not in the House, it would would be worth his while to turn up the report of the speech delivered on that occasion, in which the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) put forward the claims of the Territories for representatives in the House, and instanced the larger settlements at Moose Jaw, Calgary, Fort McLeod, Prince Albert and Edmonton, as being large, populous, prosperous and happy communities, and to-day possessing larger populations than many of the Territories of the United States, when they got representation in Congress. That speech will supply all the information the hon. gentleman requires, as regards the distribution of immigrants in Manitoba.

Resolution to be reported; Committee to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:35 o'clock, a. m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House, tomorrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend "The Liquor License Act, 1883," in several respects, and especially as to the time for applying for and taking out licenses,—as to the appointment of Commissioners, and as to legal proceedings enacted and the penalties imposed by the Act, and by providing that any deficiency in the license fund, in respect of expenses may be made good out of moneys voted by Parliament for the purpose.

JUDICIARY OF MANITOBA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient that a salary of $4,000 be provided for an additional Puisné Judge of the Queen's Bench in the Province of Manitoba.

ADJOURNMENT—EASTER.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, may I ask whether the Government are prepared to make any announcement respecting their course as to Easter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I intend to propose, with the consent of the House, that when the House adjourns on Thursday, it shall adjourn until Saturday, and that when it adjourns on Saturday, it shall adjourn until Monday, so that Friday will be the only holiday.

Mr. BAIN.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 128) further to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874.—(Mr. Costigan.)

The following Bill was again considered in Committee, amended, reported and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 87) further to amend the Indian Act, 1880.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 130) to amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose that the Bill be amended so as to allow temporary or supernumerary officers who have passed the requisite examination to enter the service provided their age when they obtained temporary employment did not exceed thirty-five years.

Mr. BLAKE. How many will this affect?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It applies only to one case, that o an official who has been long time a temporary officer, who was considered, in fact, a permanent officer, and who submitted to the necessary examination. This amendment will apply only to those who have been constantly employed, not to those who were employed at one time and then removed.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has suggested a possible difficulty. A man might have been employed a little while a great many years ago, and would still be entitled to the benefit of this amendment, for no exception, such as the hon. gentleman suggests, is made.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I beg to call again the attention of the hon. Secretary of State to a question I brought up yesterday, in relation to the promotion examinations. I am informed that in some cases where promotion examinations have taken place, successful candidates have not been furnished with certificates, which, I think, are required to be furnished to them by the law, or under the regulations. I would suggest that in those certificates furnished to successful candidates, the number of marks they received ought to be indicated, so that they may know whether they have passed an examination entitling them to a higher grade than that which they competed for; and if they have, they should not be requested to pass another examination to be rendered eligible for a position in such higher grade.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The only examinations for promotion that have taken place were general examinations, and, in those examinations, the candidates who were successful were either entitled to a first class clerkship certificate or a second, according to the number of points they obtained. I have consulted a member of the Civil Service Board, and I do not see any objection to providing that candidates for first class will not be obliged to submit to a second examination, even when the examination asked would be for another vacancy, if the number of points obtained entitled them to a first class certificate. I suggest another amendment, that the graduates of the Royal Military College be added to subsection 6 of section 4.

Bill, as amended, reported; and read the third time and passed.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No,

111) respecting the Independence of Parliament Act, 1878, 41 Vic., chap. 5.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. I desire to move an additional amendment to the 9th clause of this Act. The 9th clause contains certain provisions declaring who shall not be disqualified or rendered ineligible for sitting as members of Parliament. Sub-section *c* says:

"Any officer of the militia, or militia man, not receiving any salary or emolument out of the public money of Canada except only his daily pay when called out for drill or on active service, or allowances."

It will be seen that this clauss does not allow any officer of militia to receive any other sum except his pay when actually called out for drill. Now it appears that it is the practice in the Department, in addition to the pay given to officers for their daily drill, for them to receive a certain annual sum, some $20, I believe, for the care of arms and for drill instruction. The object of the clause was to allow militia officers, or militia men, to be elected members of Parliament if they only drew their daily pay, and it is for the purpose of including staff officers who receive salaries like Adjutants General and the Brigade Majors. But the words of the clause strictly interpreted would really render ineligible every officer of militia who received this annual fee for the care of arms and for drill instruction; and I believe there are many hon. members here who, if the strict interpretation of the Act were insisted on, would be ineligible. My hon. friend, the member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), is one of them. He was surprised the other day by getting notice that he was going to be sued for breach of the independence of Parliament Act, and that he was liable to pay $6,000, I think. My hon. friend did not know what in the world he was going to be sued for; he was not aware that he had in any way infringed the independence of Parliament Act. But on enquiry it was found, that as captain of his company, he had received, like other officers, this fee of $20, for which he was now threatened with a suit. Subsequently he put the case in the hands of his solicitor, and his solicitor writes:

"I enclose you a letter which I received to-day from Mr. Mosgrove. I called on him for an explanation, and from what he says to me he expects $500 or $600 from you, otherwise he says he will proceed with his threatened suit."

In other words he attempted to levy blackmail because this officer, like other officers of the active militia, had received this annual sum for drill instruction. I move that the following section be added to the said Bill as the fourth section:—

4. The following words are hereby added to Sub-section (c) of Section 9, of the Act hereby amended,—"and any pay or remuneration allowed him for the care of arms or for drill instruction," and shall be construed and have effect as if they had formed part of the said Act and Sub-section at the time of the passing thereof:—

And any Member or Members of the House of Commons or any person whosoever being or having been such Member is hereby indemnified and exonerated from all liability to any penalty or other responsibility and from any suit, demand, or judgment which may have been or may be hereafter brought or rendered against him with respect to any such penalty or responsibility of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, while not otherwise disqualified, than by reasons of his having received any pay or remuneration for the care of arms or for drill instruction while an Officer of the Militia or Militia man; and this Act may be pleaded as a bar and discharge to any action or suit pending, or which may be brought against any Member of the House of Commons or other person as aforesaid for any matter, cause, or thing mentioned in this Act, and shall also be a discharge of any judgment for any such penalty as is mentioned in this Section, and any costs or such judgment

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not press the third reading of the Bill, and that this clause will appear in the Votes and Proceedings to-morrow, so that we may have the opportunity of examining it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Bill, as amended, reported.

SUPPLY.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

SUPERINTENDENCE OF INSURANCE COMPANIES.

163 To meet expenses in connection with the Inspection of Insurance Companies..... $6,250 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Part of the increase is due to one of the clerks being made a second-class clerk, at $1,100 a year, and the other part of the increase is made up of the contingencies of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did the fees amount to last year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. An assessment was made to cover the expenses, and it did cover the whole.

DOMINION LANDS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

211. Amount required for surveys..... $300,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope the hon. First Minister will give the Committee some general idea of the policy of the Government on this subject. So far as I can make out an enormous quantity of land has been surveyed, much in excess I should imagine of the quantity which, for a good many years, can be required for settlers. I shall be glad if I am mistaken on this point, but the quantity seems to me to be in excess of the needs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When in Committee before, I laid on the Table a map showing what surveys had been made, the block surveys as well as those where townships had been sub-divided. The attention of the Department was, in the first place, directed to lay out the land on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and that has been pretty well done, I think as far as Calgary. Next the Department proceeded to lay out as far as possible the various areas which had been selected by the colonization companies. Of course, the object of those companies was to obtain settlers as soon as possible; and they could not get settlers until their lands were sub-divided, and they covered very considerable areas. Then there was special surveys at particular points—at Prince Albert, Edmonton, Battleford and elsewhere. Then there were general surveys which have been completed, except a small tract between the international boundary and the Canadian Pacific Railway. That small tract consists of land supposed to be of value only for grazing purposes, and not specially adapted to agricultural purposes. Whenever it is ascertained beyond a doubt that a region is chiefly adapted for grazing, of course it is a waste of money to sub-divide it into quarter-sections, because grazing locations must be of very considerable dimensions. That is, speaking generally, the plan that has been carried out by the Surveyor-General's branch of the Department of the Interior. A large vote for surveys was taken last year, $650,000. The season was a particularly favourable one for the work, and a very large amount of surveying was done. It is thought desirable that we should diminish the amount of surveys to be carried out this year. It would not have been at all well to have decreased the work before this time. Both in the United States and Canada, settlers will not go where the Government wish them to go, but only wherever their caprice and fancy suits them, and it is not well to discourage that feeling. Although of course it prevents the settling of immigrants in large communities and interferes with the establishment of municipal institutions and self government, yet there are no means of checking that practice; and if the immigrant gets disappointed when he has set his heart on a particular place, he

is very apt to become a member of the exodus party. So we must put up with it. It has been thought well under these circumstances to continue the surveys, but carry them out on a reduced scale. There is another reason why the surveys should not be stopped suddenly. It was with some difficulty that a satisfactory body of competent men was found. These men have been found, and on the whole they have done their work well. There are of course surveyors and surveyors—some who are competent and some who are partial failures; but the experience of last year and the fact that the extent of surveys will be diminished for this year, have enabled the Department to make a selection of the men. Unfortunately, Mr. Lindsay Russell, as everyone will regret to hear who knows him, is in bad health and is to be superannuated, and Captain Deville, who is at the head of the surveying branch has been able to classify the surveyors from his experience and his acquaintance with their acquirements and capabilities. Of course, in choosing a surveyor you must choose him first for his professional knowledge, and in the next place for his reliability and honesty of purpose, and his economy as well. Some are wasteful, and some slight their work. They have been arranged, however, from first class down to fifth class, and I may say, on behalf of the head of the Department of the Interior, that they have been selected without the slightest reference to himself. It has been left entirely to the head of the surveying branch to choose the fittest men.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Have any of the surveys been conducted north of Edmonton, towards the Peace River District?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are some surveys on the north branch of the Saskatchewan, but to what extent I cannot say without the map. At Saskatchewan, Battleford, Edmonton, and some other points, the general system of survey, the equilateral system, has been of necessity abandoned. These were old settlements of the Hudson Bay Company, and the holdings have narrow fronts and great depth. I was anxious myself, I must say, for the sake of carrying out the principle all over the North-West, to have the new system carried out there, even by compensating the parties, or arranging with any of the settlers whose improvements were cut up by the new survey, but that was found to be exceedingly distasteful to the people. They like to hold their old holdings, so that these are special surveys, which have been laid out according to the original plan of the Hudson's Bay Company. A very difficult question has arisen as to the settlement of the boundaries of these people, and as to ascertaining those parties who really have *bonâ fide* titles from the Hudson Bay Company, or have acquired the equitable title which is always recognized in the North-West from long actual settlement. That question is now in process of settlement, and will be settled this summer. Patents are issued as soon as they can be issued. The system which has now been adopted since we were able to do so by the Act of last year, has enabled the Department to put an end thoroughly to the cry of delay in issuing patents. Formerly there was the issue of patents by the old system, which had always obtained in Canada, and which we got from England. As legal gentlemen opposite know, there is great sanctity thrown about the great seal of England, and no matter how improperly it was affixed to a paper, the seal itself is conclusive evidence—no other is required, unless fraud, or something of that kind, has been proven before a court of competent jurisdiction. We have altered all that, and we have been issuing from 50 to 100 patents a day, and have really caught up with the demand. There is, of course, sometimes a natural hesitation on the part of the settler, who thinks that the day after the three years have expired, in which he has resided on his place he must get his patent. It is impossible that he can do so; there must be an inspection and evidence must be got; and we do that by personal inspection and not by affidavits, which are so many sources of fraud and misrepresentation by dishonest people. The agent goes along the line, and makes a report in each case, with special instructions that if there is real, *bonâ fide* evidence of actual residence, subject to the leave of absence allowed by law—if it is evident that he is not a bogus settler, a most liberal construction is given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand from the hon. gentleman's statement that from this time out, and for a period shortly preceding, a personal visit of the inspector is necessary in all cases?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not say so, but that is the general practice of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not the invariable practice?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; not the invariable practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because, though there is a good deal to be said for a personal inspection, in some cases it might lead to a great delay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Patents are issued generally in the United States about six years after the party has a right to it. There is, however, an intermediate certificate, which for most practical purposes amounts to a patent.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the local agent authorized to issue a certificate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was the old law until we altered it two years ago, I think. We found that we had occasionally a dishonest or careless agent, who colluded with the parties, and therefore the certificate is given by the local agent, and is sent on at once to Winnipeg, to the Commissioner, or the Land Board, and unless they see any reason to suspect anything wrong they confirm the certificate at once. That is final, and thereupon on the certificate of the Land Board, or Mr. Walsh, the patent issues. *Apropos* of this vote, and of the map which I have laid on the Table, I will read the memorandum of the Department:

"The map herewith shows the localities in which the surveys for the next season are proposed to be made. The red skeleton lines thereon indicate the townships of which the outlines are to be surveyed; and the red colouring indicates where the lands previously outlined are to be sub-divided and set out for settlement. It is estimated that 4,200 miles of outlines will be run, and 216 townships sub-divided and set out for settlement. The outline work is almost wholly west of the fourth principal meridian, and between the Red Deer River on the south and the North Saskatchewan River on the north. The outline surveys in the Wood Mountain region, lying immediately west of the third principal meridian, will be completed as far as the western boundary of the 8th range, and as far north as the northern boundary of Township 6. The scheme of sub-division includes seven to ten townships in the Province of Manitaba, mostly remnants of contracts of former years. The rest of the work is all west of the third principal meridian, and consists of scattered blocks of townships on the South Saskatchewan and Red Deer Rivers, not sub-divided last year, although included in the scheme; a large block immediately north of Calgary, on the fifth principal meridian; about ten townships on the Red Deer River, about half way between Edmonton and Calgary; about seven townships on Buffalo Lake; seventeen on the Battle River, directly north of Edmonton. The larger portion of the sub-division work will be along the North Saskatchewan and Battle Rivers, from Fort Carleton to the fourth principal meridian, which intersects the North Saskatchewan about 10 miles west of Fort Pitt."

Mr. CASEY. Is anything to be done this season in the direction of surveying the districts lying south-easterly from Prince Albert?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I think not.

Mr. CASEY. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the Manitoba and North-Western Railway is expected to be built this season in that direction, and that

there is a larger section of good land there likely to be soon settled upon than in many of the districts referred to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to get the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and I shall ascertain in the Department whether, if the North-Western Railway goes on, the survey will not be carried on *pari passu* with the progress of the road.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, it is something in the future; but there is a railway going in that direction, whereas in the stretch of country towards Edmonton, there is no railway even in immediate prospect. It is very distant from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have no pledge or statement from the Company that they intend to build a branch in that direction. It is quite possible that the Manitoba and North-Western may be the first road to reach that section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told that all the lands through which the Manitoba and North-Western Railway will pass during the next year have been surveyed already.

Mr. CASEY. Probably as much as it will pass through next year; but people strike out ahead of the railway, and you should have the country prepared for them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite true.

Mr. CASEY. With regard to the general expense, the reduction is very considerable, but it is quite clear that the surveys in those particular neighbourhoods will be ample for a great many years to come. I quite agree with the hon. Minister that for many reasons it would not do to stop the surveys, but it does seem to be possible that all that requires to be done this year should be done for a great deal less than $300,000, which will survey 10,000,000 acres, a very great addition to the surveyed territory to be made in one season.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will agree that it would be well that that portion of the country lying north of Minnedosa, and running towards Prince Albert, should be surveyed. Well, there is scarcely a section of that country with regard to which you will not find people to say that it ought to be surveyed.

Mr. CASEY. But there is the general principle to be followed, I think, of surveying those districts where there is an early prospect of settlement, and leaving those where there is no immediate prospect of settlement. My hon. friend also referred to the surveying of tracts belonging to colonization companies. I should think that that work is pretty well completed by this time, because the number of colonization companies that have really made their payments and have a right to the land is comparatively small. I suppose that money has not been spent unnecessarily in surveying the lands of those companies that have failed to carry out their agreements.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The companies have selected their lands, which is a pretty good evidence to the Government that the lands of these companies are fit for settlement.

Mr. CASEY. A good many selected them without any inspection at all. Of course, it may be evidence as to the quality of the lands; but the hon. gentleman knows that many of these tracts are so far away from railway communication that unless with that stimulus of the forcing action of the companies, they are not likely to be settled for many years.

Mr. WATSON. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to the necessity of having the large tract of land lying between the Riding Mountains and Lake Manitoba, immediately west of Lake Manitoba, and the tract even between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, surveyed. Many people would take up land there in preference to going 1,000 miles further west, as it is close to settlement, and to railway and water communication. I would also suggest that some means be taken by which applications for patents could be made to some officer in Winnipeg and the evidence received there, as the system at present entails considerable correspondence with the Department at Ottawa.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The inspector reports, the agent signs the certificate, and the report and certificate go to Winnipeg for the approval or disapproval of Mr. Walsh. If there be any delay, the parties may appeal from the decision of the Land Board to the Department here. You cannot help that, unless you say there shall be no appeal from the Land Board at Winnipeg, and I do not think that will be satisfactory.

Mr. WATSON. It would be much better if a great many of the cases could be settled in Winnipeg where they can get the evidence. A man may apply for a patent who has had his land for four years, and still not have lived on it six months in every year, but have lived long enough to be justly entitled to his patent, though he may not have kept the strict letter of the law. Such cases have to be referred to Ottawa. But if they could be dealt with in Winnipeg, it would be a great relief to many settlers who are rather hard up, and not having got the patents for their lands, cannot borrow money on the lands to enable them to go on cultivating the soil and make improvements. I must say the Department has been generous in granting patents such as I have described, but still, if settled at Winnipeg, it would be a great relief.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has laid on the Table a map showing the surveys which have taken place in the North-West Territories and in the Province of Manitoba. I observe, in looking over the quantity of land surveyed, about 100,000 square miles are reported surveyed in that country, or 64,000,000 acres. In 1873, 4,790,000 acres were surveyed; in 1874, 4,237,000; in 1875, 655,000; in 1876, 420,000; in 1877, 221,000; in 1878, 306,000; in 1879, 1,130,000; in 1880, 4,427,000; in 1881, 9,147,000; in 1882, 9,460,000; in 1883, 27,000,000; or in all about 64,000,000 acres. I do not think the hon. gentleman's map discloses so large an extent surveyed as 100,000 square miles. This is a matter deserving our serious attention, because if lands are surveyed for any considerable length of time in advance of settlement and it is found that the marks of the boundary disappear and the survey has to be made a second or third time, it is pretty clear we are expending a considerable sum of money on surveys to no particular purpose. Now the hon. gentleman has intimated that every homestead lot is to be personally inspected by some agent or officer of the Government before the patent is issued, in order to see that the homestead provisions of the law have been complied with. This, no doubt, will be a serious burden, and the hon. gentleman will be able to say what number of lots an agent will be able to inspect during the year. If settlement were to go on with any thing like the rapidity the hon. gentleman at one time anticipated, the expense of inspection before patents could issue would in itself require no inconsiderable vote. I observe that in 1877 there were 2,283 entries; in 1878, 4,065; in 1879, 6,782; in 1880, 4,200; in 1881, 5,819; 1882, 16,740; in 1883, 10,450. It is clear that in the course of two or three years there will be 16,740 patents to issue, and the numbers of homesteads being upwared of 7,000, there will be 7,000 inspections to make. If the settlement were to go on with great rapidity, this inspection would entail a very large expenditure of public money. No doubt the question has been considered by the hon. gentleman, because he could hardly adopt such a means of determining whether the party was

entitled to his patent or not, without first considering what the cost would be and of carrying such a means of verifying the good faith of the patent into effect. It would be seen from the report that the issue of patents has not kept pace with the issue of settlement entries, and there must be a great number of entries that have been abandoned or a great number of patents in arrears. In 1877, the number of entries was 2,283, and the number of patents issued that year 2,438; in 1878, the number of entries was 4,065, and the number of patents issued, 2,357; in 1879, the number of entries 6,782, the number of patents, 2,663; in 1880, the number of entries, 4,210, the number of patents only 1,000. Now it is perfectly obvious that there must have been a great many more than that number entitled to receive patents. The next year, in 1881, the number of entries was 5,819 and the number of patents issued, 1,981. Of course, those who paid cash for their lots would all be entitled to patents, so the number of patents from the previous year should have been 4,065 besides the 1,417 who purchased in that year, and yet only 1,981 patents were issued or less than 20 per cent. of the number who were entitled to patents. Then, in 1882, the number of entries was 16,740 and the number of patents issued, 2,197. If we look back three years as to the number of persons entitled to patents, we find there were upwards of 6,000 people, unless the hon. gentleman will assume that a large number of those who purchased had failed to pay, and a number of those who had entered upon these lands under the homestead provisions of the law had abandoned their homesteads and given up the lands for which they were entered. From these facts, it is pretty clear that the work of the Department must be falling very largely into arrear. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but it is impossible that it can be otherwise, unless, as I said before, many who purchased failed to pay for their lands, gave up their purchases, and a large number of those who made homestead entries abandoned the lands for which entries took place. Unless that is so, it is perfectly obvious that the work of the Department is very largely in arrear, as the number of patents issued has not been one-fourth of the number that ought to have issued, in case the returns made to us are perfectly reliable, and all the parties are in possession of the land for which entries were made. I observe, in looking over the revenues derived from the sale of these lands—and I have gone back as far as 1873—that the revenue has, so far, fallen very, very far below the actual expenditure that has taken place, and, that instead of the public lands of the North-West, as yet, being a large source of revenue to the public, up to this moment they have been a burden, and that those calculations that the hon. gentleman submitted to the House a few years ago have not been realized. In 1873, the sales for which payments were made in cash or military bounty warrants, for both were authorized at that time, amounted to $28,586; in 1874, $25,987; in 1875, $25,161; in 1876, $8,724; in 1877, $143,645; in 1878, $138,211; in 1879, $255,119; in 1880, $155,812; in 1881, $164,451; and in 1882, $1,633,051; and the next year it had fallen again to $798,222, or a sum less than the expenditure for surveys and for the management of the Land Office of the North-West, to say nothing about the cost of the administration of the Department of the Interior here. For I observe that the expenditure on behalf of the Land Office at Winnipeg was $140,000 odd, and the surveys $650,000, making considerably more than the amount of money actually received from the sale of lands in the North-West. I mention these facts in order that the hon. gentleman may have an opportunity of giving us further information upon this subject, that he may be able to inform us how far he expects those brilliant pictures of the large revenues to be derived from the sale of these lands are likely to be realized, upon what he counts for the fulfilment of those opinions, and what plan he proposes to adopt in order that patents may issue as fast as the public are entitled to them, and what means are to be adopted for actual inspection of the homestead lands with the view of seeing whether the patents ought to issue or not, because it is clear that, if a large number of persons take up homesteads, the cost of personal inspection will become a very large charge upon the revenue of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman has taken a great deal of trouble, and perhaps not too much profit. Certainly the chief expenditure in the North-West has been in surveys. The country has to be surveyed. Whether you give away the land to actual settlers or sell it, the primary expense is that of survey. Then the hon. gentleman says the patents must be in arrears.

Mr. MILLS. So they are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I do not think they are in arrears. In the first place, the experiment of having homestead inspection is a new one, having only been commenced last year. Before that, the Department of course, waited until the settler applied for his patent and sent in his affidavits, and very many do not choose to do that. They are quite satisfied. Having got their entry and built their house, no mortal man and no Government can disturb them. They are quite satisfied with their title, and do not apply for their patents. Then there are very many instances in which one patent covers a great many acres, and there are parties who not only get their homesteads but take up their preemptions. Those pre emptions are on time. The party does not pay cash, and the settler wants to get the one patent for his homestead and his preemption, and he waits until he pays up for his pre-emption and gets his patent for both. But there has been really no delay, and I believe there are no arrears. There are only four homestead inspectors at present. There is an estimate made for seven, for fear that three more might be wanted. They will go over the country and verify the residence.

Mr. MILLS. Do they report on each individual lot?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot exactly say as to that.

Mr. MILLS. How many do they inspect in a year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman must recollect that this system had only been introduced in the year 1883. From the immense number of claims that were bogus or believed to be bogus, and the immense number who claimed over the heads of those who had got the entries on the ground that they had abandoned them and tried to jump their claims, it was absolutely necessary to verify in some way the affidavits put in, and for this purpose the homestead inspectors were employed. Of course, it does not relieve parties of the obligation, *ex necessitate* under the Statute, of putting in reasonable evidence of having satisfied the terms of the law. The homestead inspector goes through the country and makes up his mind whether the thing is altogether bogus or substantially correct. It takes very little time. A man can cover a great deal of ground in a day, or a month, and especially in a season. But we will be able to speak more definitely in a year.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that he has not explained away the condition of things that I pointed out. I pointed out to him that from the returns made by the Department of the Interior, going back the length of time for which is necessary that parties should be in occupation before the right to get a patent for a homestead entry should accrue, will find that the number of patents issued do not make more than 25 per cent. of the annual entries by sale or by homestead in the North-West Territories. Now it may be as he has

stated that these parties have not applied for their patents, they may be content to allow the matter to stand over. That may be quite true—in all probability that is the case; but if that be so it is perfectly obvious that the work of issuing patents has not yet taken place; inspection has not yet taken place; that is yet to be done, and there is an accumulation of work to be performed at some future period which, according to the scheme marked out by the hon. gentleman, implies a very large expenditure, whether it be done this year or five years hence. Whenever it is done it will entail a very large expense on the country. For instance, in 1883 there were 16,740 entries either by sale or by homestead entries. Well, in the course of a very few years there will be 16,740 patents to issue, and there will be 16,740 inspections to take place, less the number of actual sales. Therefore I say that a less expensive mode of inspecting the country and of determining whether a party is entitled to a patent, should be adopted than that which the hon. gentleman has suggested.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I ask if the hon. gentleman is aware what steps are taken to secure that in conjunction with this service some sort of record is made of the quality of the land surveyed? Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have an uncommonly excellent plan, and I am not sure that it is possible for the Minister to adopt it. Still, I wished to know what step is being taken to see that as the survey goes on, a record is kept of the quality of the lands to which purchasers may have access.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The surveyors make their field notes; all surveyors do that, as the hon. gentleman knows. In their field notes they give a general description of the country, and of its quality, so far as they are capable of judging—and surveyors are pretty good judges of what land is—and of the timber, and I suppose any special indications they observe; and these are returned to Ottawa.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman ever seen the maps—the little books that are prepared by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of each township of theirs?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. But I understand from the Deputy Minister that the duties of a surveyor in surveying are quite different from those of the parties sent to examine land by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The latter are not surveyors; or may not be. A surveyor lays out the boundary of the township and marks out the sub-divisions, the different sections and quarter sections of a township; but he does not go into the interior and does not examine every lot, whereas, the officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway value the land with the object of selling it; they go over the lot and look at the soil and make a report for the purpose of selling it. The Government could not do this, as the expense would be enormous. Our surveyors make a report, as all surveyors do, of the country which they actually traverse.

DOMINION LANDS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Land Board at Winnipeg.

	Commissioner's salary	$ 5,000 00
	Inspector of Agencies' salary	3,200 00
	do travelling expenses, &c.	1,200 00
	Inspector of Colonization Companies' salary	3,000 00
	do do travelling expenses, &c.	1,000 00
	Secretary's salary	2,000 00
	9 Clerks	8,000 00
	Contingencies, fuel, light, postage, telegrams, &c.	4,880 00
	Messenger	350 00
	7 Homestead Inspectors	8,400 00

Dominion Lands Agencies.

	13 Dominion Lands Agents	16,800 00
	17 Clerks	17,273 00
	Messenger	350 00
	Contingencies, including office rent, fuel, &c.	8,000 00

Crown Timber Agencies.

	Crown Timber Agent, Winnipeg, salary	1,600 00
	Book-keeper, do	1,200 00
	Crown Timber Agent, Edmonton, salary	1,200 00
212	do Calgary, do	1,200 00
	do Prince Albert, salary	1,200 00
	6 Forest Rangers	4,200 00
	Contingencies	5,000 00
	Stationery and printing for Outside Service	4,000 00
	Board of Examiners of Dominion Land Surveyors	1,000 00
	Contingencies paid at head office for Outside Service	1,000 00

Land Guide Service.

	Land Guides, at $3.50 per day each, covering all expenses of transport and living cost for six months	10,000 00

British Columbia.

	Salary of Resident Agent and staff, and contingencies	10,645 00

INSIDE SERVICE.

	Extra Clerks at head office, Ottawa, publishing maps, advertising and other similar expenses	30,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Inspector of colonization companies' salary and travelling expenses $3,000. About how many companies has he to inspect?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are twenty-six living existing colonization companies, and he inspected twelve last year, those that are in the vicinity of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those living further north about the Saskatchewan were not inspected. They will be inspected this year. The object of inspection, of course, is to ascertain what settlers there are within the area, and what credit shall be given for the settlers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should imagine the officer might have easily enough inspected twenty-six companies in the course of a year. Do I understand that his whole time has been taken up in inspecting twelve last year? Because that does not seem a superhuman amount of work to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The survey can only be made during the summer season. They lie many miles apart from each other, perhaps 300 or 400 miles; it is a country of such enormous distances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the whole twenty-six lie 300 or 400 miles apart. They may lie thirty or forty miles apart, because they are most of them substantially within the same belt. I do not want to censure the officer, because it is quite possible in that country that the proper inspection of twelve companies may have occupied the whole time. But *prima facie* it did appear to me that he might have visited the whole twenty-six.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of his going is to see whether there is going to be deducted 100 per cent., or 50 per cent. The colonization companies paid $2 an acre for their land, and if through their endeavours they succeeded in settling the even numbered sections, they obtained a credit of $1 per acre; and therefore the Inspector of the colonization companies must see that the settlers are permanent residents and have made the necessary improvements before the credit is given. This has to be done carefully, or it will be no use to employ him. This work

will be the means of saving a good deal of money to the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it necessary that the Inspector of the colonization companies should spend a large portion of the winter at Ottawa?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It matters not where he spends the winter.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are the lands of any colonization company located in the county of Kent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know the names of the counties in the North-West.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. First Minister ought to be able to give the Committee a report from the Inspector, showing the colonization companies' lands which he has inspected, the number of settlers within their limits, and the character of the improvements which have been made. In this way we would obtain substantial evidence as to the work of inspection performed. If the hon. First Minister has such a report it should be placed before the Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Inspector makes his examination as to the settlement and reports to the Department. His reports are considered very good, very satisfactory and very clear. They are not published, because to do so would involve a waste of public money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We all know the position which our esteemed friend, Mr. Stephenson, formerly occupied here; and I am informed that during part of the winter he was rather actively engaged politically in the county of Kent. I do not think that should be allowed; I speak in Mr. Stephenson's own interest. I would be sorry to make an attack on him; but officers of this class particularly should be instructed by the Department to keep themselves clear of political contests. The hon. First Minister does not require to have pointed out to him the great practical inconvenience arising, and the reflections that might be cast on the officer's work, if he interfered in political contests while in Ontario. I think it is to be regretted if that officer did interfere; and I think without depriving him of the right to cast his vote if he happens to be in the county, it should be understood that officers occupying such positions should not interfere in political contests.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say that he did interfere. Like an old coach horse, when he hears the whip crack he becomes excited at election times like the rest of us.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is the hon. gentleman quite certain that he was not invited to come down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not by me. I will not speak for others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us some information in regard to the item $8,400 for seven homestead inspectors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There were four Inspectors appointed, but one has since left the Service. The present Inspectors are Aikman, Rodgers and Park. It is proposed by the Department to appoint four more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are their duties; are they employed during the summer or during the whole year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are employed outside during the summer season, and work in the office during the winter.

Mr. MILLS. It is important that these officers should discharge their duties fairly and justly to parties who take up land under the Homestead Act. A case of hardship has been mentioned to me—the name of the party I do not remember. But he took up land not many miles from Winnipeg a few years ago. He subsequently engaged in the service of the Hudson Bay Company, and according to their regulations he was not allowed to settle on the lot. He put another person on the lot, built a small house and made improvements, and he sent his earnings to Scotland, I believe, with a view of bringing out his family. His family were brought out, but a person in Winnipeg was appointed by the Commissioners to examine into the matter, because although he had improved the lot, and built upon it, he had no rights which were recognized, because he did not reside on it, and Mr. Aikins, a son of the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, became in some way or other the proprietor of the lot and all the improvements.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Act is precise. It is not the cultivation, but the residence with the cultivation, which gives the claim. That subject was fully ventilated last year when the subject was before Parliament, and there seemed to be a concensus of opinion; that the cultivation clause would enable people who are wealthy to select favoured portions of the country, where there were chances of there being town sites or water privileges or something of that kind, put a man on it to cultivate it, and reside in Winnipeg all the time, keeping out the actual settler, and being in fact a speculator. Therefore it was considered that cultivation was not sufficient. That seemed to be the general opinion of the House, and that, I understand, is the general opinion of the Land Department at Washington—that residence is the only protection that the public have that the land will be occupied by the *bonâ fide* settler. You may get a man of capital; and he may acquire an enormous area of land, like the Dalrymple Farm, if the cultivation system is adopted. Some have considered the law to be too rigid with regard to residence, and some cases of hardship have been explained to myself. That, however, is to be remedied to a certain extent by the Bill which is now on the Table, from the Upper House, by which it is provided that if, say, the father comes and settles on the land, and the son takes the next free lot, they can live together, instead of requiring each party to put up a house, and have a separate residence of his own. The Act provides that within an area of some two and a-half miles from a given point, the parties can live together.

Mr. MILLS. That Act is not passed yet. I may say, however, that the case which I mentioned was evidently one of good faith and intent, the man having gone to earn means to bring out his family, with the intention of settling on the land. It seems to me that if a case such as I described does not come within the rule, it would be a very extraordinary rule indeed, for it is evidently within the spirit and intention of the law. The explanation which the hon. gentleman made with reference to the Bill in the Senate, shows a disposition on the part of the Government to meet cases of this sort, and it does seem to me that the person to whom I referred has been unfairly dealt with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That however is the construction of the Statute. There is the law, and we must carry it out, although if the law is unreasonable we may alter it. It may work hardly in some cases, and if it does so generally, it should be altered. If it works hardly in particular cases, the particular cases must suffer, if the general purview of the law is in the public interest. Will the hon. gentleman give me the name of the person he referes to?

Mr. MILLS. I have not got the letter at present.

Sir. JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he is the particular individual I think he is, I scarcely think he was hardly treated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What area is allowed to each of these officers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is a good deal according to the character of the country. The various points where there is likely to be a run of settlement are selected for agencies, and, as the settlement spreads, the various outlying sections are added, and charges are made according to the ever changing progress of settlement in particular districts. They are chosen altogether on the belief that particular districts or points are supposed to contain areas of land which are likely to be settled.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have been trying to get a return in regard to the granting of timber licenses, but so far we have been unable to get it. Perhaps the Minister will tell us what area of timber land has been put under license, what number of parties have taken out licenses, during the past year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report of the Department shows the number of licenses granted during the year. The normal size of each, is 50 square miles.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would also like to ask as to whether these licenses have been granted after competition has been solicited by advertisements, or as heretofore, without inviting competition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have been granted to the explorers—those who go to the expense of exploring them, and make application, and pay the rental and the dues. In case there are more than one application in any given period, then they are put up to competition among the parties applying.

Mr. CHARLTON. A sort of private competition?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, among the different parties. If they pay the Crown dues they get the license, and they are obliged to put up a saw mill, &c.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Government have not seen fit to make explorations on their own account, and inform themselves of the probable value and number of these timber limits, so as to be able to put them up at auction among the parties who may wish to acquire them. If that is not done, these limits are likely to be disposed of at a mere fraction of their actual value.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt persons have sometimes had a bonanza; they have explored, and finding a particular limit, have applied for it and got it. At first for several years back, the great aim was to get down the price of lumber, and the man was considered the greatest benefactor of the North-West who would go and explore, obtain a limit, put up a saw mill, and send boards and timber to market. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that with the increasing knowledge of that country that we have now, and with the large number of settlers who are going in, that competition may ere long be introduced to perhaps the same extent as it exists in Ontario and in Quebec, except in the outlying districts, where it may be very difficult to get people to tender, unless they have examined the land. They will not go to the expense of examining the land if they think that all their money may be lost because some person stays at home and tenders low.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the policy had better be adopted at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps so.

Mr. CHARLTON. We ought not to allow such a vicious policy to continue any longer. With regard to a reduction in the price of lumber, I judge, from the present price in the Winnipeg market, that that object has not been secured; and certainly the policy of the Government is not calculated to reduce the price of lumber. The granting to a person of a limit at $5 a square mile enables that person to sell it again at an enormous advance. I believe one limit that was got for $5 a square mile was resold a short time afterward at $2,000 a square mile. The policy in that case, had not the effect of reducing the price of lumber, but of placing a fortune in the pocket of a friend of the Government. The Government ought to lose no time in putting their timber limits up to competition, and ascertaining what their real value is.

Mr. COOK. I would like to ask if the Government have adopted the principle of bonuses, and if so, what amount rules as a bonus besides the ground rent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When there is more than one applicant, they are asked to tender, and the man who tenders the highest bonus gets the limit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite understand the force of the remark, that the men who make explorations, ought to get the preference; and I quite understand that a few years ago, when the railway was not in existence, except from Winnipeg to Pembina, it was proper that large concessions should be made, to induce people to go in, particularly as the expense of transporting machinery and other material was very great; but that difficulty for two years past at any rate, has been almost entirely overcome. The valuable timber limits are now almost all within a comparatively short distance of the railway line, and if it be the fact, as my hon. friend has stated, that timber limits can be got for $5 per square mile and afterwards within a few weeks can be sold at $2,000, such a system would be trebly undesirable if the holder of these limits should happen to be a political friend of the Government in power. Such a thing would be justly looked upon, even though capable of explanation, as an entire departure from the true principle that ought to govern the regulation of these limits. Although I am not going to refer to the past, if the hon. gentleman admits the bare possibility of such a thing taking place, he ought to assure the House that he is going to put a stop to it from this time forth.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that it is a sin to be a friend of the Government, and I am not sure that a friend of the Government ought to be excommunicated if he complies with the regulations as other people. All parties are treated with perfect fairness on the principle of first come first served. If two people come at the same time, they are asked who will give the highest bonus. Whether we have arrived at that point that we should put all the limits up to the highest tender, I am not prepared to say. Perhaps in the outlying districts, the present course ought to be continued; but in those districts where settlement is running close to the line of railway, I think the limits ought perhaps to be put up to competition. I shall call the attention of the Department to this discussion. Of course, the Minister of the Department will have the opportunity of seeing in *Hansard* all that has been said; and he has only one desire, that is, to do the best for the Department and for the country.

Mr. WATSON. In the past it has not been the case that the first applicant has received the limits. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to one case. Some four years ago certain limits on the shores of Lake Manitoba, which were represented to have large quantities of timber, were sold at public competition in Winnipeg. Some of these limits did not turn out to be as represented. One man cleared all the timber off his limit in one season. He built a tug and a saw-mill, and went to considerable expense, and for the last two years that plant has been lying idle. Other limits were granted on Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis, which have not been operated to this day. The gentleman of whom I speak has, I believe, applied for the privilege

of cutting timber on these limits, but has not been allowed to do so. I think that should not be; but while he has his plant there, he should be given a license to cut timber on these limits until the parties who own them are prepared to operate them. This man, I believe, has $16,000 worth of plant. These limits should be operated, or the licenses for them should be cancelled, and the parties who are willing to operate them should be allowed to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly they ought to be worked or cancelled. I do not know anything of the particular case the hon. gentleman mentions.

Mr. WATSON. I think this matter was brought before the Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the man's name?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Pratt. His plant is lying there, and is of no service until the Department does something about his case.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Pratt, I think, bought these limits some time ago at public competition. The limits, I think, could not be operated without improvements being made on Lake Manitoba, and he did not comply with the requirement, simply because it was impossible to do so, unless improvements were made in the navigation of the lake. He, no doubt, paid largely for those limits, and has a certain claim for consideration, and at the same time the question is one that deserves the consideration of the Government as regards the improvements on Water Hen River.

Mr. WATSON. What the hon. gentleman states is not the case. Mr. Pratt bought those limits and paid for them in cash. He has operated them and has taken all the timber off them. He did not require any improvements to be made on the Water Hen River, for he took all the timber off in one season.

Mr. ORTON. If he took all the timber off, he certainly has no claim.

Mr. WATSON. He bought the limits on certain representations made by the officer of the Government at the sale. There was only a month's notice of the sale, not time enough for an inspection, and he purchased those limits solely through the representations made by the Government officer, expecting to find them as represented. The limits did not turn out as represented, and consequently the parties who purchased them had to suffer.

Mr. COOK. The position taken by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) seems to be, that when limits are got for nothing and they turn out to be no good, the parties who got them must have other limits; but if the limits were purchased at public competition, the purchasers are not entitled to any compensation. That is the conclusion I would draw from the remarks of the hon. member for Wellington. In connection with what has been said already by the leader of the Government, I may say that, as far as my experience goes, only the outlying timber limits are the most valuable. In Ontario, you do not get the timber limits in the section of country generally settled, it is the lumbermen who get the outlying country under license and become the pioneers of the country. I suppose the same thing would apply to the North-West, and the Government should adopt the plan of selling limits at public competition, so that the limits not under license, if there are any—but if what I can gather is true, there are not many yet under license, as nearly all have been given for $2 a square mile and no bonuses; $2 per square mile with 5 per cent for Government dues on the gross receipts—but if there are limits remaining, the Government should take the plan of selling them by public competition.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. ORTON. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in his version of my remarks. I stated that Mr. Pratt, who has, I believe, expended much money trying to develop the limits he bought, had a proper claim for consideration. With regard to the limits granted in the North-West, my hon. friend must remember that he was granted 200 square miles of limits on the North Saskatchewan, during the time his party were in power, that he held them for a long time and I doubt if he ever saw them or knew individually, what they were worth, or took any steps to develop them.

Mr. COOK. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken when he says I got 200 miles of limits on the Saskatchewan. I never got a foot of limits. If he says such is the case, he knows what he says is not true. I have not received a foot of timber limits in that section. I received the promise of a timber limit from the Mackenzie Government the year before they went out of power, and the head of the Department in that Government brought down a return in which the name of Cooke & Sutherland appeared as the parties who had received a timber limit by Order in Council a few days before Mr. Mackenzie went out of power. That was taken advantage of in my constituency by my political opponents and was issued in the form of a circular through the constituency, under the heading of "A great timber steal." It was a falsehood on the face of it, and I blame the Department of the Interior for putting forward that falsehood before the elections. I made an application in May, and in June I received a reply that upon certain conditions a license would be granted to me. I made an application for 100 miles of timber limits, and the condition was that no more than $25 per 1,000 feet should be charged for the lumber to be manufactured from the limits. Lumber was then selling at $50 and upwards per thousand, and the condition was that a mill should be built and the lumber should not be sold at more than $25 a thousand. For two years before that, the Deputy Minister of the Department, Colonel Dennis, had frequently asked me if I would not go up there to assist in developing the country by accepting a timber limit and furnishing timber; and I have his letters to prove what I say. I declined to do it because I had all the timber limits I required in Ontario, and I acquired them at public competition. I did not do as hon. gentlemen opposite have been doing in the North-West; I did not get them for nothing. There are gentlemen on that side of the House to whom I could point my finger, who, I know, got timber limits in the North-West for nothing; and it ill becomes them to attack me by statements in reference to my transactions in regard to timber limits in the North-West. These hon. gentlemen made this charge for the purpose of injuring me at my elections, but it had not the salutary effect they expected. They did not succeed in defeating me, because the people in my county know that all the timber limits I have ever had were acquired by me at public competition in Ontario.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). From what I have heard respecting the policy of the Government in relation to the issuing of timber licenses in the North-West Territories, that policy is exactly the same as the one adopted by their predecessors. I have always thought the principle on which that policy is based is a vicious one. It is not a proper mode of disposing of public timber and has been found in the old Province of Canada and in the Province of Quebec, subsequent to Confederation, to have a prejudicial effect, and it seems to me that the time has arrived, indeed I think it arrived long ago, when the mode of disposing of those public lands should be altered. I do not think that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who adopted that mode when they sat on this side of the House, ever ought to have adopted it. I think that the price of the timber lands ought to have gone to the people, and I venture to say that, notwithstanding the fact that gentlemen have obtained timber licenses

is the North-West Territories, either from the present Administration or the Administration who preceded them, without going to public competition, they have not sold a single foot of lumber at a lower rate than they would if the licenses had gone to competition and the public had realized what they ought to have realized, the fair and reasonable price of those lands. I venture to suggest to the leader of the Government that the time has now arrived, at all events, when the mode of disposing of those public lands ought to be changed, and they ought to be submitted to public competition.

Mr. COOK. The present policy was adopted by the present gentlemen in power. Before Sir John A. Macdonald's Government left power, in 1873, before he resigned, he wrote three letters to three different friends of his, stating they could have certain timber limits in the country north of Port Arthur, or between Port Arthur and Lake of the Woods. These letters were written, I think, only two or three days before he resigned. The policy was one inaugurated by himself, and the hon. member for Renfrew was wrong when he stated that Mr. Mackenzie adopted that policy. It was the plan adopted by his present leader, and it was not a plan adopted at that time, but it was his plan always. Always, ever since the timber limit system came in vogue, the hon. gentleman gave limits in the Ottawa district and through this section of the country, gave them to his political friends, and to other parties perhaps who were not his political friends. That was his policy, and that was not changed till after Confederation; but when Mr. Sandfield Macdonald came into power, he adopted the plan that was always held by the Liberal party of Canada, that they should sell timber limits. Therefore, the argument of the hon. gentleman falls to the ground.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. Long before Confederation the policy had been adopted of exposing timber limits to public competition, and he knows it very well.

Mr. COOK. Yes; perhaps when there were conflicting claims, such as the leader of the Government speaks of now, but not as a general principle.

Mr. ORTON. The hon. member seems to speak on both sides of the question. He attempts to defend, in the first place, the position occupied by the Government which he supported before the present Government came into power, when they granted him 200 square miles, which he acknowledges he held; and I fail to see the provision, and I guarantee that it does not appear on the records of this House, that he was bound to sell his lumber at $25 a thousand. But, independent of that, the fact remains that he held those 200 square miles of timber limits and prevented their being developed by other parties. He acknowledges that he was asked to go and develop them and that he never tried to develop them. He has given us a history of his timber speculations in Ontario, and he forgot to mention that he is also a large timber speculator on the other side. He ought to have given us the whole history of his timber limit speculation, because it would be interesting to know how he got those limits on the other side of the water, and what reputation he gained for enterprise, for the vigorous way in which he advocated the timber interest of this country on the other side and realized, I hope, a large amount of money, as some state, to the amount of half a million of dollars. But this is a very important question, and we should consider it in a serious way, and I maintain that the effect of the policy, as far as the North-West is concerned, upon the timber supplied to the people of that country, has been very beneficial. Instead of lumber being sold, as it was a few years ago, at $30 and $35 a thousand in Winnipeg, you can buy it there to-day at $22 a thousand. Is not that a great benefit to the people of that country? We have here the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), who is a large lumberman, who can compete and offer probably larger amounts for timber limits than any other lumberman in this country, but is it to benefit the people to give the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) and the hon. member for Renfrew, a monopoly of the timber limits of this country? I believe the principle adopted, if fairly and honestly carried out, is one that will develop competition, and benefit the people of this country.

Mr. COOK. One would think, from the hon. gentleman's remarks, that he was a colleague of Kirkland's.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). And that you were McKim.

Mr. COOK. I would say, as to my holding the timber limits of 200 square miles, that the Government only promised me 100 square miles. I expended a large amount of money upon the timber limits. I immediately went vigorously to work to explore the timber limits, but I only held them a short time when the hon. gentlemen came into power, and because I happened to be opposed to them in politics, they made it inoperative, so that I never had another opportunity.

After Recess.

Mr. COOK. Before the House rose I made a statement that in March, 1882, a return was brought down to this House in reference to the amount of timber limits that had been granted in the North-West Territories, and in that return appeared the names of Cook & Sutherland, to the extent of 200 miles; and by an Order in Council passed by the Mackenzie Government on the 7th October, 1878, it would appear by the reports that the application for the timber limit had been made at that time. I have a copy of the application that was made by myself at the time, which I will read to the House:

"May 14th, 1878.

"Hon. D. MILLS,
"Minister of the Interior,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—I have the honour to make application to you for a timber limit, say for one hundred square miles, to be selected and surveyed at my cost, in the vicinity of the Saskatchewan River, between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains. My object in obtaining this is for legitimately manufacturing and supplying lumber, shingles, &c., to the settlers on prairie lands, in the Territories to the east.

As you are aware, the supply of timber fit for making lumber in Manitoba and the Territories south of the river mentioned, is so limited that unless the Government facilitates to every reasonable extent the views of men having capital and accustomed to the lumber business, who are willing to develop the large timber district known to exist west of Edmonton, the price of lumber must be such, for years, as to operate powerfully against the settlement of the country. I now, therefore, respectfully urge the concession of the above privilege, requesting one year from the first of July next, in which to make my selection and to furnish you with the plan and description of the limit, when I will be prepared to accept the same on such terms as the Government may, under all the circumstances, and considering the great expense of taking machinery to such a great distance, consider reasonable.

"Hoping to receive a favourable and early reply.
"I remain,
"Yours faithfully,
"H. H. COOK, F.W.L."

On the 6th June following, the same year, I received the following letter from the Department of the Interior, written by J. S. Dennis, the Surveyor-General:—

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"DOMINION LANDS OFFICE,
"OTTAWA, 6th June, 1878.

"SIR,—I have the honour, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, in reference to your application dated the 14th ultimo, for a timber limit of one hundred square miles, to be selected and surveyed at your cost, in the vicinity of the Saskatchewan, between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains, the same having had the consideration of the Minister of the Interior, I am directed to inform you that under certain conditions he would be disposed to recommend the same to the favourable consideration of the Privy Council. As the great object of encouraging a proposal of this nature is to cheapen the price of lumber to settlers in the Territories, the Minister would desire to receive an assurance from you that whereas he understands that at present the price of lumber at the

mills in Prince Albert is from $35 to $45, you should agree not to charge more at your mill than from $25 to $35, which he considers would be very profitable rates. In case the limit should be conceded you, a certain bonus per square mile would be required, in addition to which you would require to conform to the terms and conditions as regards payment of ground rent and royalty, as set forth in section 51 of the Dominion Lands Act, a copy of which is herewith transmitted.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) "J. S. DENNIS,

"*Surveyor-General.*"

Then, on the 21st May, 1878, the following memorandum was made to the Council:

"Referring to Mr. Cook's application for a timber limit, as set forth in his communication of the 14th instant, the undersigned begs respectfully to remark that he considers that it would be very much calculated to encourage the formation of settlement on the line of the Saskatchewan, if facilities were afforded for obtaining lumber at a reasonable price.

"The undersigned has been given to understand that the price of lumber at Prince Albert is from $35 to $45 per thousand, and shingles at $6 50 per bunch.

"The undersigned is convinced that a reasonable competition would reduce the price of lumber to from $25 to $35 per thousand, and the price of shingles in proportion, and if Mr. Cook or any other capitalist accustomed to the manufacturing of lumber would undertake to supply settlers along the line of the Saskatchewan within those figures, it would appear to him that the Government should facilitate such person being placed in a position to do so, by a grant of a timber limit, upon reasonable conditions.

"Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) "J. S. DENNIS,

"*Surveyor-General.*"

On the 7th October, 1878, the following report was made by a Committee of the Privy Council, which was approved by His Excellency:

"On a Memorandum dated 4th October, 1878, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, representing that being of opinion that it would encourage and facilitate settlement in the valley of the Saskatchewan if facilities were afforded for obtaining lumber at a reasonable price, which he learns cannot be done at the present time, he recommends that a timber limit to the extent of two hundred square miles on the Saskatchewan River and its tributaries, in the North-West Territories, be granted to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, the same to be selected by them in blocks of not less than twenty square miles, the bonus payable on the said limit to be at the rate of $15 per square mile. And further recommending that the applicants shall have a period of three years within which to make selections of the limit, which shall not interfere with any lands which may be set apart for the Canadian Pacific Railway or for reserves for Indians or with school lands or with any other timber limits which may have been previously granted or which may be hereafter granted and selected prior to the selection by said Cook & Sutherland, and shall in all respects be subject to the conditions contained in the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act. The Committee submit the foregoing recommendations for your Excellency's approval.

"Certified.

"W. A. HIMSWORTH, C.P.C."

In this report the Council confounded the name of Cook with that of Sutherland, who had also applications in the same part of the country. Each one had an application for 100 miles, and the Government confounded the application made two years previous to the one I made. Mr. Sutherland's application was made two years previous, and in passing the Order in Council, they put the two names together, and made it as if it were a co-partnership. On the 20th March, 1879, I received a letter signed by Lindsay Russell, Deputy Minister of the Interior, in which he says:

"SIR,—Referring to your recent personal enquiry respecting the result of your application for timber limits in the North-West Territories, by letter dated the 14th May, 1878, I have the honour to inform you that on the 7th of October last an Order in Council was passed in favour of yourself and Mr. John Sutherland, for a limit of 200 square miles on the head waters of the Saskatchewan, on certain conditions, such limits to be selected and surveyed by you in manner as therein set forth. This Order was not, however, notified to you or Mr. Sutherland in the usual course, and a subsequent one was passed, on the 26th December, arresting its operation. I may say that the extent of the limits proposed to be granted in your and Mr. Sutherland's favour was thought to be excessive."

The opinion which the then Minister of the Interior, the leader of the Government hold at that time was that 200 square miles was too much for any company or individual to hold. I do not know but that I agree perfectly with the hon. gentleman, but as I have stated, the names of Mr. Sutherland and myself were combined, although the applications of both parties were separately at stake. I wrote the Minister of Interior as follows:—

"TORONTO, March 26th, 1879.

"Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, K.C.B.,

"Minister of Interior,

"Ottawa, Ont.

"SIR,—I had the honour of making an application on the 14th May, 1878, for one hundred square miles of timber limits, to be selected between Fort Edmonton on the Saskatchewan River, and the Rocky Mountains. On the 6th of June following, a reply was received, informing me that my application, upon certain conditions, had received the favourable consideration of the then Minister of the Department. In furtherance of this assurance, about the 7th of October of the same year, an Order in Council was passed granting my application, but including the name of Mr. Sutherland, with the addition of another hundred square miles, making it appear, I am informed, as if a co-partnership existed between myself and Sutherland, who, as I understand, was also an applicant for one hundred miles in the same district. The issue of this Order was immediately afterwards communicated to me personally by the late Minister of the Interior. Immediately on receiving this intimation, I caused, at considerable expense, an expedition to be equipped and sent to the Saskatchewan, for the purpose of selecting limits. That expedition is now on the ground; it is uncertain when communication can be had with it, and could not, under any circumstances, be recalled before the spring. I have been recently informed that the operation of this Order in Council has been arrested. I presume this action was taken in ignorance of the circumstanees above stated, and have to request, in view of those circumstances, the arresting Order should be recalled. It has been suggested to me by the Deputy Minister, that it is thought the grant of 200 miles to one party may be excessive. Without waiving my claim, in case this proposal is unacceptable to ask the fulfilment of the order, I beg to state that I am prepared, if that course will obviate the objection, to accept such a modification of the Order as will give me the 100 square miles for which I have applied, independently of Sutherland, in which case I would relinquish all interest on the other hundred."

I stated on a former occasion that I had been requested by the then Surveyor-General, Colonel Dennis, to make an application for a timber limit in the North-West country, which he sets out in his statement to the then Minister of the Interior. The report having been submitted just before the last elections, a circular was issued in my constituency for the purpose of injuring me in that contest. The *Mail* and several of the lesser lights of the Conservative press in Ontario and throughout the Dominion endeavoured to make considerable capital out of the fact that I endeavoured to obtain a timber limit from the Dominion Government for which I would not pay a proper amount. They declared that it was a very wicked thing for me to do. I do not know, if the policy of the Government is such that parties can obtain timber limits under such circumstances, why I should be denounced for endeavouring to obtain a privilege which was accorded to doctors, lawyers and other professional men. Lumbering is my business; I am a lumberman and have always been so. What the Conservative party thought it was very wicked for me to do, they have been doing much more extensively. We have not had a full return brought down, as was asked for by the hon. member for West Huron last Session; but there is an old return before us—the full return, I suppose will never be brought down until a change of Government takes place, and then we shall know the depths of the iniquities perpetrated by the Government before the last General Election, by which they retained power. The Committee will remember that after the election in June, 1878, the Conservative party came into power. They denounced the action of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, because they had on one or two occasions granted timber limits—as I have already stated, I did not obtain a timber limit in the North-West. I made application by letter; the request was granted by letter, and an Order in Council was passed; but the license was never issued, from the fact that I had not time to complete the survey I was making before the Government went out of power. The Minister of the Interior knows very well that a large expenditure was involved in connection with that survey, and that copies of the accounts were presented to his Department. These accounts, which represent only a portion of the expenditure

paid, amounts to from $4,000 to $6,000. It has been stated that the Mackenzie Government should not have acted as it did in regard to timber licenses. The Government of Sir John A. Macdonald in the throes of defeat wrote letters promising licenses without any restriction to Fowler & Fuller, of Hamilton, and J. W. Macaulay. The Mackenzie Government carried out the intention of their predecessors although they had no right to do so. We will now see what this present Government has been doing since they came in power. On 14th December, 1881, Germain & Co., of Winnipeg, were granted a timber berth of fifty square miles, without any consideration whatever. On 14th December, 1881, John Bergin & Co. were granted a limit. I know there is a member of the House by the name of Bergin, and he has a brother by the name of John; but I do not know that he is connected with the company. On 6th December, 1881, a limit was granted to M. H. Cochrane, a Senator of the Dominion, for which he pays an annual rental of $5 per square mile. On the 4th of July, 1881, Mr. J. R. Stevenson, of Georgina, obtained a limit on Boggy Creek for $5 a square mile. I do not know what connection he has with the gum swamp gang, but I know he comes from that part of the country, which is very suspicious. On the 4th of July, 1881, Mr. Geo. Devey, farmer, of Ancaster, got 100 square miles, but no sum is mentioned, and I suppose he got it as a free gift. Then Mr. M. G. Miller, and Jas. Scott, of Teviotdale, got some limits on the Assiniboine River—50 square miles, for which they paid $5 a mile. On the 28th of February, 1881, James W. McLean, and Wm. Ross Sinclair, got a limit of 100 square miles for $5 a mile. Mr. Chairman, I have been in the habit of addressing public meetings in the country, large political meetings, and I find that it makes no difference whether a man is a member of Parliament or an ordinary voter as regards his respectability or fertility in making noises. I know, Sir, that these facts are not very palatable to hon. gentlemen and that is the reason they do not want to listen to them. They know that these statements will go broadcast over the country and that they will do them no good. I think these gentlemen had better get their Sessional allowances, so that they can get their boots vamped as they appear to be wearing them out by scraping the desks. There are a good many of them who do not earn enough money for that themselves, and who could not earn anything but what they get here. I find that Messrs. Armitage & McCulloch, of Minnedosa, N.W.T., got a limit of 72 square miles, on the 13th of November, 1880, at $5 a square mile. Now, I would like hon. gentlemen to be quiet for a little while, because I am going to say something which will interest them. I have no doubt they will be pleased to hear that their old friend Shields, and Haggart, McLaren and Nichol, got 100 square miles, for $5 a mile, on the 17th of February, 1881. Again, I find that the same men, only their names are changed—that is, John Shields, John Haggart, Peter McLaren, and Thomas Nichol, got fifty square miles on the Saskatchewan. Then, Sir, we find that on the 2nd January, 1879, Joseph Whitehead got favours from hon. gentlemen, but as he was a Grit he did not get them so cheap; but as they wanted to get him out of Section "B" they gave him a timber limit, and he figures in several places in the same way. Then, Sir, we find that Captain Henry Moore, of Prince Albert, figures in the return as one who got timber limits. On the 4th of February, 1879, I find that Dick & Banning, lumber merchants, Winnipeg, got a limit for $20 a square mile; but that was given to them in exchange for another limit, which, I suppose, they wanted for some other friend. On the 5th of April, 1880, we find that Mr. McCulloch figures again as receiving some more timber limits. On the 5th of July, 1880, S. H. Fowler got a timber limit of 100 square miles. I know these things are not palatable, and that hon. gentlemen do not wish them to go to the country. I could give the names of license holders who have got their licenses in blocks of two square miles. I think it is unfair to miners and agriculturists that such large sections of the country should be encumbered in that way. I regret that the hon. leader of the Government did not instruct his Minister of the Interior to bring down the list that was ordered by the House to be brought down, on a motion of my hon. friend from Huron. I regret also that a return that was asked for in connection with the Saugeen Peninsula timber limit, was not fully brought down. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if he has men in his Department who are paid for the special purpose of scrutinizing returns, and taking from them anything that he thinks should not be given to the public, in violation of the order of this House. I have heard rumours of that sort, and as rumours are frequently repeated in this House, I take the liberty of repeating that, and I would like to know from the hon. leader of the Government if that is true. Now, I will relieve you, gentlemen. I have more respect for your boots than I have for your heads, and I will spare your boots the difficulty under which they have been labouring for some time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think my hon. friend should have complained of the mode in which gentlemen opposite conduct their argument. He ought to have allowed them to conduct it in their own way.

Mr. COCKBURN. This is a subject of which you, Mr. Chairman, like myself, feel very strongly. The system of disposing of timber limits by public sale was recognized twenty-five years ago, and is still approved of by a majority of the people throughout the country. It is the system that is in vogue in the Province of Ontario, and that has produced a very large amount of revenue, and contributed greatly to the financial prosperity of that great Province. I disapprove of the course of former Administrations in giving large limits without competition. At the same time, I think that the conditions under which the limit was about to be given to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland were not so vicious as the conditions under which some licenses have subsequently been issued. Both of these gentlemen, who were known to be practical lumbermen, proposed to get the limits for the purpose of operating them. The succeeding Government, if they thought proper to cancel that license when they came into power, ought to have continued the same policy, and should have refused to give timber limits, without competition, to anybody else. We know that they have not, but that there are many throughout the country, not lumbermen, but lawyers and others, who have been granted timber limits by this Government without any competition. The Government, if they desired to be consistent or to act fairly towards Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, ought to have re-tored at least a portion of that timber limit to them, or else to have refused to grant timber limits, without competition, to others. I was told by a lawyer the other day that his share of a certain limit was 25 square miles. The Ontario Government have realized from $2,000 to $2,500 a mile for their timber lands, while this Government have granted licenses for $2 a mile. There may be instances in which it is expedient to grant a few isolated lots without competition; but large limits of 50 or 100 square miles ought invariably, as a general principle, to be put up to competition. I feel so strongly on that point that I would vote to censure any Government that would grant large timber limits without competition; and I think the present Administration are very culpable with regard to their dealings in timber lands and timber limits. In speaking as I do, I am sure that I voice the sentiments of seven-eighths of the members of this House.

Mr. MILLS. As this discussion has given rise to a reference on two or three occasions to an Order in Council,

which was passed at the time I had charge of the Department of the Interior, and as the hon. gentleman who was at the head of that Department has on two or three occasions referred to that matter, and the press that supports him has again and again referred to it, I feel it to be my duty to make a few observations on the policy of the Government at the time, and to the circumstances which led them to grant a timber limit to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland. As the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said, the First Minister, shortly before his retirement from office, proposed to grant timber limits to Messrs. Fowler & Macauley without complying with the provisions of the law, and my hon. friend who was at the head of the Government that succeeded him, or the Minister of Interior at the time, Mr. Laird, proposed changes in that law which authorized the Government to grant timber limits without putting them up for competition. This, no doubt, was justifiable under the circumstances at the time, because it was found most difficult to induce persons who were engaged in the lumber business to undertake to build mills in order to supply the very scanty population which were to be found in the vicinity of what is now known as Winnipeg, and a little further west in the Red River settlement. That condition of things was not changed while we were in office. The population at no time had become so numerous that men who were engaged in the lumber business could be induced to compete actively with each other for the possession of timber limits, and the Government, at that time, acted upon a commercial principle. They fixed what they believed to be a fair rental value per mile for the timber lands, and they sold to all lumbermen—persons who either had mills or were engaged in the business of milling—on the same terms. There was no distinction made as to persons and parties. At the time the hon. member for Simcoe applied for timber limits on the Saskatchewan, there was but one mill in that country, owned, I think, by Captain Moore, and lumber then was selling in that district to the people at Prince Albert and those who were going into the country in the vicinity of Battleford at as high as $100 per thousand feet. The Government, after mature consideration and obtaining what information they could in regard to the position of the population and the extent of the area covered with timber in the vicinity of the Saskatchewan and its tributaries, agreed to grant to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland 100 or 200 square miles, I forget which.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two hundred.

Mr. MILLS. Two hundred. I remember at the time it was pointed out to us that a mill would be erected of considerable proportions. It was known that the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway tended then to the northward and that a very considerable portion of the population that would go into the country would settle in the vicinity of Battleford; it was necessary that facilities should be afforded them for building purposes, and the area granted was thought not an unreasonable area, not one that would more than supply such a mill as it was proposed to build, for a very limited period. Under these circumstances, the grant was made, I think, at a rental of $25 per square mile, upon the same terms and conditions as those on which limits had been granted to Messrs. Fowler, Macauley, Dick & Banning, and others who were engaged in cutting lumber in the vicinity of Winnipeg. At that time we took care to protect the population. I remember very distinctly that those gentlemen who applied to us asked us to give them a reservation of the timber in a particular district for a certain period of time, that we should not grant license to other parties until a reasonable time was given them for the purpose of selecting the various tracts of limits that they were authorized to select under the Order in Council, but we did not agree to that proposition. On the contrary, the Government said to these gentlemen that if another party applied for a timber limit they would be granted the limit on the same terms as those on which we granted the limit to the firm referred to, and if others exercised greater diligence in locating the various portions of their limits, the reservation on their behalf would be made first; and you must, we said, take your limit subject to the limitations which they have marked out for themselves. We did more than that. We provided that as, in many cases, the area covered with timber was very limited, and as we believed it was necessary to protect these limited areas for the population that might settle in that country, for the purpose of fencing and building, we provided that no limit or portion of limit should be sold containing less than twenty square miles. I think that was the provision of the Order in Council authorizing the limit to be granted to Messrs. Cooke & Sutherland. These gentleman, if they chose, could take an area covered with timber, if it were but two square miles, but they would have to pay a rental on twenty miles. That was the extent of the limit, so that they could not go up some tributary of the Saskatchewan and pick up all the choice lots of timber which might be found in the valley of any one of those rivers. They were restricted to a minimum limit of twenty square miles, so that the people who might go into that country to settle were adequately protected against the whole timber of the country being swept away by those engaged in the business of lumbering. Now I understand all that has been changed. I understand that the hon. gentleman has granted timber limits to parties who were not engaged in the business of lumbering at all, but who must have purchased for the sole purpose of speculating, and has granted them at a ground rental of $5 a square mile; I understand also that they have been allowed to select plots of timber as small as two square miles. My hon. friend behind me says that in some cases the rental charged is as low as $2 per square mile. It is perfectly obvious that the Order in Council which was carried shortly before the retirement of the late Government was not cancelled, because it granted terms that were unduly favourable to Messrs. Cooke & Sutherland and against the public interest; for, in referring to this subject on a former occasion, the hon. First Minister said they had cancelled this Order in Council, on the ground that it had been granted by the late Government after the elections had gone against them. That is, I understand the hon. gentleman laid down the rule that no Government, after the opinion of the country had been pronounced against them, were to be at liberty to administer the affairs of the country until their successors might be appointed. I do not subscribe to that doctrine; I hold to the view that there is certain business connected with the administration of public affairs which an outgoing Administration will be better qualified to dispose of readily than would be their successors in office. I am quite ready to admit that official appointments, new departures in public policy, questions of great moment, ought not to be dealt with by an Administration after the country has pronounced against it. But, with regard to the ordinary routine of office, there are, perhaps, in almost every Department of Government, questions coming up that a Minister has had an opportunity of considering, that he is prepared to dispose of, that, if disposed of at all, will be disposed of according to some uniform principle which has been recognized and acted upon before, and I say that, in all such cases, it is not only the right but the duty of the Administration in office for the time being to deal with them. I know that shortly before we went to the country there were a great many questions connected with the administration of the public lands, with the issue of patents, and with timber limits, questions such as that to which the hon. gentleman refers, that had been considered and the papers in regard to which were in the Department and ready be submitted to the Government, and it was in the public interest that those questions should

be disposed of by the Ministers then in office, because they were familiar with all the facts and circumstances connected with them, which the new or incoming Administration could not be supposed to be equally conversant with. Under these circumstances, I believe it was the duty of the Government to deal with those questions, and it was, in my opinion, equally the right and duty of the Government to deal with the question of the application of Mr. Cook and Mr. Sutherland. We were not laying down any new principle. We were not dealing with them in any way differently from the way in which others had been dealt with for three or four years preceding, and that being the case, we were simply discharging a routine matter connected with the administration of public affairs and in a way which was, we believed, in the public interest. What has since been done shows that the hon. gentleman has gone a very much longer way in the relaxation of these rules and regulations than had the Government which preceded him in office.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I think the Committee and the House and the present Government should feel very deeply obliged to the hon. member from Simcoe for reading that memorandum from the Minister of the Interior of the late Government. He sets forth that every facility should be afforded to the manufacturers of lumber, with the view of reducing the price. That is the policy which should be carried out, and I believe it is being carried out to-day. I know, as a matter of fact, that the competition among our own people, as it reduces the price, causes the Americans to reduce their price for import. I know that when the price has been reduced by the lumbermen in our own country, the Americans have gone so far as to give a drawback on lumber sent into this country from yards in Minneapolis. That fact will completely obviate any obnoxiousness which may arise from that policy, besides affording plenty of lumber for building purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. In reference to what has been said by the member for North Ontario, that he was prepared to vote against any Government or any set of men who would abandon the principle of selling timber limits by public auction, I would say that, in that case, he would have to oppose Mr. Mowat and the Provincial Government of Ontario, because they abandoned that principle previous to the last General Election; and although it had been one which had obtained from the time Sandfield Macdonald was in power and was, as he says, a good one, from which they received not less than $2,000 a square mile, still, on the eve of an election, Mr. Mowat abandoned that and adopted the principle of selling timber limits privately to individuals at whatever price he saw fit. The member for Simcoe said, in reference to the member for Wellington (Mr. Orton), that he supposed he was connected with Kirkland in his timber affair. He seems to forget that the allegations made by Mr. Kirkland were that the hon. member for Simcoe and Caldwell were the parties who were taking from him what was his right; because, while he bought this land believing he had the timber on it, he found afterwards that it was bargained away to Messrs. Caldwell, of Streams Bill notoriety, and Cook, of Simcoe. I think, if any party in this House ought to be associated with that matter, it ought to be the member for Simcoe. The member for North Ontario made the remark that he was given twenty square miles, and that that could not be given in a block. If he had said twenty miles square in a block, I could understand it; but by getting that distance along the river of ten miles on each side, he would be taking virtually all the timber that was along the river. I think there is no comparison at all in this, except as showing the difference between the two systems. I think there is no justification for passing the Order in Council by a Government which was then virtually moribund, because the country had decided so strongly against them, and they were evidently not actuated by a desire to do right, but by a desire to do a service to a strong political friend.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be as well that the Minister should let us know what his decision is about this matter. I doubt if there is a question before the House which excites more interest in the North-West than the disposal of their timber, and I am bound to say I think, after all that has passed from the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) and other of his supporters, it would be high time, as has been said, that the Government should consider what course they are going to pursue in this matter. I can tell him that all over the North-West very curious stories indeed are floating about as to the dealings, especially on the part of members of this House, with the timber limits. How far those stories are true or false we have not got the evidence at this moment to determine, but even the First Minister does not deny, either now or on other occasions, that there have been instances in which men for perfectly insignificant trifles, have got possession of valuable portions of public property, which they have sold at enormous profits, nor did he deny that many of these people were persons who had no connection with the lumber trade whatever. I can understand quite well that, whether the principle be objected to or not, there may be occasions, like that of my hon. friend behind me, on which the First Minister might have found it in the interest of the country to grant special privileges to well-known lumber firms, especially if it were on the condition that lumber should be sold at moderate rates, but I do not think any case could by any possibility be made out for disposing of perhaps the most valuable part of the public domain at very small rates indeed to persons who were not lumbermen, and who, it must be known to all parties concerned, only sought these limits for the purpose of selling them again. I do not know that it is desirable at this moment to go into a discussion, with the evidence before us, of some of the cases to which my hon. friend alluded, but it is very desirable to know whether the Government propose to continue that policy. The First Minister spoke somewhat doubtfully on the point. He gave us to understand that it was under consideration. Now, I think in the case of timber limits, it is scarcely possible that any application could be made on the part of parties who have invested so much capital in searching out those limits as to give them a real prior right. I think the time has come when those timber limits should be disposed of by competition, but if any special cases did arise, it would be manifestly the duty of the Government, in order to prevent valuable public property being sacrificed for nothing, if it were not put up for competition, to cause every separate application to be specially examined and specially reported upon; and I would be glad to know what the hon. gentleman is going to do on that matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In 1872, when the Government of which I was Premier were in office, the Dominion Lands Act was passed by us and that Act provided that timber limits should be put up to public competition. So it remained on the Statute Book until 1874, when the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member came into power, and the first thing they did was to repeal that Act and do away with the clause in the Statute which provided that all timber limits should be put up to public auction, and from 1874 to 1878 they gave out the timber limits without putting any of them up to auction, without making any conditions whatever as to putting up mills, and granting many of them for twenty-one years. When we returned to power we amended the law and followed the practice that had been carried out for five years by the hon. gentlemen opposite with this exception: We granted at first, after we came in, a few timber limits for twenty-one years, but on consideration we disapproved of that and limited them to be annual licenses, terminable on notice, and providing that every party must, within a year, put up a saw-mill for

the purpose of consuming the timber within the license. The hon. gentleman will find it is so, and if it had not been for the interference, the administrative action and the legislative action of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the law would have remained to this day as it was in 1872, viz. that timber limits should be put up for public competition. The hon. gentlemen now say "Oh they ought to be put up!" Why did they alter the law? Why, Sir, between 1874 and 1878, when they were in power, they never found out that it was an unwholesome practice to grant timber limits to applicants. The hon. gentleman says that other persons besides lumbermen have got timber limits. I say they ought to get timber limits. Any man who will comply with the terms the Government lay down, any respectable men who are able to carry out the contract, have the same right as lumbermen—lumbermen, like my hon. friend (Mr. Cook) who made a very eloquent but rather inaudible speech a little while ago—lumbermen have no right to monopolize the timber limits. Lumbermen would be very glad, no doubt, to keep out every other class of the community from getting timber limits. But every man who applies and every man who complies with the conditions has the same right as a lumberman to go and cut trees down in the woods, and to send oxen, and horses, hay, oats and pork, into the woods—because that is all they do. There is no mystery about it, there is no secret, everything is fair about it. A lawyer, or a parson for that matter, can get a limit and can buy pork and beans, and tea and coffee, and send them into the woods just as well as the hon. gentleman. It is all very well to raise this cry about there being a specially favoured class. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that they had granted limits so small as two square miles. Never such a thing has happened. The original law was, that timber limits should be put up to public competition, and that was altered by hon. gentlemen opposite. When we came back, we did not return to the Statute of 1872, but we provided that when there were conflicting applications, the several parties who applied should have the opportunity of competing, one against the other, and the man who offered the highest bonus should get the timber limit. That was the arrangement made by the Government. The hon. gentleman from Bothwell says that he does not agree with the proposal that the license to Cook & Sutherland ought not to have been carried out. The hon. gentleman took quite a different line of action from that of the previous Government when they went out in 1873; and there is a very remarkable document in the archives of the Government in which there is a solemn protest against any Government, who had forfeited the confidence, as it stated, of the people, doing any executive act but what was absolutely requisite to carry on the affairs of the Government. Well, was there any absolute necessity, a day or two before their resignation was given, to grant 200 miles to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, along the line of the North Saskatchewan, from Edmonton to the foot of the Rocky Mountains? And what do you think were the terms of the license? There was no provision compelling the parties to saw a certain quantity every year; there was no provision for putting up a mill to enable them to do so. But those two gentlemen found out that the timber limit from Edmonton to the Rocky Mountains was not a continuous line of forest, but was in clumps of trees, about 20 miles square, and the license contained the provision that they were to have 200 square miles, but they were to pick out those 200 square miles in special areas of 20 square miles, in order that those two gentlemen could get a monopoly of every clump of trees, of every single tree, between Edmonton and the foot of the Rocky Mountains. There was a monopoly giving all the timber of that country from Edmonton to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. And that was the reason the Government did not think themselves at all bound to follow their course, especially after they had before them the precept of the hon. gentleman, in the strongest and most eloquent terms, and if the hon. gentleman would like to see that document produced, we will be most glad to bring it down, to show how indignantly virtuous the hon. gentlemen opposite were, because we, who had never had a vote of Parliament, never had a vote of the people against us, when we went out, made certain appointments and did certain administrative acts. There was a holy indignation in the House and out of the House, and in the press, at this Government making an appointment and taking care of their friends just before they resigned. But the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, this is an administrative act; this is a carrying on of the ordinary affairs of the the country." Why, the Government going out could not appoint a Tide Waiter. That would be a great breach of constitutional propriety, but they could hand over a whole region of country, 200 square miles of country, two or three days before they resigned.

Mr. MILLS. That is not true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice we have carried out is simply this: We grant now fifty square miles upon terms of paying an annual rental, and paying stumpage, and putting up a mill warranted to saw a certain given quantity provided in the license; and the license is only from year to year and, on notice, can be cancelled.

Mr. MILLS. No; it is not so. I have the return here, and the majority of the licenses are for twenty-one years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I stated that when we first came in we followed the practice of our predecessors, but we soon found that it was prejudicial, and we altered the system from a twenty-one years' lease to an annual lease. That is the course the Government take. Now, the hon. gentleman wants to know what we are going to do with respect to the timber limits in the future. The Government have been carrying out, up to this moment, the practice that has obtained since 1874; we have been granting limits only for a year; when there is more than one application, we call upon them to compete. That has been the practice of the Government. It is a matter well worthy of consideration whether, in future, or in certain districts, at all events, the practice of unlimited competition, and of putting up to public auction would not be the best. That is a matter which the Government will fully consider. They have not yet adopted it nor come to a conclusion upon that matter. The hon. member for West Huron says there were special cases in which men specially fitted, such as lumbermen, should have special privileges. If limits are put up at public auction there is no security that the highest bidder will be a lumberman. Every speculator, any man who chooses to go and invest his money in timber, whether a member of Parliament or a person outside, can buy if he is the highest bidder and makes the necessary deposit; and the hon. gentleman knows that timber limits, like land, form a legitimate matter for speculation. There is no reason why any class or every class should not go into that business if they choose. The only thing to be seen to is this, that the Government take care that the purchaser, whether a lumberman, a lawyer, a member of Parliament, or a bishop, carries out the conditions of the license; that he cuts a certain quantity during the year, that he puts up a mill and pays his dues. That is the way the matter stands now. As to the question which I rose to answer, the Government have not yet come to any decision as to whether they will make it an invariable rule to offer all timber limits to public competition.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. First Minister has stated that the Order in Council granting limits of 200 square miles to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland had no conditions in regard to the building of a mill, or the cutting of timber. The hon. gentleman has not taken the trouble to read the application

The Order in Council is for the purpose of giving effect to the application, and one of its provisions is that a mill is to be built. The conditions are set out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS. The Order in Council is based on the conditions set out in the application.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Order in Council speaks for itself.

Mr. MILLS. It is to be read with the conditions given in the application.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. The Order in Council has no force, apart from the terms of the application. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for East York had changed the law. The hon. gentleman undertook to act in violation of the law. The hon. gentleman, in his communications with Messrs. Fuller, Macaulay, and others, proposed to disregard the law, and to treat with them without putting up the limits to competition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Did not Messrs. Macaulay, Fuller and Fowler get their limits from the late Government and not from the present Government, in consequence of the joint arrangement made with the Mowat Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In the Macaulay case—I recollect it very well—he came pleading that some mistake had been made by the hon. gentleman with regard to his license. That mistake was corrected. That is my recollection of Mr. Macaulay's position. Mr. Macaulay was no supporter of mine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say he was.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Macaulay, it is true, did not have all his limits set out until the hon. gentleman had retired from office; but he was authorized to acquire 100 square miles, to employ surveyors, and was assured that he would secure the limits he surveyed. When the hon. member for East York came into power, he found that on account of the paucity of the population, the limits could not be put up for competition, and the result was, that after due enquiry a fair rate of payment was arrived at, the limits being sold at a certain price, on condition that a mill was erected in the vicinity of the limits. The hon. First Minister knows these were the conditions. The hon. Mr. Laird stated the reasons for the change being made in the law, and my recollection is, that the present First Minister himself admitted that the old rule acted on in Ontario and Quebec could not, at that time, be adhered to in dealing with timber limits in the North-West. The hon. First Minister now says that he objected to Cook & Sutherland's license because it was for a period of twenty-one years. But the hon. gentleman could not have cancelled the Order in Council on that ground, because he continued, during two or three years, to act on that principle and to grant licenses for that period of time. I have a report of the licenses granted in 1882, in which the principle of twenty-one years' leases was adhered to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that was the ground on which it was not granted.

Mr. MILLS. I find that P. Kelly, Pratt & Smith, W. J. M. Pratt, William Smith, Joseph Whitehead, and others, all obtained twenty-one years' leases. Then, the hon. gentleman tells us that he did not care to give small areas, such as 20 square miles. I find by the return that the hon. gentleman has granted licenses for areas less than 10 miles. In one case it was for 6 miles; to R. Z. Rodgers, 7 miles were granted; to A. Watts, 1 mile was granted. And yet the hon. gentleman claims he has patriotically taken care to protect the public interests, by providing that small limits shall not pass into the hands of lumbermen. The hon. gentleman tells us that he fails to see why lumbermen should have any special opportunity of acquiring timber limits. The hon. gentleman moreover says that these lumbermen will take care that the hay and oats of the farmers will be purchased. I should like to know whether the hon. member for Lincoln and other hon. gentlemen whom I could name on the other side of the House, hon. members who acquired timber limits at $5 a square mile and sold them at $2,000, so acted in order that they might cut lumber and provide a market for the hay and oats of the North-West farmers. The reasons given by the hon. gentleman for the course he has pursued are not adequate reasons, are not true reasons, and are not those which appeared to have influenced his conduct in dealing with this particular matter. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says another reason for cancelling this license was, that my hon. friend had left on record a protest against his wholesale appointments to office before his retirement in 1873. Well, Sir, if I remember aright, the hon. gentleman made some 600 appointments within a few days before he left office, adding thereby to the public burdens between $200,000 and $300,000, and his colleague made no provision for the payment of this amount. While he was quite ready to appoint any number of his friends to office, he did not ask Parliament to provide the salaries of those whom he thus appointed. And my hon. friend was not obliged to continue them in the offices to which they were appointed. There were no places for them; the public service did not require them, and the hon. gentleman did not obtain from Parliament the means of compensating them. I think there is no analogy between these extraordinary appointments and the ordinary routine work of the Department, which had been carried on during a period of five years, with the knowledge and sanction of Parliament, which the hon. gentleman, although he succeeded in displacing his predecessors in office, has not seen proper to change in the direction in which he would lead the public to believe the elections required him to carry on that change. The hon. gentleman has not put up these limits to public auction; he has not inaugurated the policy which he has intimated he was elected to give effect to. On the contrary, he has reduced the amount of the ground rent. He has granted those limits to his friends for the purpose of speculation; in fact, the public property has been taken out of the hands of the public and put into the hands of supporters of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about these six forest rangers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They look after these celebrated timber limits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid they are rather late in looking after them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; not too late. The country is divided into timber agencies, and every agent has a forest ranger or so under him to look after the stumpage and see that the public revenue is preserved, and that these men pay their dues and carry out the terms of the timber licenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood that the hon. gentleman had some notion of attempting to create one or more Crown forests in the North-West. Is this vote in any way connected with such a plan?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there was a discussion in another place on that subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; and the Bill is now before Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman might state briefly what the intention of the Government is with respect to them. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the forest ranges of the North-West, to know whether

such a plan is practicable or not, but I must say that I believe that all over Canada a great deal of practical negligence has occurred for many years, on the part of all Governments, in not creating one or more Crown forests. In other countries, where these matters are more carefully attended to, a large portion of the public revenue is extracted from Crown forests, not in the hands of lumbermen, but carefully worked by public officials. I supposed that the hon. gentleman was going to try something of the kind in the North-West, and there would be a great deal that could be said for such a scheme.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the proposition is not so wide as the introduction of a system of forest planting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I did not mean forest planting, but taking the land on which valuable wood is growing and preserving it for the public use.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the object of forming these forest tracts is to lay aside forests, where they exist at the sources of various rivers. The hon. gentleman knows that there are countries, especially in the east, formerly flowing with milk and honey, rich and fertile countries, which have been rendered arid and uninhabitable almost, by the timber on the forest ranges, which are the sources of the rivers, being cut away. This subject has especially attracted the attention of the United States. The United States Government issued a Commission a year ago, and the proposition there is to lay aside, for instance, on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, a strip of forest as a protection, or a shelter or covering, for the sources of the rivers. As is truly said in that report, a condensation of which I read in a leading American journal, the various States will look after the tree planting and the establishment of forests on the plains, and the general area of the country; and if the country is denuded of its timber, it can be restored by judicious planting. But when the timber at the sources of the rivers is carried away, the character of the rivers is altered altogether. Then comes a period of inundations, and dry, waterless river beds. Besides this proposition in the United States about the Rocky Mountains, there is a great agitation in the State of New York and other States, for protecting the sources of the rivers in the Alleghany and Appalachian Ranges, and the proposition made in this Bill is, that the Governor shall be empowered to set aside an area of protective land, along the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, to protect the streams flowing into the North-West Territories. That is the scheme which is proposed in the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear it, although I am afraid, from what I hear of the character of the streams, that the evil does exist to a great extent already, and that these streams are more or less of the character of mountain torrents.

Mr. COLBY. The intention which the hon. gentleman has in view is of the very best, but I should doubt very much, from my experience in the Rocky Mountains—and I have had occasion to visit these regions for some years—whether it could be practically carried out, whether the forest fires would not nullify the laudable purpose which the hon. gentleman has in view. In the case of spruce and pine forests, on almost every mountain side through the Rocky Ranges which I visited, in the vicinity of miners' camps and settlements, you will see the blackened trees which show the ravages of fires. Of course, with hardwood districts it would be quite different.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The same reason would prevent you from building a house.

Mr. COLBY. I think that as settlement enters a country it will be found that notwithstanding any precautions which may be taken, the good purpose could hardly be subserved, and I think that no policy should be hastily entered upon, until some observations are made.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think we could depend wholly on the growth of timber on the Rocky Mountains, but we would have to depend on preserving the forests in the heights or table lands, in which the tributaries of the Saskatchewan and other large rivers take their rise. Take, for instance, the Riding Mountains Section, and the Beaver Hills, those large, swampy districts, in which considerable timber is found. I think it would be a great advantage if the Government should have a thorough exploration, and preserve all such timber districts as these as public property, in order that they might be devoted to the production of timber.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the duties of these land guides?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are to convoy the immigrants to their homesteads after they have made their entries.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I am not going to take part in the war that has been waging here for some time. But before this vote is carried, I wish to make a statement with reference to a remark that was made during the discussion on colonization companies. It was stated here, I have no doubt under misapprehension, that Mr. Stephenson, the Inspector, had taken part in the recent election in the county of Kent. I wish to state, from my personal knowledge, that Mr. Stephenson was not in the county of Kent during that election, or for some time before. Some members of his family took part in the election, and they were probably confounded with him; but Mr. Rufus Stephenson did not take any part in the contest.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman I suppose alludes to what I said. I said that I had been informed by the public newspapers that he was there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was I who called attention to the statement, and I am very glad to have the explanation, because I should regret, for Mr. Stephenson's sake, if he had taken part in that election. I am glad to hear that he did not.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Department of the Interior.

216	To pay to Mr. Andrew Russel, Chief Clerk, amount of annual statutory increments, not paid to him from the 1st April, 1879, to 1st January, 1883	$ 600 00
	Further amount required for departmental contingencies	10,000 00

LEGISLATION.

Miscellaneous.

	To pay the accounts of Beauchemin & Valois, for $300.00 for works partly for Library exchanges, and Wilson & Lamb for $80.00, for works wholly for the use of the Government, being copies of publications authorized by Order in Council of 10th November, 1882	$ 380 00
	To purchase 400 copies of the new edition of the Dominion Annual Register and Review, at the rate of $3 per copy, for the use of the members of the Senate and of House of Commons, and for Library exchanges	1,200 00
	To pay for the purchase of 25 copies of the following works:—	
227	Sulte's "Histoire des Canadiens Français," at $32	800 00
	"Biography of Sir Charles Tupper," by Thibault, at 75 cts.	18 75
	"Insects Injurious to Fruits," by Saunders, at $3	75 00
	Larcque's "Manuel d'Horticulture pratique et d'Arboriculture fruitière," at 50 cts.	12 50
	Sum required to cover the amount in excess of that authorized by Order in Council of 4th June, 1883, for the purchase from M. A. Desjardins of ten copies of "Débats de la Législature de Québec," for the year 1883, the work being valued at $8 instead of $5, as authorized	30 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an item of interest. Sir, I am not rising to oppose a vote of $18.75 for twenty-five copies of the biography of the High Commissioner. If I call attention to it, it is for another reason. When I first saw this item, Sir, I had doubts. I knew the magnitude of the subject, and I knew that it was scarcely possible for any ordinary person to do full justice to it; consequently, I made enquiries as to Monsieur Thibault. I am happy to say that those enquiries were more than satisfactory. In point of fact, I think I may go to the length of saying that Monsieur Thibault's antecedents were all that could be desired or expected to enable him to fulfil the very onerous task he had assumed. It was not, Sir, that my standard was not high. My standard for a biographer, to do justice to the hero of this sketch, is high. I felt that the man who undertook that task ought to be a person of a very vivid imagination, and ought to be quite untrammelled by any regard for trivial conventionalities. In point of fact, Sir, he ought to be a sort of prose poet, to do full justice to the subject. Now, Sir, I found all this, and more too, in Monsieur Thibault—all these qualities combined. Perhaps, Sir, one single anecdote which has been given to me within the last day or two will suffice. Mr. Thibault is a man of resource, a man of ingenuity, a man of fertility of invention. I am told that on one occasion he was conducting a campaign in the interest of hon gentlemen opposite, I think in the county represented by my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail). Questions arose—questions of a theological character. Monsieur Thibault had declared that no man who had a true regard for religious principles could help supporting the present Government. He was called on for proof of that assertion. The proof was forthcoming. He produced a document which I am led to understand was an unsigned patent from the Department of the Interior. And he displayed that as a rescript, signed by the very highest spiritual authority, in which eternal condemnation was pronounced against all infidels who might vote against Mr. Thibault and Sir Charles Tupper. Mr. Chairman, when I heard that anecdote, I was satisfied. I felt that for once we had the right man in the right place—the biographer was worthy of the hero, and the hero of the biographer. Since then I have been privileged to examine the work itself, and I am bound to say, Sir, that the style is equal to the matter. Mr. Thibault, as I have said, is a man of no ordinary attainments. Mr. Thibault has great powers of analysis. I will give the House a sample. Speaking of the hon. gentleman, says Mr. Thibault:

"In truth, if the member for Cumberland is impetuous, if his language jets out clear, bitter, aggressive, with volubility almost unequalled——"

How true!

"If his assertions are hazardous even to temerity——"

How true!

"It is none the less true that he, a thousand times, defied his opponents, and they accepted not the defiance."

Well, there I draw the line. I think there are two or three hardened individuals who have accepted the defiance in times gone by:

"He has the qualities of a tribune; his voice is sonorous,
"His voice is heard around,
Loud as a trumpet with a siver sound."
His language attractive, his style correct, his phrase powerful, his gesture expressive, his appearance proud."

His appearance proud! Mr. Thibault is a philosopher, Sir. Mr. Thibault reflects, and I would like the hon. gentleman to listen to one of his reflections:

'The people govern the land! Happy illusion!! * * * Yet how highly is responsible government appreciated! The people are the direct source of power! The people really believe that they govern! Oh happy illusion; imagination plays its part in it.

"The real truth is that but only a few men govern the land; the remainder follow in their footsteps! It requires but a short examination of our Parliamentary debates to find this out. Fortunately the electors scarcely ever assist at the debates."

Mr. Thibault understands the case evidently, then he compares our hon. friend with those who sit around him, and it may be interesting to them to hear the comparison:

"Although sometimes too sarcastic, the House always listens to Sir Charles Tupper with great respect and close attention * * * Sir John A. Macdonald charms his adversaries; Sir Hector Langevin convinces them; Sir Leonard Tilley coaxes them; Mr. Blake inspires them; Mr. Chapleau astonishes them; Mr. Pope perplexes them; Mr. Laurier mesmerises them; Sir Charles Tupper nails them down—masters them; one would think he grasped some solid and heavy weapon with which he mercilessly strikes his opponents. He holds above them the glistening sword of Damocles. A Conservative Danton advancing in powerful strides towards the goal with an ever increasing audacity, heightened by constant successes."

Then there is an interesting narrative—I will not trouble the House with reading the whole of it—as to how the hon. gentleman penetrated into the recesses of Manitoba:

"Major Cameron, son-in-law of Dr. Tupper, a brave and a cool man, tried to scale the barriers. "Take away that fence," he cried out to the half breeds that awaited him. For answer, they seized the major's bridle and forced the major to retrace his steps; these Métis are not to be laughed at in war time."

Then he goes on to show how the hon. gentleman penetrated to the depths of Manitoba, the very confines of the besieged country:

"Like the celebrated Chevalier Bayard, it may well be said of him that he is *sans peur et sans reproche*."

And so he he goes on. I really regret I had not this publication earlier in the Session, because I cannot detain the House with all of it at this late period. But I must give one more quotation:

"It is by his deeds that we know the good man. Sir Charles Tupper has done everything in his power to promote great public interests. He may have been mistaken on the means to use, but his object is always commendable."

I trust after that we shall vote unanimously this $18.75. I feel that Sir Charles Tupper, if I may be excused for naming him, would be incomplete without Mr. Thibault, and Mr. Thibault would be quite incomplete without such a hero. As Macaulay once said, slightly modified:

Where'er a Tupper sits on high,
A Thibault you shall see,
And wheresoe'er such chiefs are found,
Such clients still will be.

If the hon. gentlemen choose to employ Mr. Thibault as their inspired bard, and if he will only take as his theme the life of one or more of them, and do it only half as well, I am prepared to supplement the Government grant of $18.75 with an equal sum at my own expense out of my own pocket.

282. To pay Mr. Justice Gray $ 75 (part of $300) and interest thereon at 5 per cent. per annum, from the 22nd October, 1874, to the 22nd February, 1884, being for services rendered as arbitrator in a case between the Immigration Department and the British Columbia Government, in 1863, "Prince Alfred Quarantine Claims," which was charged to Quarantine in the Public Accounts, 1874 75, Part 2, page 128, but was placed towards the removal expenses of Mr. Justice Gray, and not paid to him.... 405 62

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1885.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1885, and in accordance with the provision of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 8th April, 1884.

Ordered, That the said Message and Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply read the second time.

On Resolution 6,

Department of Militia $43,160 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Minister of Militia was to give some information about one or two items in that vote.

Mr. CARON. I gave the information when the vote came up in Supply. I state that the Estimates provided for the statutory increase of $50 to salaries of those who are eligible for the increase under the Civil Service Act. In addition to that, it makes provision for four new appointments, one second-class clerk, at $1,150, one third-class clerk, at $850, and one second-class clerk, the increase being for the new branch created to take charge of the military buildings and fortifications under direction of a military engineer, and a third-class clerk at $800. In regard to the item of $1,150, the hon. gentleman seemed to consider that it should have been kept within the limit, under the Civil Service Act. I have explained that in that particular branch it was necessary to have a man possessing special qualifications. I hope I may not expend the whole amount, but, after considering it and the amount having been placed in the Estimates upon the recommendation of the Deputy Minister of Militia, I think it ought to be left as it is. If I can secure the services of a competent person to fill the position without paying the whole of that amount, it will not be spent.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 22,

Amount required to provide for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, and to provide £100 for the salary of the Secretary, hitherto charged for unforeseen expenses $4,500.00

Mr. BLAKE. The House will recollect that when this was discussed it was pointed out that it was intended, in view of the proposed acquisition of the residence, that the rent should be paid as before. It turned out, on the vote being brought down, that it was not for lease alone, but also to provide furniture, and therefore it is necessary that the vote should be reduced by an amount equivalent to the proposed charge. This vote, as I explained, was taken in order to provide for these expenditures, which are now provided in another way. I therefore move in amendment:

"That the said item be reduced by $3,350, being 4 per cent. on $29,500, the cost of the High Commissioner's residence, and 15 per cent. on $12,500, the cost of the furniture for the High Commissioner's residence."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I would suggest that that item stand. We will not take Concurrence on it now, but we will consider it.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 41,

Printing paper and book-binding..... ..... $70,000.00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will take this opportunity of enquiring what decision has been come to on a matter which has been mentioned twice or thrice across the floor, with respect to making some provision for distribution of books to gentlemen who have been members of Parliament. It was understood that on Concurrence we would be informed what decision had been come to by the Department. The First Minister is not here, but I think he intimated on that occasion that Government considered it favourably, and would advise the Committee to have a considerable number of these books placed in the hands of the clerk for distribution. I should be glad to know if that recommendation will be given effect to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The matter has not been considered yet, though I believe the leader of the Government did suggest that it was desirable to do so.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the Committee on Public Printing should deal with this. It is part of the distribution of public documents, and I hoped that, after the intimation of the leader of the Government, the Committee would take it into consideration.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may say the Committee on Printing will meet on Thursday, and will then consider the matter.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 48,

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics..... $99,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister in charge give us some information in regard to the collection of health statistics. He stated in Committee that the Government had no scheme arranged, but that on Concurrence some information would be given.

Mr. McLELAN. I can only state that returns are to be gathered from all the principal cities of the Dominion and at as many other points as we may be able to enlist the services of medical or other gentlemen qualified for the work, showing the condition of the health in the several localities. This vote is to provide for a small salary for each person making a return, as well as for printing, compilation of statistics, and other incidental expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is any special person in connection with the Department to be in charge of this work?

Mr. McLELAN. All these different services are placed under the charge of one special officer in the Department, who is supposed to have some special qualifications for the work, and he is held responsible for that branch of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand by health statistics, simply the causes of deaths in different parts of the country, or is it intended to enter into an examination of the prevalent types of disease, and their causes?

Mr. McLELAN. The causes of death are given, and when any special type of disease is prevalent, returns are made of the causes, in any particular locality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no provision for what one may call the hygienic conditions of the country at large—only in case of epidemics.

Mr. McLELAN. It is proposed that statistics shall be gathered of the causes of death and the general condition of the district at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see this is not a revote. What was done with the $20,000 taken last year?

Mr. McLELAN. Of that amount, $10,000 is practically a revote, as only about $5,000 were spent.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 63,

Maintenance and care of military properties transferred from the Ordnance and Imperial Government..... .....$12,000.00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was to have given us the total value of these properties, I think.

Mr. CARON. The total value, from the returns which have been handed in to the Department, is $12,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much of that amount is land, what is the selling value of the land, and how much is military works?

Mr. CARON. The return which the hon. gentleman now asks is a very lengthy one—too long for me to do more than refer to it. The value I now give the hon. gentleman is the value estimated between the Imperial officers who transferred the property, and Mr. Walkem, who was acting as the Head of that Branch of the Department of Militia. Mr. Walkem went very fully into the matter, and made a lengthened report. I think, however, it will be sufficient to tell the hon. gentleman that the estimated value arrived at between these gentlemen was $12,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is it divided? In other words, how much is the estimated value of the fortifications, and how much the value of the land?

Mr. CARON. Some ordnance land and military property was transferred in 1866, the estimated value of which was $5,000,000. In 1870, on the withdrawal of Her Majesty's forces, the fortifications and buildings were transferred at an estimated value of $7,000,000.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I took a great deal of trouble last Session to ascertain the value of these lands, and a return was brought down from the Department showing what their actual cash value was. My impression is, that between two and three million dollars' worth of land had been disposed of up to last year.

Mr. VAIL. When this item was before the Committee, I stated that there was no necessity for a caretaker to be appointed for the military property in Nova Scotia, and if my hon. friend will examine the return he has brought down, I think he will find that that is the case. There are no fortifications and no buildings to be taken care of, and there are only small tracts of land here and there, that do not require any person to look after them.

Mr. CARON. If a caretaker is not required, he will certainly not be appointed.

Mr. GAULT. What value has been placed on the buildings on St. Helen's Island?

Mr. CARON. That is a very valuable property. The buildings are in a very good state of preservation, and are used for keeping our military stores. I think the property was estimated at £150,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I cannot allow this item to pass without making another observation with reference to some volunteers who belonged to the Grey battalion, and who took sick while on their annual drill, and without asking whether any provision will be made out of the large vote for contingencies, for sickness or accidents arising from drill. I felt it my duty last year to bring the claims of these volunteers before the House. I stated that six or seven had taken sick shorly after returning from their annual drill, which was held in Owen Sound and in Toronto. The volunteers were taken down to Toronto from Owen Sound in a flat car. It was wet nearly all the way down, and no doubt this was one of the causes of their illness. I stated then, as I state now, that I believe it is the duty of the Department to pay those members of the force who fell sick on that occasion. It is well known to the members of this House that the volunteers receive a very small remuneration for the services they perform; and if those of them who run the risk of contracting disease, or of suffering serious injury, are to be neglected and passed over, that neglect will strike a blow at the service of the volunteer force of this country. Now we are spending this year over a million and a quarter on the volunteer force, and I would like to know, in the interests of that force, what is being done with this money, and why it is that these worthy men who fell sick on that occasion are not to be requited for the loss of time and the serious illness they suffered, resulting from their service in the force. Last year I brought before the Department affidavits from one or two of these volunteers, and I have since been furnished with affidavits from the others. The hon. Minister of Militia then declined to pay the accounts, because the surgeon of the battalion made a statement to the effect that he scarcely thought they contracted the disease in the service. I told the hon. Minister then, as I tell him now, that the battalion surgeon never saw any of these volunteers when ill, and had no means whatever of forming a conclusion as to how they contracted the disease, except on consultation with the medical men who attended them. It was my duty to attend two of them, and I am fully convinced they contracted the disease in the service. Some others were attended by *Dr. Jamieson*, a very respectable medical practitioner in the town of Durham, and he also stated they contracted the disease in service. Although they remained sick for a long time, they have not received compensation at all, and I have affidavits from five or six of them, in which they stated that they contracted the disease in the service. I want to show the hon. Minister of Militia that the surgeon of the battalion, however respectable and eminent a gentleman he may be, and I admit he is a very deserving man, had no opportunity of arriving at a conclusion with respect to those cases, except on consultation with the gentlemen who attended them, and *they both stated distinctly to me that the men* contracted the disease in the service and were entitled to compensation. The affidavit of John Willey is to the effect:—that he performed his term of drill in Toronto and Owen Sound in 1878; that while there he contracted a serious and painful illness, typhoid fever, from which he suffered a long period of time; that the surgeon of the battalion did not see him at any time during his illness; that he was unable to resume work for several months; and that he received no compensation whatever from the Militia Department for the loss of time and the pain suffered during this illness, contracted in his country's service. Similar affidavits were made by the others; and in reference to James Allen, I have a very melancholy task to perform, in laying his claim before the House. James Allen fell sick while on duty, suffered for a long time and has since died, and I have an affidavit from his father, which I will read here, and if the hon. Minister of Militia is actuated at all by the impulse of a generous soldier, he will listen to the affidavit made by the father of this volunteer, who fell sick and subsequently died, his death, no doubt, having been produced by an illness contracted in the service of his country. The affidavit is as follows:—

"I solemnly declare that my son, Samuel Allen, was a member of No. 4 Durham Company of Infantry, in the year 1879, which, in that year, put in their term of drill in Owen Sound and in the city of Toronto; that immediately after his return from said drill he was taken ill of typhoid fever, from which he suffered a long and painful illness, which, I believe, was contracted at the said drill; that he was under medical care for one month; that he was for a long time unable to do his regular work; that he was never, while he remained at home, a period of two and a-half years after said illness, in as good health as he had been before; that he went to Manitoba, where he since died; that the battalion surgeon, Dr. Charles Bamhardt, never saw him during his illness; that I paid all bills for medical attendance on my son during said illness; and that I have not received any compensation from the Militia Department or from any other source, for the expense and trouble consequent on the illness of my said son.

"JAMES ALLEN.

"Declared before me.

"DAVID JACKSON,
"*Magistrate.*"

I strongly urge these claims and I believe I have strong grounds for urging them. I think they are of sufficient importance to be brought before this House, and I wish to

draw the attention of the House to the fact that similar claims were paid last year. I would hardly like to believe, in the interest of the force, that these claims were paid because they were brought by some hon. member who happened to be a supporter of the Government, and that these genuine claims which I urge are refused merely because I consider it my duty, in the interest of the country, to give only an independent support to the Government and the Department. From last year's Public Accounts, I see that the following claims were paid:—

"Sergeant-Major McMinphey, injury sustained while at target practice, $200; Trooper Townsend, injury to horse, $18; Napoleon Girard, injury to horse, $100; Troop Sergeant-Major McDairmid, illness contracted, $123; Gunner Wallace, injury sustained, $17; Sergeant Tracy, injury to horse, $100; Trooper-Sergeant, Cobourg Cavalry, $38.70; Bandsman Thompson, illness, $25; Corporal Landry, illness, $175; A Desjardins, illness, $60; W. T. Dolan, illness, $147.50; and a number of other cases."

I know that none of these cases was more deserving of compensation than those I have brought to the notice of the hon. Minister. It is thought by every person in that section of the country from which these men come, that they should be paid. The gentleman who occupied a seat in this House as a representative of South Grey before I had the honour of being elected to represent that constituency, Mr. Jackson, also urged that those claims be paid, and the captain of the company also maintained that they had a right to compensation. I repeat that it is not in the interest of the volunteer force that these men, who only received the small pittance of 50 cents per day, should not be paid for the time they lost and the suffering they endured on account of this illness contracted by them in the service of their country. I feel it to be my duty to bring their case before this House on this occasion. They were all young men, just starting out in life. One of them came and lived with his brother and his companion came and lived with him also, and both had to be kept without compensation from the Government, and when we are asked to vote a $1,250,000 to the militia service of the country, I think that if these honest, straightforward accounts are to be left unrequited, the country may well ask where is the money expended. When honest debts are neglected, when incidents arising out of the drill are unrequited, and when soldiers who fall sick are told they may fall sick, it is not likely that a loyal spirit will be infused among the privates of the force when they are thus treated by the Militia Department.

Mr. CARON. I think the hon. gentleman will do me the justice of saying that, when he spoke to me and brought this claim before me, I was very anxious indeed to take it up, to look into it, and, if possible, to do what the hon. gentleman asked me to do; but the hon. gentleman must remember that these claims had already been submitted to my hon. predecessor who, when he was occupying the position which I now occupy, had the same claims submitted to him. Unfortunately, doctors differ. My hon. friend who has just spoken says that the disease which afflicted these unfortunate volunteers had been contracted in camp. As far as the Department is concerned, we had nothing to go by but the opinion expressed by the surgeon of the battalion. He was consulted about it, his report was sent to the Department of Militia, and in that report he stated that the disease had not been contracted in camp.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have shown the affidavits of all these volunteers, who state that the Surgeon never saw them during their illness.

Mr. CARON. The report came before the Minister, and after looking into it and taking all the information it was possible for us to get, it was decided that this claim could not be paid. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Public Accounts to show that several injuries, some to men and some to horses, had been paid for by the Department of Militia. Under our regulations, these injuries are paid for, provided it is established that they have been incurred when the men were on duty, and I believe, if the hon. gentleman looks into these cases, he will find they are quite dissimilar in every respect to the one refused by the Department. I would have been very glad indeed if it had been possible for me to have this claim settled, but from the information conveyed to us by the surgeon of the battalion, it became impossible for me to follow any other course.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is bound to follow the guidance of the surgeons of the battalion, although he never saw one of them, and although the medical men and every one else who saw them report that they did contract the disease in camp. I am speaking subject to correction; but I believe the surgeon of the battalion did not state definitely in his report that they did not contract disease in camp. He said that he scarcely thought they did, but he had no way of coming to a conclusion, except in consultation with those who attended them; and Dr. Jamieson, who attended three or four of them, states definitely that they did contract it in camp. The Minister of Militia says he is anxious to pay these men; yet he repudiates the evidence of those who saw and attended them, and accepts the evidence of one who never saw one of them. That is the anxiety of the Minister of Militia. He will accept the testimony of the surgeon of the battalion, who did not investigate the matter for nearly a year afterwards, as against my own testimony and the testimony of Dr. Jamieson, and the testimony of the captain of the company, and he says he is anxious to pay them. Does this look like anxiety? He has an affidavit from all the volunteers that the surgeon was never near them when they were ill; and yet he is anxious to pay them. I state that I attended two of them, and I believe my word is worthy of credence anywhere I am known. And I know that they contracted the disease there. I believe it is the rule in the Department not to pay claims. I believe the hon. gentleman has not paid the claim of the surgeon for making the investigation, and certainly he is entitled to pay. If the Minister of Militia is going to neglect all these claims, if he is bound not to pay them, we should know it. He says he is anxious to pay them, and yet the information on which he declines to pay them is that of a gentleman who never saw them at all, and the claims I have brought before him are on the authority of those who did see them.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 111,

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia $21,850 00

Mr. VAIL. The hon. Minister of Public Works promised to give me some information, with reference to the amount of $2,000 in the Estimates of 1882, for building a pier at Westport, Nova Scotia. Last year I asked the Minister what he proposed to do, and he replied that he intended to extend the time by an Order in Council for three months after the 1st of July, and expend the money before that three months had expired. I see no reference to it in the Estimates this year, nor in the Public Accounts.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Papers were received about this pier and the engineer made a report on it. The report enclosed the offer of a site by Mr. Titus, and recommended that the offer be accepted in case it were decided to build the pier. The engineer reported that $10,000 would be required for a pier of 200 feet, that would give 5½ feet at low water; $11,000 for 9 feet at low water, and $14,500 for 12 feet at low water. As we only had $2,000, we could not proceed with the work.

Mr. VAIL. Does the hon. Minister propose to give anything this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not this year.

Mr. VAIL. When?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will see about that in the future.

Mr. VAIL. I think the hon. gentleman should have got this information before the grant was made. It was made the Session before the election, and the people were told that they might depend upon the pier being commenced within the year. I referred to this matter particularly last Session, and after speaking to the Minister of Public Works about it, I put a question to him across the floor, when he replied that this $2,000 for a pier would be expended within the financial year. I thought that would be sufficient. I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider the matter, because the work is one of great importance to the people at that place, and they would be greatly disappointed if they found no pier was to be erected there. At present the people can only reach the steamer by boats.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It appears that after this $2,000 had been voted, and when we came to call for tenders, it was found by the report of the engineer who had been sent down to examine the place, that the sum was far too small to justify us in commencing the work. However, I may have said what the hon. gentleman has stated: it is quite possible; but after looking into the matter, I found that it would not be prudent to go on. The sum was not one-quarter of what was required to build the smallest pier.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 112,

Harbours and Rivers, Prince Edward Island..... $1,250 00

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. Minister of Public Works promised to inform me whether he intended to take any steps with reference to the Victoria breakwater, for which $2,000 was voted last year. I told him then that it was no use spending that money at all, unless he made up his mind to prolong the breakwater, so as to make a natural harbour; that he might just as well pitch the money into the sea, as to leave the harbour standing as it is now.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 154,

Completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-alarms $40,000.00

Mr. VAIL. I find in a statement which has been put in the hands of hon. members, that there is provision made for the construction of a lighthouse at Shafter's Point. Will the hon. Minister inform us where Shafter's Point is, and at whose instance the application for this grant is made?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been urged very strongly that a lighthouse is necessary for vessels passing up and down the river and basin. If it is found that the statements made in the application are not sustained on enquiry by the officer in charge, the money will not be expended.

Mr. VAIL. By whom is the application made?

Mr. McLELAN. By some in the locality, and others in Halifax.

Mr. VAIL. I know all about this place, and I know that there is no necessity for a lighthouse at this point. I frequently go up and down the basin by steamer, and I am quite sure that the time has never come yet that a light would be of the least service. I do not object to any grant in Annapolis county or anywhere else, in the interests of navigation, but I hope before the expenditure is made the Minister will make full enquiry into the necessity for such a work. I am quite sure that people who know anything about the locality will tell him there is no necessity for it at all.

Mr. McLELAN. I may tell the hon. gentleman that careful enquiry is always made in such cases, and no lighthouse is erected unless it is found to be necessary in the interest of commerce.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:55 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:

Bill (No.142) further to amend the present Tariff of Duties of Customs.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SCRIVER presented the Third Report of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister if the Auditor-General audits the accounts of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I was under the impression he did until I read the report.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think he does, because we find a year or two ago there was an over-expenditure. It would be a great improvement if those accounts were subjected to audit.

Mr. MACKENZIE. An order of the House will suffice to have the Auditor-General attend to it. If we were to pass a motion instructing him to audit the accounts, that would suffice.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think there has been no such action taken. With reference to the auditing of the accounts of even the House of Commons, the accounts go there, but I think there is no legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The accounts go to the Auditor-General in consequence of a resolution adopted by the Public Accounts Committee three or four years ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE. More than that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Three or four years ago.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the Chairman of the Committee on Public Accounts will take a note of it. It is said that the report which suggested the audit of the House accounts is wide enough to include the other, so it would be only necessary to call the Auditor's attention to it.

BERTHIER CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada a copy

of the certificate of judgment of the said Court in the matter of the Election Petition relating to the Electoral District of Berthier, in the Province of Quebec, by which the sitting member is declared duly elected and returned.

CUSTOMS EXAMINATION OF BAGGAGE AT ST. VINCENT.

Mr. HESSON enquired, Whether the Government have seen an article in the Winnipeg *Sun* to the following effect: "Trouble is likely to arise over the inauguration of a new system of having goods manifested at St. Vincent by the Canadian Customs authorities rendering it necessary to carry manifests with the way bills—that an immigrant who arrived with the first load of immigrants this season informed a reporter that a Customs broker named Chapman who lives in St. Vincent charged each member of the party who had baggage fifty cents a piece for passing it. Owing to some hitch the manifests were not signed and the immigrants had to pay another fifty cents to get their goods passed. Enquiry was made at the Canadian Pacific Railway offices about the matter, and the facts were in the main corroborated." And is there anything in such statements?

Mr. McLELAN. The Customs Department has no advice on the subject, and is not aware of any new arrangement respecting manifests. The same rules apply to Manitoba that apply to all other parts of Canada. Personal baggage is not manifested excepting in case a train does not stop long enough to complete the examination, or on the request of the owners that it may be examined at destination. There is no information in the Department of Agriculture from any immigrant of complaint of the nature indicated in the question.

EXAMINATION FOR MASTERS' CERTIFICATES.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether the Board of Examiners have been instructed to grant James Chesnut a certificate as master? Whether such certificate has been granted? Whether James Chesnut had been refused a certificate of fitness, and also an examination on the ground that he was not under the Act entitled to either? Under what circumstances has the special action been taken in his case? Whether any other persons have been allowed to go up for examination though not within the Act? If so, who? And under what circumstances?

Mr. McLELAN. The answer to the first question is no, they have not; to the second question, no; to the third question, no. He was refused a master's certificate but not on the ground mentioned in the question. The ground of refusal was that he did not show he was a master previous to 1883, and that point is still under consideration, and enquiry is being made as to when he served. The Act debars no one from going up for examination. There have been cases in which persons have been up and have not passed, but it would require a return to bring all these cases down. If the hon. gentleman moves for a return of them, it will be brought down.

INSPECTION OF BANK RETURNS.

Mr. MASSUE enquired, Whether the Government have matured the plan they had under consideration for the appointment of inspectors to supervise the returns of banks in the Dominion, and if so, whether it is their intention to bring down a measure to that effect during the present Session?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not aware that the Government have had any distinct plan under consideration on this subject. It engaged the attention of the Government some time ago when we had the Banking Act before us, but since then the subject has not been brought under our consideration or received our attention. It is not the intention to arrange for the inspection during this Session.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned, to and for the parties, railways and railway companies hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Government of the Province of Quebec, in consideration of their having constructed the railway from Quebec to Ottawa, forming a connecting link between the Atlantic and the Pacific Coasts *viâ* the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific railways, and being as such a work of national and not merely provincial utility, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile for the portion between Quebec and Montreal, 159 miles, not exceeding in the whole.....	$ 954,000
And for the portion between Montreal and Ottawa, 120 miles, $12,000 per mile, not exceeding in the whole.....	1,440,000
For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the Harbours of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route, a subsidy not exceeding $170,000 per annum for 15 years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on bonds of the Company undertaking the work.....	
For the construction of a line of railway from Oxford Station on the Intercolonial Railway to Sydney or Louisburg, a subsidy not exceeding $30,000 per annum for fifteen years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the Company undertaking the work, in addition to the subsidies previously granted, and also a lease or transfer to such Company of the Eastern Extension Railway from New Glasgow to Canso, with its present equipment.....	
To the Quebec Central Railway Company for a line of railway from Beauce Junction to the International Boundary Line, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	211,200
For the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, to the Harbour of Quebec, in such manner as may be approved by the Governor in Council, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	960,000
To the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for a line of railway from Mississippi to Renfrew, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	48,000
To the Great Northern Railway Company, for that portion of their railway between St. Jerome and New Glasgow, in the county of Terrebonne, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	32,000
For a line of Railway and Bridge between the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and St. Martin's Junction, connecting the Jacques Cartier Union Railway with the North Shore Railway proper, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole.....	200,000
For a line of railway from St. Louis to Richibucto, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	22,400
For a line of Railway from Hopewell to Alma, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	51,200
For a line of Railway from St. Andrews to Lachute, in the County of Argenteuil, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	22,400
For a line of Railway from the Grand Piles, on the River St Maurice, to Lake des Isles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	217,600
For a line of Railway from Annapolis to Digby, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	64,000
For a branch line of the Central Railway from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, between Sussex and St. John, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	128,000

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company for a line of Railway, from the Victoria branch of the Midland Railway to the Village of Bancroft, in the Township of Dungannon, County of Hastings, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	160,000
To the Pontiac Pacific Junction, for a line of Railway from Aylmer to Pembroke, provided the Ottawa River is crossed within the county of Pontiac, at some point not east of Lapasse, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	272,000
To the Gatineau Railway Company, for a line of Railway from Kazuabazua to Le Desert, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exeeeding in the whole	160,000
To the Napanee and Tamworth Railway Company, for a line of Railway from Tamworth to Bogart and Bridgewater, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	70,400
To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for a line of Railway from Lake Simon to Le Desert, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	160,000
To the Miramichi Valley Railway Company, for a line of railway from Fredericton to the Miramichi River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole (instead of the subsidy proposed in 1883)	128,000
To the Erie and Huron Railway Company, for a line of railway from Wallaceburgh to Sarnia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	96,000
To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Cornwall to Perth, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	262,400
For the extension of the line of Railway from Caraquet to Shippigan, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole	76,800
For a Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, from Metapediac eastward towards Paspebiac, in the Province of Quebec, a sum not exceeding in the whole	300,000
For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, from Derby Station to Indian Town, a sum not exceeding in the whole	140,000

The subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose, shall be granted to such companies, respectively:—The other subsidies shall be granted to such Companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways, respectively. All the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of July next and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government shall be empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed, in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister. The subsidies to the Province of Quebec to be capitalized and the interest to be payable at such time and in such manner as the Government of Canada shall agree upon with the Government of the said Province. The two subsidies last mentioned above being for works to be constructed by the Government.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS OF CANADA.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 134) further to amend the Act 31st Victoria, chapter 12, intituled: An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada. He said: The Bill is to repeal the 13th section of the Act passed in 1867 respecting public works and to substitute the following in lieu thereof:

All lands, streams, watercourses and property acquired for the use of public works or buildings shall be vested in Her Majesty, and when not required for the said works or buildings may be sold or disposed of under the authority of the Governor in Council, and all hydraulic powers created by the construction of any public work, or the expenditure of public money thereon, shall be vested in Her Majesty, and any portion thereof not required for the public works may be sold or leased under the authority aforesaid, and any portion of the shore or bed of any public harbour vested in Her Majesty, as represented by the Government of Canada, not required for public purposes may, on the joint recommendation of the Ministers of Public Works and of Marine and Fisheries, be sold or leased under the authority aforesaid; and the proceeds of all such sales and leases shall be accounted for as public money.

It has been found that properties of that character could not be sold unless we had the special authority of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand it this is an enlargement of the existing clause 13. I have not read clause 13 but I am told it does not contain those words with reference to the shore or bed of any public harbour, and the practical effect of this Bill is to introduce a new power respecting shores and public harbours for purposes within the purview of the thirteenth section, and provides for their sale on the recommendation of two Ministers instead of under the authority of the Governor in Council. The addition of "any portion of the shore or bed of any public harbour" is accompanied with the provision that they may be sold on the joint recommendation of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. So it is introducing a new power to enable them to dispose of the shores or bed of public harbours. It is due, I suppose, to the decision of the Supreme Court which is supposed to enlarge the territorial acquisitions of the Federal Government, which I think was a surprise to many, and I think the First Minister himself stated when the subject was brought up last Session, that it was a surprise to himself. The question cannot be taken to have been conclusively adjudged as yet because the court of last resort has not been called upon to decide it. However it does not, as I understand it, except indirectly, provide to vest in the Dominion Government these shores or beds which are spoken of, but speaks simply of those which may be vested in the Government of Canada. I do not myself apprehend that under the British North America Act public harbours, using those words in the general sense, are otherwise than vested in the Provincial Governments. I think that is a sound construction of the law; but supposing it were otherwise, we have a tolerably large question before us. We have the question of the mode in which these important properties ought to be disposed of, and I think there are two general considerations to which the House should address itself: the first is, what shall be the relation of the shore or bed of the harbour with the preemptive rights, so to speak, of the riparian proprietor of the ground in front of each shore or bed. Heretofore, at any rate, in the Province of Upper Canada, and I fancy elsewhere, the general mode of dealing has been to recognize a preemptive right in the riparian proprietor to purchase. Is that to be departed from? If not, it ought to be recognized. Secondly, we have the question, in what mode the sale is to take place—is it to be by public competition, or by auction, or by private sale? If the right of preemption of the riparian proprietor is not to be guarded, there seems to be no reason at all why the ordinary principle of disposing of such valuable properties ought not to take effect, and why in all cases there should not be a tender or an option. I have not had time to consider the matter, and I do not know whether a Bill which provides for the disposal of a large portion of the public domain is in order in coming before the House in this way, and whether it ought not to be initiated by Committee of the Whole. I have just now seen the Bill, and, apart from the question of order, I would direct the hon. gentleman's attention to those two propositions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice has been ever since I have been in Parliament to initiate such legislation by the present mode.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not seen the Bill, or read it sufficiently to be able to give my judgment upon the question of order. I will give my decision to morrow.

Mr. BLAKE. I will not raise the question just now, because I will have an opportunity later.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think, under the circumstances, as Mr. Speaker is not in a position to decide on the question of order, that I had better withdraw my motion and leave the second reading for to-morrow. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has leave to withdraw the motion and allow it to stand.

Motion for second reading withdrawn.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the amendments made in Committee of the Whole to Bill (No. 111) respecting the Independence of Parliament Act, 1878, 41 Victoria, chapter 5, be considered.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose, at this stage of the Session, to enter into a lengthy discussion on this Bill. I think the first clause of it shows, in a very marked and significant manner, the great inexpediency there is of pursuing the course of altering the general law with a view to meet a particular case. The general law of the Independence of Parliament, which this clause proposes to alter, is one which prevents from sitting here those who hold a very large class of offices. All those office-holders who have been heretofore excluded from this House are by virtue of the alteration which is proposed in the first clause to be rendered eligible for this House and capable of sitting or voting here, provided that the patent or other instrument appointing him shall be so drawn as to show that the office is to be held without salary, allowance or emolument. We have not heretofore had occasion to deal with the question of the incompatibility of certain office-holders retaining their position and holding the position of member of Parliament irrespective of the question of emolument, because this long range of office-holders was excluded under the Independence of Parliament Act as they held offices of emolument. But the course which the hon. gentleman proposes to take, obviously and emphatically to meet one single case, and one single class of office, and that a political or *quasi* or political office, is to open the door wide, to open it altogether, and to permit persons who certainly are not considered to be capable of sitting here to sit here, provided their patents are in a particular shape. Your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, vacated his seat in Parliament by the acceptance of the office of Collector of Customs at the Port of Quebec. Had this Act then been the law, it would have been quite competent for the Government, within the spirit of this legislation, to have issued a patent to Mr. Blanchet as Collector of Customs without a salary during the last Session of the tenure of his seat here, and he might have remained sitting and voting in Parliament upon a tacit understanding that at the end of the Session, or such time as would be convenient to the Administration, he should disappear, a new patent issue, and become a salaried officer. And so with anyone of hundreds, aye of thousands of offices in the gift of the Crown. A large power is being given by this clause to the Administration of the day to appoint members to offices, they not receiving emolument while they are members, but upon a plain and palpable understanding that at an early and convenient season, consistent with the convenience of the Government and the members, they would vacate their seats and enter into, not merely the discharge of their duties, but also the receipt of the emoluments of the office. I view with great regret, then, the introduction of this clause, and I would have infinitely preferred—of two evils preferring the least—a special Bill directed to this particular office which has given rise to this question, and providing that so long as the occupant of this particular office filled it without salary or emolument of any kind, so long he would be eligible for a seat in Parliament. Thus could we have left the whole law touching the Independence of Parliament upon the sound footing, as I conceive, on which it now stands, altering that law only so far as the Ministerial exigencies required. But the hon. First Minister has preferred the more objectionable mode of dealing with the case. He has proposed to the House to alter, and we are about to alter, the whole law and destroy the Independence of Parliament simply in order to provide for a particular case. Turning to the other clauses, I recall the attention of the House to the fact that this Bill departs in an important particular from the arrangements which were made in 1877, when several members on both sides of the House were found to have unwittingly violated the existing Independence of Parliament Act. The law that was then brought forward and passed, against the remonstrances of the hon. gentleman now proposing this law, against the very vehement and urgent remonstrances of the First Minister, the Minister of Railways, and other members, not merely by vote, but by speech, was a law that provided that the members who had violated the Independence of Parliamont Act should be protected against liability to penalties for that Session. However trifling might have been the emolument obtained, even when it was of no pecuniary profit,—as it was in some cases—whether it was a transaction of trifling moment to the party in question or not, the law took no account of those things. So a disqualification which had been obtained by the voluntary act of the party, although acting under a misconception of the law, remained in force. There was no attempt to validate the seat of the party; the Act was only to save him from penalties during the current Session, and if at the end of the Session he did not choose to go back to his constituency, he remained exposed to the penalties of the law in all future Sessions, although the relation which had created the difficulty might be of a casual and temporary description and have long ago terminated. Now what is proposed is, in contradistinction to that course, not merely to guard against the penalties for the present Session, but to guard against the possibility of recovering the penalties for all future Sessions, although the relation creating the disqualification shall be subsisting. It seems to me that in that respect the Bill is not covered by the clearest precedent we can find—that of 1877, and that, as I have said, was strenuously opposed by the hon. gentleman as going quite too far. I know not how to deal with the first clause, unless I should propose affirmatively, what I am not disposed to propose affirmatively—an amendment, agreeing to the proposition that this particular office should be held, under the circumstances under which it is now held, as not creating a disqualification for a seat in Parliament. My opinion is that the offices are incompatible on other grounds than those pertaining to the simple pecuniary relation, and that the state of things which is provided for in the first clause, under which the member is qualified only in case he does not receive any salary, fee, allowance, wages, emolument or profit of any kind, is not a case which applies to the case in hand, in which, though no salary be received, there are allowances and emoluments of other descriptions attached to the office. But, Sir, putting this case to one side, I see no ground why, in this case, we should depart from that portion of the precedent of 1877 to which I have referred, and I move in amendment thereto, that the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with power to amend the same, by inserting clauses in the same words as those contained in the Indemnity Act of 1877 as clauses 3 and 4, as follows:—

3. Nothing in this Act contained shall be held in anywise to indemnify, exonerate, free or discharge the said Sir Charles Tupper from any pecuniary penalty or forfeiture, if any, to which he may render himself liable by sitting or voting in the House of Commons at any time after the end of the present Session of Parliament.

4. Nothing in this Act contained shall be held to affect any subsisting disqualification or incapacity to sit or vote in the House of Commons, or to validate any void election thereto, or to affect the vacation of any seat therein, or in anywise to interfere with the operation of section 5 of the said Act, as to the said Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true this Bill was introduced on account of a question of doubt having been raised in the case of Sir Charles Tupper, but the alteration of the Independence of Parliament Act in the first clause, the amendment of it, does not affect Sir Charles Tupper; because the Committee on Privileges and Elections have already reported that Sir Charles Tupper did not vacate his seat, that he is still the sitting member for the county of Cumberland, and if he is still so during this Session, he must be, unless he forfeits it by some other Act, the sitting member for the whole of the present Parliament. The House having concurred in and affirmed the resolution and report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that Sir Charles Tupper did not vacate his seat, that is beyond a doubt. He has got his seat. The House of Commons is the only authority or tribunal which can settle that question. They have so settled it, that the acceptance and the holding of that office, and Sir Charles Tupper having received no salary, he did not vacate his seat. So that in so far as the sitting here is concerned he has this Session, and every Session of the present Parliament, a full right to sit and vote. In consequence of an action having been brought against him for penalties, and Parliament having decided that he had a right to sit, it follows as a logical consequence that the House of Commons shall sustain that decision, respecting the penalties of a legal tribunal. That is a necessary and logical consequence. The House of Commons says he has a right to sit and vote, and no matter what may be the legal construction of the Act he would be indemnified. It was on that principal that the Act of 1877 affected Mr. Perry's case, and Mr. Macdonald's case was passed. The hon. gentleman moves an amendment that the indemnification shall only last this Session. Suppose Sir Charles Tupper comes back he is then, by the declaration of this House, the sitting member, but he might have another writ served on him, and that would only create the necessity of our passing the Bill sessionally.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly; there is no doubt about that. As regards the propriety of the Bill, that was so fully discussed in the previous stages that I do not think I need weary the House by discussing it again. I cannot agree to the amendment, and I believe the House will not accept it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has expressed views in connection with the Bill now before the House very different from those to which he gave expression in 1877. The hon. gentleman has said it is necessary to provide that this indemnity should extend indefinitely through this Parliament, in order that Sir Charles Tupper may not have brought against him next Session a writ similar to that with which he is threatened on this occasion. If the first observations made by the hon. gentleman had been well founded in law, there would be no necessity for such a provision. The hon. gentleman knows right well that the view expressed in the Committee on Privileges and Elections is not necessarily the view that will be taken by the Courts. On the contrary, the opinion, I think, of a very large majority of the members of this House—both of those who support and those who oppose the Bill—is that the Courts would differ from the views expressed by a majority of that Committee, and the view expressed by the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, what objection does the hon. gentleman make to the adoption of this amendment, proposed by my hon. friend? Is it that it is not sound? Is it that the majority of this House ought to protect his colleague from the consequences of a violation of the law? That is practically the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, in my opinion, the Independence of Parliament Act is a necessary Act. The majority of Parliament, ever since Confederation, have entertained that view; and if the hon. gentleman thinks that the appointment of a Minister of the Crown, or any other member of this House, to an office is in the public interest—an office which by the law he is not qualified to accept—that may be a good reason for repealing the law altogether. But the hon. gentleman, while he in a great measure continues the Independence of Parliament Act, also undertakes to invalidate it, so far as one of his own colleagues is concerned. Now, I observe that by the first section of this Act the hon. gentleman declares that a party accepting an office, who is a member of the House of Commons, shall not be disqualified from sitting or voting therein, if by his commission or other instrument of appointment, it is declared or provided that he shall hold such office, commission or employment without any salary, fees, wages, allowances, &c. Now, Sir, this is a provision of a Bill to overthrow the policy of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. Parliament says that a certain salary shall attach to an office, and also provides that a person accepting such an office shall be disqualified from sitting or voting, and the hon. gentleman undertakes to provide by this Bill that if a person accepts such an office without salary, and it is so stated in his commission, then he shall not vacate his seat; that is, he shall not do what Parliament declares he shall do in case he accepts such an office. I call the attention of the House to two English precedents on this point—that of Sir Henry Petty, and that of Mr. Addington, in which it was held that the agreement to accept an office before any acceptance had actually taken place disqualified the person so agreeing to accept from taking his place in the House. Now, if that is the law—and I believe it is the law—and the provision which the hon. gentleman has introduced into this Bill, shows that he is precisely of the same opinion—then it is perfectly obvious that he has undertaken by this Bill to completely change the law of Parliament in this particular, in order that he may enable a colleague who has vacated his seat, and who is disqualified from sitting here, to continue to sit here. Why does the hon. gentleman wish that these penalties shall not apply to the hon. gentleman next Session? It is because he believes that the opinion of the majority of the Committee could not be upheld before any legal tribunal in this country. I am satisfied that he is right in that impression. But the hon. gentleman declares that Sir Charles Tupper is a member of this House—the Committee has said so, and that has concluded the matter. Now, I say it has not concluded the matter. In the opinion of a majority of the members of this House, Sir Charles Tupper has no right to sit here, and the Government propose by this Bill to take away the right to have that determined, not only for this Session, but for the remainder of this Parliament. I say that this Bill, in effect, elects Sir Charles Tupper a member of this House, and takes away from anyone of his constituents, or any elector in the country the right to ascertain whether he is lawfully sitting in this House or not. The hon. gentleman referred the Committee to a judgment of the High Court of Justice in England upon Mr. Bradlaugh's case, in which the court held that there was only one way in which a court could be seized of a question of this sort, and that was, in a case in which penalties were attached to any person

sitting or voting illegally in Parliament, a party might raise the question of the right of the person to sit or vote, by prosecution. That is no doubt the case; and the hon. gentleman in taking away the penalties for sitting and voting in this case is taking away from the electors of Cumberland and the electors throughout the country the right to ascertain whether Sir Charles Tupper has a right to sit in this House or not. It is in fact an attempt on the part of the majority, by changing the law, to put Sir Charles Tupper in the House and keep him there in defiance of the law existing at the time he was appointed to this particular office.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Speaker, when this House convened some weeks ago it was promised by some and predicted by others that our friends on the opposite side were not intending to allow the usual routine or legitimate work of the Session to pass without giving us by way of variety a lively and stormy time, and if we can judge from what has already taken place in the endeavour to unseat the hon. member for Cumberland and what is taking place now I would judge that they were determined to see those promises fully realized. I would say that it does not reflect credit upon hon. members opposite that they should make the base of this attack an onslaught on the Minister of Railways, who is respected, loved, and trusted by his supporters both in and out of this House, and honoured by a nation he has done so much to build up and consolidate, and for no other reason than simply because he in consequence of his ill-health in Canada from overwork as Minister of Railways thought proper for a change of scene and air and to improve his health, to assume the duties of High Commissioner without salary. I repeat it without salary—cross the Atlantic and visit England. He being one so well qualified by powers of eloquence and strength of will, to wield the destinies of this Dominion, was the very person best fitted for so important a position, so that instead of assailing him in the manner in which it is being attempted, he should receive all the honours, eulogy and compliments that could possibly be extended and that by every person who is at all interested in the welfare of Canada irrespective of party feeling or party bias. More particularly when it is considered that by his having accepted said office of High Commissioner without salary, he was saving to Canada, in round numbers, $6,000 per annum. Despite the utterances of hon. members opposite, it is an undeniable fact that he is held in the highest esteem in the Province to which he belongs, and throughout this Dominion, and is looked upon as the war horse of this noble party—the party of purity, the Liberal Conservatives—he having successfully marshalled his way through every political fight, standing shoulder to shoulder with his friends, not driven out of his constituncey or forced to beat a retreat, as was the case with some hon. gentlemen opposite, and compelled to go seeking, but, on the contrary, through his geniality of manner, unswerving rectitude, and persistency of purpose, and indomitable courage to fight the battles of his country in advocacy of its rights, he has so endeared himself to the people of Canada, that he has represented the county of Cumberland uninterruptedly for twenty-nine years often returned by acclamation, and whenever his opponents have thought proper to array their forces against him they have taken ignominious defeat for their pains. The points at issue in this case have been so clearly and ably discussed that I am satisfied that all should feel that the hon. member for Cumberland has not violated the law, neither in the spirit nor yet in the letter. The question appears to be a very simple one, and may be embraced in a few words, namely, when the hon. member for Cumberland accepted the office of High Commissioner without salary, did he infringe the Independence of Parliament Act? Todd and other authorities on the British Constitution hold that when salary is not accepted the seat is not vacated, and when salary is renounced such renunciation removes the penalties. This appears most reasonable, and should be accepted by the sceptic and others willing to be advised on the question. Mr. Speaker, I believe there are very few members in this House who would desire to see the hon. member for Cumberland unseated, but I would say that if he this day were to retire from the arena of political warfare, his works as the result of his public life are his monument, and whilst the world lasts he will continue to speak in the pages of the *Hansard* and in the annals of history as one of Canada's greatest and noblest sons. In fact, his record of good works since his commencement of public life, twenty-nine years ago, down to the present, is dotted year by year on the pages of the *Hansard* like milestones by the wayside marking the traveller's progress, and so completely does it commend itself to the people of Canada that it will be a pleasurable subject of conversation for many a Canadian fireside, and his name a household word in many a family for many long years to come—and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if his strength will permit him to labour as zealously and as successfully in the future as he has done in the past for the advancement of his country, I believe many of his friends opposite will change their tactics, offer their commendations, or show a disposition to come over and join this happy family—(some possess it now, but lack the courage to desert their leader)—and testify in a more tangible manner than they have done recently, or are attempting to do now, to his greatness as a Canadian statesman, and one of her most honoured and respected sons.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mulock,
Auger,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Platt,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Blake,	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Catudal,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Charlton,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McCraney,	Wells,
Cook,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
Davies,	McIsaac,	Wilson.—58.
De St. Georges,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dickinson,	McCallum,
Amyot,	Dodd,	McCarthy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dugas,	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dundas,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Barnard,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Moffat,
Beaty,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Foster,	O'Brien,
Belleau,	Gault,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Riopel,
Bolduc,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bossé,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hay,	Scott,
Breckon,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Small,
Burns,	Homer,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Houde,	Sproule,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	Ives,	Tassé,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Taylor,

Caron,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Tilley,
Cimon,	Kinney,	Tyrwhitt,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Valin,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	Macdonald (Kings),	White (Hastings),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	McDonald (CapeBreton),	Wigle,
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Dawson,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desaulniers,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Woodworth,
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wright.—117.

Mr. FISHER. I beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions that they have power to amend it by striking out the first section thereof.

In explaining this motion, I will occupy the attention of the House but a very few minutes. This amendment is rendered necessary by the two chief parts into which this Bill is divided. In the first, there is a radical and important change in the law of the land; and in the second, the subject dealt with is entirely and wholly of a personal character, and, without wishing in anyway to belittle the importance of the hon. gentleman whose seat has been in question, I think this portion of the Bill is of far less importance than the first. In making such a change as this Bill contemplates, a change which may in the future materially affect the position of members of this House, the Government are taking upon themselves a very great responsibility; they are making a change in the law of the land which, I think, will have very dangerous consequences. There is no doubt that the discussions which have taken place on this Bill, the personal question has been brought prominently forward, and it is greatly to be regretted that hon. gentlemen, in discussing this question, should have allowed themselves to be actuated by personal or party feeling, thus losing sight of the far more important section, the first section of the Bill. It is to this section I wish to draw the attention of the House. There will be nothing in the law, should this Bill be passed, to prevent the most important positions in this country being held by members of this House; it is quite possible that Lieutenant-Governors of Provinces may sit here and vote and support the Government from which they received their appointments; it is quite possible that Judges of the land may sit here and vote and make the laws they themselves are afterwards to administer. In fact, the principle might be carried to such an extent that the number of members of this House holding positions from the Government might become so great that a Government could be kept in existence by the votes of their own creatures. In view of these possibilities, I deem it my duty to propose this amendment, so that the hon. gentleman who, in their votes already given on this Bill in its various stages, may have been largely influenced by personal fealty to the hon. Minister of Railways or by party considerations, may now record their votes free from any such considerations. The personal part of the Bill, the part which relates wholly to the seat of Cumberland which the hon. Minister of Railways and High Commissioner now occupies being eliminated from their consideration, hon. gentlemen must now vote upon the principle of the Bill as regards its general application. In doing this, I do not wish in any sense to belittle the importance of the personal consideration, or desire to be supposed to condone what I believe to be the great wrong which has been perpetrated by the Government in their course on this question; but still I consider the personal question very far inferior in its ultimate effects to the question of the Radical change in the law of the land. It is for this reason that I have moved this amendment.

Amendment negatived on the same division.

Main motion agreed to; and Bill read the third time, on the same division reversed, and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply read the second time.

On Resolution 196,

Intercolonial Railway (collection of revenues)....$2,500,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Railways was to have brought down certain statements as to the tariff on the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER I think the question asked was as to the lowest rates of freight on the Intercolonial Railway. The lowest rate on coal going to points west of the Intercolonial Railway was $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile. The lowest rate on experimental cargoes of grain carried from Chaudière Junction to Halifax for shipment has been about $\frac{2}{10}$ of a cent per ton per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not correspond with the Minister's statement that they had been paid at the rate of 6 cents per hundred pounds.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I took the statement of the hon. member for Halifax—I was not aware myself of the rate—as the amount he had been obliged to pay for cargoes he had carried over the line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the Minister sure that no cargoes have been carried at the rate given by the member for Halifax?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is furnished to me by the General Manager, Mr. Schreiber, as the lowest rate on experimental cargoes, so there has been no lower rate given than this, according to his statement. I may take this opportunity of mentioning that the hon. member for Queen's County, Prince Edward Island, was under the impression that a circular had been issued preventing employés from complaining of the rate of wages. I made enquiry, and I can confirm the statement I made to the Committee that no such circular has been issued either on the Prince Edward Island or on the Intercolonial Railway.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 70,

Canadian Pacific Railway—Station accommodation..$200,000 00

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister was kind enough to hand me a memorandum with respect to the station-house on the British Columbia section. There is a vote of $200,000 for station-houses. I see that one of the items of that vote is $90,000 for engine-houses. I wish to enquire of the Minister whether that is for the erection of a round-house for the engines at the terminus, capable of accommodating all the engines of the British Columbia Division? It appears to me an unduly large sum for the section from Port Moody to Kamloops.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume that is so.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is an item of $55,000 for section men's houses, which seems to me to be disproportionate to the amount of $20,000 for station houses.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are a large number of section-men on that division in comparison with the number of station houses.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways whether a decision has been come to by the arbitrators on section "B" of the Pacific Railway, and if so whether the figures of that decision will be laid before the House before we are asked to discuss any further items in reference to that railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An award has been made by two of the arbitrators, Mr. Brydges and Mr. Light, the arbitrator named by the contractors and the arbitrator named by Chief Justice Ritchie of the Supreme Court. It has not been signed by Judge Clark, the arbitrator named by the Government, and the award is, I believe, correctly stated as at $395,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, but I want to get the details of it before we discuss any item for the Pacific Railway in the Supplementary Estimates, and I may find it my duty to call the attention of the Committee to something in connection with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this moment, the award has been sent to me and has been referred by me to the Department of Justice for report. That is the present position of it. If it should become necessary to ask a vote of the House, as we have no funds at our disposal to meet that award, of course the papers will be laid upon the Table. In the meantime I will give the hon. gentleman any information in my power.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman give me the heads of the award? I saw them in a newspaper, but I do not know that they are correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is $120,000 awarded, but from what I learn in a communication from Judge Clark, who was the Government arbitrator, I do not think at this moment that the award itself contains the headings; I think it gives simply the bulk sum awarded. But as far as I remember at this moment, the $120,000 awarded, as signed by these two gentlemen is for the losses that were sustained by the rock work being exchanged for trestle work, the change made by substituting a different mode of crossing the waters from that contemplated in the first place; and the balance of the award—I am speaking from memory and in general terms—was for the damage sustained by reason of the noncompletion of section 15, known as the Whitehead contract, and the change made in the character of the work after the contract was made. I may say while on this point that I believe, notwithstanding the very large award which has been made, I am safe in saying, that assuming all that we are compelled to assume—and I offer no opinion upon that in advance of the report of the Department of Justice—assuming all that we are compelled to undertake by the contract, the expenditure is still something like $1,000,000 within the estimate of Mr. Sandford Fleming, who was Chief Engineer at the time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I only desire to say with regard to that, that the hon. gentleman himself estimated the graded portion, two years ago, at $600,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt that the change in the character of the work rendered it much less costly than it would have been if carried out on the original design.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways, in connection with the matter I referred to a moment ago, whether he considers it incumbent upon the Government to spend a sum sufficient for the round house accommodation of the entire British Columbia division of the Canadian Pacific Railway, while it is only ostensibly providing for 213 miles from Port Moody to Kamloops?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have limited the expenditure and provision for station buildings to the amount we felt we were compelled to expend under the contract with the company. Nothing has been done beyond what we considered we were legally bound by the contract to do.

Mr. CHARLTON. One round house would not be considered more than adequate for the 213 miles of road?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I should think not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should imagine it would be sufficient for the whole division.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Engine houses are very expensive.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 170,

Indians, Manitoba and the North-West..... $648,271 90

Mr. MILLS. This item was to stand over until certain information was given with reference to the expenditure in that country of something like $80,000 in keeping up Indian farms; and the hon. gentleman promised to bring down a statement showing the amount of expenditure on each of these farms, the party in charge, and the amount of the products of each farm. Some of these farms have been established several years and instead of being self-supporting they seem to have become a heavy burden on the public Treasury. I noticed the amount expended last year, according to the report on Indian Affairs, was upwards of $80,000 for supplying these farms with various appliances, and furnishing provisions to the occupants. I understand these farms were established for the purpose of teaching the Indians how to farm and for the purpose, in part, of supplementing the supplies that the Indians were to raise for themselves. Now that they have had a full and fair trial I think the hon. gentleman should be in a position to state how it is that some thirty farms have been established, and so far from supplying anything for the Indians to enable them to be self supporting they have from year to year entailed a very considerable charge on the public Treasury. Those parties who have gone into the North-West as ordinary settlers have been obliged to provide for themselves. I have not gone back over the report during the whole five years they have been established to see what amount has been appropriated on their behalf, but certainly it has been a very large sum, and after five years' trial we find that they are still a charge upon the Treasury to the extent of $80,000. That does seem to me to indicate a very extraordinary condition of things, and the hon. gentleman promised to bring down a statement before concurrence which would inform us of the amount expended in each case, the party who is in charge of the farm, and the amount produced upon each farm.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Bothwell mentioned last night that he desired this information, and I sent a memorandum to the Interior Department to have it prepared. The Indian farms were an experiment; and I do not think that, on the whole, they have been successful—some have turned out well, others the reverse. Some of the most promising are kept up. The original idea was that the farm instructors should not be on the reserves, but on farms contiguous thereto; but that has not proved successful, and the arrangement has been altered. The farms are being sold.

Mr. MILLS. When the discussion was in progress on the Estimates I requested the information in question.

Resolution allowed to stand.

On Resolution 164,

Geological Survey..... $60,000 00

Mr. CHARLTON. When the Estimates were being discussed last Session some reference was made to the subject of explorations on the eastern side of Hudson Bay and Labrador, and the First Minister informed the Committee that steps were being taken by the Dominion Government, in connection with the Quebec Government, to secure an exploration of that part of the country with a view to ascertain its timber, mineral, and other resources. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is able to furnish some information to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand a report of the Special Committee on the Geological Survey will be laid before the House, if it has not already been submitted. I am told it is a very full report on the state and prospects of the Geological Survey. A great deal of evidence has been taken—some of it of a personal nature, but the chief portion will be of great interest to the country, the House and the Government, and this evidence will be laid before the House. I do not know that I have anything to add to what has been already said on this subject. Dr. Selwyn has already indicated in the report attached to the report of the Minister of the Interior what he proposes to do during the coming season.

Mr. MACKENZIE. From a perusal of the newspaper reports of the Committee's proceedings, it appears that the examination was of a very peculiar character. Dr. Selwyn's subordinates were allowed to give evidence that he was unfit for the position. I question whether that was in good taste. He may not be just the man for the position, but those who are endeavouring to obtain his position are scarcely the persons who should sit in judgment upon him. Dr. Selwyn was understood to be an efficient officer, and he should have the moral support of the Government. If he is not a suitable officer for the position, and if we were misled in making the appointment, then the matter should be seriously reconsidered. But every man is entitled to fair play; and it appears to me that some of the remarks made by one gentleman who is an applicant for the office, and another who thinks he is hardly used in being second to Dr. Selwyn, were of a character more personal than they should have been for the benefit of the service. I am not personally in a position to give an opinion on the subject, though in my intercourse with Dr. Selwyn during my political life, he has always seemed to me to be very zealous and attentive to the duties he had to discharge. I may be wrong in all this; but it is evident the present state of things cannot continue. There is something very like insubordination in the ranks of the staff, and it will, of course, be very difficult for the director to carry on the business unless he has the formal support of the Government behind him. I think some expression of opinion by the First Minister is under these circumstances absolutely indispensable.

Mr. HALL. It is hardly fair to the Committee that their actions should be judged by the newspaper reports on the evidence taken. The whole evidence will be submitted to the House some time this week. As it was not intended to ask the adoption of the report, consequently it was thought there was no great haste in presenting it. However, as the matter has been alluded to, it is only just to the Committee to say that the personal references made were drawn out, not at the request of members of the Committee, or by any question submitted on their part, but in consequence of statements made by Dr. Selwyn in regard to members of his staff. He was asked as to the efficiency of the survey, and in answer to that question he made some comments on the members of the staff, who, when afterwards called as witnesses, felt they had a right to answer those statements, and the Committee felt they had no right to shut their mouths in that respect; that, in fact, as those charges had been made against them, they certainly had the right to make their answer to them. We felt we had no right to stop the statements of witnesses who were regularly before the Committee; but we have not treated the personal matter as a matter of any consequence, considering that it is a matter relating to the internal arrangement and administration, and is one to be treated only by the superior officer of the Department.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), that if a superior officer were on trial it would hardly be reasonable to have the matter tried on the evidence of subordinates, some of whom might be desirous of securing his place. But that was not the case in connection with the enquiry which took place before the Geological Committee, of which I had the honour to be a member. I may say that whilst the evidence of various members of the staff was taken, it will be found, I think, when the conclusions arrived at by the Committee are examined, that the Committee have not felt themselves bound by the evidence of any of those persons. Out of deference to all of them they took their evidence, but I do not think it can fairly be said that the enquiry took the direction of a mere attack of any individual connected with the survey.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have heard, generally, of the enquiry of the Committee, and the general course of the examination of the witnesses, and I believe, as has been stated, it was for the purpose of carrying out the legitimate objects and purposes expressed in the resolution establishing the Committee, and that this personal matter arose in the way the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has described. However, as those personal matters are generally the more piquant portion of any examination, the press took hold of them, and it was generally published that there was a war between the director and some of his subordinates, and their language was quoted as against Dr. Selwyn, and perhaps undue prominence given to it. But I have no doubt that the report of the Committee will settle all that, and show that so far as they were concerned the Committee carried out their whole proceedings properly, and did not allow it to degenerate into a personal quarrel, though the evidence given by these gentlemen may have pointed to a personal feeling against Dr. Selwyn. I agree with the hon. gentleman, that so long as Dr. Selwyn is there, he should have the moral support of the Government. He has got that moral support hitherto, and I feel in no way disposed to withdraw that support from him, until it is shown that it ought to be withdrawn. I took occasion, in alluding to the matter before, to state that I would be slow to believe that there was either ignorance or want of zeal on the part of Dr. Selwyn in the conduct of his Department. I took occasion to say that he was specially selected by Sir William Logan, when that distinguished gentleman found that the time had come for his retirement—by Sir William Logan, whose heart and soul was in the survey and in the science of geology as applied to this country. When he retired he asked that no pains should be spared in getting a suitable successor. He was specially sent home to make that selection, and he put himself in communication with Sir Roderick Murchison, the great authority, official as well as personal, and well known in connection with geological science, and Sir Roderick Murchison strongly recommended Dr. Selwyn, who had just arrived from New South Wales, where he had distinguished himself, and from the Government of which he had brought very high testimonials of their satisfaction with him as director of their Geological Survey. I should be slow to believe that he has changed in any way, or in any degree. Of course as the hon. gentleman says, this kind of thing cannot go on. Insubordination is a great vice in any Department, and especially in one of that kind, where science and the zealous application of the science or knowledge of the individual, is absolutely required to make the work of the Department of any service. If there is quarrelling amongst each other, a disparaging of each other or each other's work, it destroys the confidence of the country in the service. And I must say that I think it would have been well, if these gentlemen had at any time thought conscientiously that the public money was being wasted, that there had been a scandalous neglect of duty by the director, they ought to have brought it before the Government, and not have treasured it in their hearts until they took this opportunity of having a fling at Dr. Selwyn. On

the other hand, however, it must be observed from the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, that the director when asked as to the reliability of the surveying staff spoke with reference to the reports of some of them, and their conduct and their efficiency, and that perhaps might have brought out this personal attack on Dr. Selwyn. However, it is an exceedingly unfortunate state of things, and cannot be allowed to continue longer. The Government will wait until they get the report of the Committee, specially appointed by the House to look into the matter, and they will do what is necessary in order to restore the efficiency of the Department if that has been in any way impaired by these quarrels, these differences of opinion, these dissensions, and they will act vigorously in the matter, and see that this kind of thing does not occur again

Mr. MACKENZIE. I should be sorry if my hon friend on the Committee imagined that I meant to pass any reflection on them. I was not present when the Committee was appointed, and I had intended to take some part in the discussion, as to the mode of conducting the surveys, because that is not a scientific matter, but rather one of common sense and expediency. I understand that there was considerable difference of opinion as to the mode of conducting the surveys, the place where the surveys were being carried on, and that the operations of the Committee would be directed to a great extent to the point. With regard to the personal matter, I am satisfied with what the hon. gentleman has said. I have no feeling either for or against Dr. Selwyn, or any of the staff, with reference to the survey. I only made my remarks on the general ground, because I felt convinced that something should be done to put a stop to the present condition of disorganization.

Mr. DAWSON. I rise for the purpose of correcting an impression which may have been created in the minds of some hon. gentlemen. Not only were the directors and the subordinates examined, but every person whom Dr. Selwyn suggested was called before the Committee to be examined, and among the number were two very eminent men, Dr. Hunt, who was formerly attached to the survey, and whose reputation as a scientist is known throughout the civilized world, and Prof. Chapman of Toronto, who also holds a very high position. So it will be seen that the examination was not confined to the subordinates alone. I think when the report of the Committee comes down it will be found that it was an exceedingly mild report, and that it deals very fairly and forbearingly with the matters in dispute, and the different persons connected with the survey. When that report is before the House I have no doubt members will be in a position to judge how the matter stands.

Mr. MILLS. I do not anticipate the contents of the report, but I would say that it is possible that the Geological Department has been left too much to the officers of the Department themselves, and not sufficiently supervised by the political Head of the Department. There is no doubt whatever that in a scientific branch like the Department of Geology, the head of the Department must, in a great measure, be guided by the director, but in working out the general policy and the publications, I think perhaps the political head may be best qualified to decide what is best to be done. Now, a good deal of the difficulty would be avoided, I think, if every man's field work was published. As a matter of course, it is perfectly obvious that when an officer is sent into the field for the purpose of making explorations and ascertaining the geological character of a particular district, a report of what he has done ought to be given to the public. It has been made a ground of attack on Dr. Selwyn, it seems to me unfairly, that he has made a change in the geological nomenclature of the valley of the St. Lawrence, and of this particular district. I believe Dr. Selwyn has simply made changes that were rendered necessary by the progress of geological knowledge relating to this section of country. In fact, I remember having a conversation with him on this subject at the time I was at the head of the Department, and he pointed out that the changes he had made were necessary in order to bring the geology of Canada, especially of the Province of Quebec, into harmony with the views of geologists in the adjoining Republic. The progress of geological knowledge, the discoveries from more minute investigations, have rendered it necessary that the opinions formed with regard to the geology of this section of country in the time of Sir William Logan should be modified. Corresponding changes have taken place in the opinions of scientists in the eastern States during the same period, and what Dr. Selwyn has done is to keep the theoretical geology of this particular district up to the knowledge of the times. I think there has been a good deal of misapprehension on this subject; some newspapers have criticised Dr. Selwyn, as if he were condemning the work done by Sir William Logan. That is not the case. He has been simply adding to the knowledge possessed in the time of Sir William Logan; what he has done has been done by geologists all around him; and it would be absurd to suppose that he should not modify or change the geological nomenclature to make it correspond with the progress of geological knowledge.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). As a member of that Committee, I wish to say that I consider it premature, if not altogether superfluous, to discuss this matter now. I believe the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), the very able Chairman of that Committee, who has spent a great deal of time and taken much pains in drawing up a report, has stated that that report will be placed on the Table this week—I think it will be placed on the Table to-morrow; therefore I think the discussion ought to be deferred until that time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It can be printed before the House rises.

Mr. BAKER. The report will be printed on the typewriter, so that every member of this House will be able to decipher it, and I think there will be an opportunity for every member to see it. I think it would be better that this discussion should cease until the report is laid on the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. We cannot discuss what the Committee have done because we do not know it; but we can discuss this vote, and that is what we are discussing.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. leader of the Government told the House last Session that steps would be taken to proceed with the exploration of the country around St. James' Bay in connection with the Government of Quebec. I would like to ask if he can give us any information on that subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there has been a report made; I am not sure; I will ascertain that.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 125,

Mail Subsidies—Steam communication on Lakes Huron and Superior $12,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any change in the destination of this vote? Does it go to the same companies.

Mr. CARLING. Yes; the same companies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does not go to the vessels about to be put on by the Canadian Pacific Railway, then?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I thought some was for the Owen Sound Company.

Mr. CARLING. It is the same grant as was made last year. No arrangements have yet been made with any of the companies for this year.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 130,

To provide for one year's subsidy, to be granted at the rate of $50,000 per annum, to line of steamers to trade between Canada and the West Indies and Brazil, provided a like amount be paid by the Brazilian Government $50,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any expectation of this being carried out?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a party negotiating; a communication is now on the way. They cabled us that a proposition was coming—that is all.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any intimation of action on the part of the Brazilian Government?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This vote has been continued for five years, and still remains, so far as the Brazilian Government are concerned.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 129,

Steam communication between Halifax and St. John *viâ* Yarmouth..... $10,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman promised to give us some information as to whether the Department would ask for tenders for the service between Halifax and St. John *viâ* Yarmouth.

Mr. CARLING. I believe the work has been satisfactorily done, and it is intended to give it to the same man again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was a complaint from the hon. member for Shelburne that the work had not been very well done and the Minister promised to make enquiries.

Resolution concurred in.

After Recess.

On Resolution 178,

To meet expenditure to be required to put into force the Act respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, $5,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. I observe in the Public Accounts that there is one charge of $128, I think it is, for advertising in the New Brunswick *Gazette*, and another sum for some advertising in New Brunswick. I do not think the Government are called upon to pay for advertising in the local *Gazettes*, and it is only the case in these two instances.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Last year, I think, there was only about $330 expended altogether.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; and that is almost all for advertising in the two local *Gazettes*.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 179,

To meet expenses connected with the consolidation of the Dominion Statutes $20,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. I should like some information as to the salaries and arrangements with reference to the consolidation of the Statutes, and as to the time when the work is expected to be completed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will bring the information down.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 184,

To provide for the payment of Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies of his office..... $2,500 00

Resolution concurred in on a division.

On Resolution 188,

To make good to those merchants of Prince Edward Island who were British subjects the amount of duties paid by them to the United States Customs on fish and fish oil in the year 1871..... $30,086.10

Mr. McINTYRE. Before this item passes Concurrence, I wish to say a few words on it. As was stated by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when this item was discussed the other night, this is an amount which in justice and honour should have been paid by the United States Government, as they were the parties who profited by the duty paid by the shippers in Prince Edward Island in 1871. I have no doubt some of the shippers in Prince Edward Island are entitled to a certain portion, but I deny that they are entitled to the whole amount. I believe that the fishermen are entitled to a certain portion of the refund. There is no doubt that the shippers and merchants of Prince Edward Island, who kept large fishing establishments, vessels and boats, are entitled to and do usually receive, in consideration of furnishing all the gear, &c., used in fishing, half the fish caught by the fishermen, and I say these merchants are entitled to a refund of duty on the amount of fish which was taken on the half line, but I deny that they are entitled to a refund of duty on that portion of the fish which was bought from the fishermen, because at that time they bought the fish at the market value in Prince Edward Island, less the duty; in other words, they bought the mackerel and kept the duty out of the fishermen, and thus the fishermen are entitled to the refund on this amount of fish. To show that I am correct, I will quote from a letter I received the other day from a gentleman who dealt largely in fish in 1871. He speaks thus of this refund:

"I bought some mackerel in 1871 and, like the rest of the dealers, I deducted the $2 duty off at the time I bought the fish, and I can get, I think, hundreds of fishermen to come forward and swear to the same."

Another letter to which I may refer, received from Prince Edward Island, in regard to the same refund, is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—I see the refund of duty on mackerel in 1871 is to come before the House this Session again. I happened to be one of the unfortunates who was catching mackerel that year in one of Mr. I. C. Hall's vessels. Prices being very low, we naturally complained of the price Mr. Hall offered us. Mr. Hall told us that he would ship our mackerel and we could have whatever they realized, which he did honestly, and at the end of the fishing season, when settling with us, he gave each and every one of us a due bill for the refund of duty which was promised that year. Now, I cannot understand how they exclude Mr. Hall's name on account of his being a United States subject, as he was honest enough to give his fishermen a guarantee for the refund of duty, should he get it, all his fishermen being British subjects. I doubt if any of those parties who are so eager to get the refund of duty acted so square with their fishermen as Mr. Hall did. The due bill reads thus:

"'Due Patrick Macdonald the sum of $18, as a refund of duty paid on mackerel in 1871 when refunded to undersigned,

"'I. C. HALL,
"'Per P. S. MACGOWAN.'"

Another letter to the same effect, from a gentleman named Thomas Walsh, gives an account of a bill of sale that year of mackerel, which was shipped to Boston through Mr. Hall. This is a copy of the bill of sale:

"Sales mackerel received from Charlottetown, per *Alhambra*, August 24th, 1871, and sold on account Thomas Walsh:

"7 barrels	No. 2 mackerel,	$7 25....	$ 50 75
"63 "	" 3 "	6 25.....	393 75
			"$444 50"

Then he gives the charges, and the first of those charges is the duty amounting to $157.50. I need not go on to enumerate the other charges, such as freight, wharfage, &c., but it shows what I want to make out, that these men were charged the duty, and on the list given to us the other night by the hon. the Finance Minister I do not find the names of any of these gentlemen whose letters I have read, and who are equally entitled to the refund with any of those whose names appear on the list. I am aware that this list does not cover a third or a fourth the number of actual claims against this refund. I am aware of one man living in my own town, who has a claim of $2,000 against this refund. He died last winter, but his estate holds it good. If these gentlemen choose to put in claims next year, I do not see, under the circumstances, by giving the gentlemen who are named on the list read by the Finance Minister the other night, the refund, how they are going to refuse those who may hereafter present claims. I do not think it is right that the whole of this money should be placed in the hands of these merchants. Some of them may be honest enough to refund to the fishermen a share of what is due to them, but there is no legal obligation whatever. Now, what I desire the Government to do is to hold this money until they receive the claims properly attested of those fishermen who are really entitled to a share of this refund. It will not do to place the money in the hands of the merchants, otherwise the fisherman's share will be very small indeed - if any at all.

Mr. YEO. I would like to ascertain by what mode the Government intend to distribute this money. It is well known in Prince Edward Island that the fishermen as a rule, and not the merchants, are entitled to the refund of duty which this vote is intended to provide. At the time the merchants bought the fish from the fishermen, they bought it at the current prices less the duty, with the distinct understanding that whenever the merchants would get the duty refunded they would return his share to every fisherman entitled to it. I had a letter lately from one of my constituents, a fisherman, whose name is Joseph Pineau, who writes as follows:—

"As fishermen are getting back the duty paid by them in mackerel shipped to the United States in 1871-72, and as I then sold two hundred and fifty barrels to Hon. George W. Howlan, for which he paid me, saying that he would give me two dollars more a barrel were it not for the duty on them. Therefore, I consider I have a right to the amount of duty deducted from the price, as the parties who bought and shipped fish on such terms did not lose anything by the payment of duty, as they gave so much less for the fish. I hope when the matter comes before the House you will protect our rights."

I also had letters from Meddie Gallant and other fishermen, to the same effect. I hope the Government will give due consideration to the claims of the poor fishermen. Merchants, as a rule, are able to take care of themselves, and on account of their more independent position are not likely to have their rights overlooked by any Government. There is no class of our population that toil amidst so many hardships and dangers as our fishermen, and I may add very often with so little result. $2 a barrel is a big consideration to a man who, perhaps, sometimes labours hard, days and nights, without having a dollar for his trouble. It is only persons brought up with or near these hardy and industrious fishermen who can understand their difficulties, and how cruel it would be to deny them their right. I hope the Government will not ignore these rights; I do not wish the merchants' rights to be ignored either, but I earnestly ask the Government not to allow themselves to pay to merchants or to any persons moneys that properly belong to our fishermen. I wish to be distinctly understood as not opposing what Senator Howlan has a right to. What fish he caught with his own boats and men was his, and he is entitled to the duty he paid on that, just as an ordinary fisherman is entitled to the amount kept out of the price of his fish by Senator Howlan or any other purchaser. What I say of Senator Howlan's claim I can say of Mr. Myrick's. The latter has carried on an extensive fishing business for many years. Through his enterprise many fishermen have a right to a share of the money we are now voting. He has given employment, and I may say a livelihood, to many people, and I trust that his own claims and the claims of those who sold fish to him in the year in question will be recognized and paid by the Government. In conclusion, I would urge the appointment of a reliable person to take the evidence offered by the different applicants for this money. Such is most important. Fishermen are often easily deceived and imposed upon; it is therefore absolutely necessary that an honest, intelligent person should be selected to decide their claims.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may state to the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken, that no portion of this money will be paid by the Government until the most careful investigation has been had, to see that when it is paid it goes into the hands of those who are entitled to it in the spirit and letter of this Resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, but that statement is not satisfactory at all. The letter of the Resolution is to make good to those merchants of Prince Edward Island the amount of duties paid by them to the United States. Now, the point of the case is this: I was told last Session—and I am not sure but that it was stated across the House, though not in detail—that these merchants of Prince Edward Island purchased from the fishermen who caught the fish large quantities of fish and told them that in the state of the question they were obliged to regulate the price they paid with reference to that question, but if the duties were allowed the money would be refunded and considered in other accounts. Well, the duties were allowed, but it was not refunded and considered in other accounts. But it is the merchants that the Resolution alone touches who paid the duties, and therefore, unless this Resolution is modified in some way, it will be utterly impossible to do that which is obviously justice. The merchant is the only person the hon. gentleman deals with, and the merchant is the only one who paid the duties, but it was at the fishermen's expense who caught the fish that the duties were paid, because the amount was deducted from the price given to the fishermen, and it was really out of the price of their fish that these duties were paid. But they were paid by the merchant; therefore, under the letter of the hon. gentleman's Resolution, the merchant will get the money and the fishermen would lose it. It does seem to me that this Resolution must be modified in some sense, so as to secure that the money shall not go to the wrong party. If we are acting in a generous spirit, we must see that those who have really been wronged should obtain the fruits of our generosity, and of our gift; but in many cases, according to the statement of my hon. friends from the Island, it is not the merchants who paid the duties, but the fishermen, out of the price of whose fish the duties were paid, and to whom the money ought to go. I will mention another matter which has come to my knowledge, and that is, that in the case of some two or three, I believe, of the persons who are making this claim, in the intervening period since these duties were paid, and the present time, have become insolvent, and been discharged of their debts without this claim being mentioned at all. Amongst their assets, of course, this claim could not be mentioned; their assets were diminished by the circumstance that this refund did not take place, but their creditors have lost, and it seems to me that in those cases in which there have been bankruptcies and a

discharge without payment of debt, it is to the creditors, to the assignee of the bankrupt, and for the benefit of the creditors, that the money ought to go, and not to the individuals who have become bankrupt.

Mr. DAVIES. I think, in view of the letters which have been read by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McIntyre), and Prince (Mr. Yeo), some alterations should be made in the language of this vote, with a view of securing to these fishermen, from whom the duties were deducted, that when the money is repaid it shall pass into their hands. Last year when the vote was proposed the junior member for King's county, who has interested himself in the question and whose name is in the schedule, stated that this money was in many instances to go to the fishermen, because it had not been paid by the merchants, but the merchants had agreed to refund it to them if they could get it back. We had that statement made by the hon. gentleman in his place last Session and that statement being corroborated by the numerous letters which the hon. member for Prince county and the senior member for King's have read, shows that it is a matter of common justice that the phraseology should be altered, so as to secure payment of the money to the fishermen. I move that the following words be added to the Resolution:—

"Due enquiry being first made with a view to securing that the money shall not be paid except to those parties or fishermen who really lost by the refusal of the United States Government to refund those duties."

Mr. BLAKE. We cannot alter the destination of the money, but we can take care that it is properly applied.

Mr. DAVIES. I will read the remarks which the hon. member for King's made during the debate last year, which placed the matter beyond a doubt. He said:

"In regard to these claims, I may say that, while there are only perhaps a dozen gentlemen in whose names they stand, these gentlemen represent a number of the fishermen of the Island. That season the fish was bought from the fishermen on the understanding that when the duty was returned the fishermen would receive that refund, and the shippers of the Province are still held accountable by the fishermen for every dollar, should the amount be returned."

So, the First Minister will see that it is a matter of common honesty and necessity that we should take precautions to secure that those people whom the hon. member for King's says really have a right to the money should have it repaid them, and it should not go to parties who have no right to receive it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we can strike out the words "merchants" and insert "persons," and add, for the purpose of explaining what the words mean, "it being understood that deductions on any sales of fish to the amount of the duty shall be held to be a payment for the same."

Mr. BLAKE. It may be that that alteration will accomplish the object; but it will involve an enquiry. I should prefer that some arrangements were made by which there would be an enquiry provided for.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Finance says there will be an enquiry. It will never do that in every sale of fish the parties should now say: I sold my fish at a lower price, because I had the duty to pay. The arrangement was this: Until that question is settled, they said, we will only pay you a reduced price, and if the duty is returned by the United States, we will refund it to you.

Mr. DAVIES. Surely some evidence must be taken in regard to this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Some collector or officer of the Government will be appointed to make the enquiry. We will take care that the money gets into the right hands.

Mr. DAVIES. I am very much afraid, if the question is left to local collectors, the hon. gentleman's object will not be obtained. I have no person in my eye, and I have no idea as to the persons whom the hon. gentleman thinks of appointing. The matter should be referred to some person who is capable of dissecting evidence and placing legal construction on evidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government will choose a proper person.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There were two other points to which attention should be directed. One was a suggestion made by the hon. member that if this sum was paid there were a great many other claims of a similar nature involving a larger amount, which claims the Government might consider. And there is another point: what is to be done in the case of those particular gentlemen who have become bankrupt in the interval between 1871 and 1881, and have obtained a discharge. The money really ought to have come to their creditors and not to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think we can go into that. That was not an asset, because there was not a debt. Some of these gentlemen have compounded I suppose, and some have had the property divided by the sheriff, but I do not think we can enter into that question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think we are called upon in that case to give a present to two or three bankrupt gentlemen of several thousand dollars.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the statement of the hon. gentleman meets that portion of the case. Of course if these gentlemen have gone into bankruptcy and the estates have been paying a composition, it is clear that the deficiency in their estates, which might have paid less than twenty shillings in the pound, was in part occasioned by their not getting these refunds. These assets were so much the worse and they paid less to their creditors. Now if the estate is closed and the creditors receive 23 or 50 cents in the dollar, it is proposed that we shall hand over this money to them. It seems to me that there should be further enquiry, and in cases in which the applicants were persons who had been prevented from paying 20 shillings in the pound, by these losses occasioned by the refusal to make good this demand for a refund, that money should go to the persons who have lost by it. They have not lost by it; they failed and their creditors have lost, not they. They are clear, and now they are making a fortune out of it. That is the practical result.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole amount is only $ 0,000.

Mr. BLAKE. But there are claims of $9,000 or $10,000 for one person, I think.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a claim. If the merchants are under engagements to repay the fishermen, the merchants will not get it, but the fishermen.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the merchants would have been so zealous in pressing the matter, if they were not prepared to dispute the claim or expected to have it divided with them if they get it.

Mr. DAVIES. In many cases the claims are not strictly legal claims that could be enforced by law, but they are moral claims, which we should recognize and take pains to secure to them. We should not be too particular to cut out the fishermen, and where a clear understanding has been come to I think the men should get the money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a matter of the grace of Parliament and not of debt. The Government will feel at liberty to consider each case, and if it is evident that it belongs to the fishermen as against the merchant, the fisherman will get it.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a satisfactory result, if we arrive at a clear conclusion in every case, where it was clear between the two parties that it was the fisherman and not the merchant who lost. Of course, if the merchant had supposed, in getting the refund, that he would make that gain, he would have bought the fish in what would have been the open market, and he would have put the difference in his pocket. Now, it should not go further than this: wherever the price is less than it would have been if the duty had not existed, then the fisherman was the loser, and he should get the money. Again, I do not think, under the circumstances, with these persons high in the Island on one side and a lot of poor fishermen on the other, that collectors or others holding small offices at the pleasure of the Government are the proper persons to adjust these matters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with the hon. gentleman as to that, and we shall see that it is put in the hands of persons who are beyond dispute.

Mr. DAVIES. I must ask the hon. gentleman to strike out the last words in the Resolution, as originally brought down, because I think it is calculated to do a great deal of harm on the other side of the border. I beg to assure him of my own knowledge, as one of the counsel before the Commission, and having given the matter a great deal of study, that the language expresses an incorrect state of facts. The words I refer to are, "it not having been deemed advisable in the general interests of the British case, to put forward and press the claim of these merchants before the Halifax Commission." Now, that is not so. It was not possible to consider them legally; we could not ask it; no counsel could stand up before the Commission and ask it. It was not within the purview of the arbitration, and if we had considered it, it would have rendered the award illegal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is proving that the whole item should be struck out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The whole matter is based on that.

Mr. DAVIES. The right hon. gentleman has already said that we are giving this as a matter of grace and favour. How can we, as a Parliament, say that it was not considered advisable to submit the claims in the interests of the British case, when the British case could not cover it, and never did cover it. It has reference to a matter which took place two years before. I remember that a claim was brought forward because bait was bought within the three-miles limit. A motion was made by the American counsel in the Board that no claim involving any commercial advantage whatever should be considered by the Commission; and a ruling was given by the three Commissioners unanimously that commercial advantages did not come within the purview of the Commission, and all claims in that regard were struck out; and we ought not to put in an Act of Parliament a statement that is not in accordance with the facts, as if we were trying to smuggle into the arbitration a claim that had no place in the Commission. I say it reflects very seriously on the conduct of the case. At any rate, I enter my protest here against these words, and if the hon. gentleman will not strike them out, I can do no more.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will these words be struck out?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like, in addition to the letters read by the hon. member for King's (Mr. McIntyre), to submit to the hon. Minister's consideration certain other letters that I have received. It appears that a large number of fishermen who are British subjects worked for Messrs. Hall and Myrick, and they do not come within the purview of this Resolution. For instance, I have here a letter which was written to myself, which says:

"My brother, W. W. McLeod, and I, owned two schooners in 1871—one called *The Olessa* and the other *The Dominion*. We were fishing in joint account with J. C. Hall, and half of the duties belong to us. Would you kindly let me know if our claim is to be considered by Parliament."

As I stated before, Messrs. Hall and Myrick, although technically Americans, did the largest part of the fishing on Prince Edward Island, and the men who will lose by this arrangement are the British subjects who were fishing for these men. The British subjects who fish for Mr. Howlan will get their money, while the British subjects who fish for Mr. Myrick will not. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can make a distinction between Mr. Howlan and Mr. Myrick in this matter. They are both in the same boat.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, as we have altered the Resolution, a British fisherman fishing for Mr. Myrick would obtain compensation just as well as one fishing for Mr. Howlan; because it is to be paid to those British subjects who have paid duty, and the fishermen are treated as having paid the duty.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman's argument is correct enough, but the vote is not sufficiently large to cover the claims of these men. It is only large enough to cover the claims of the British merchants, and not those of the British subjects who fish for Hall & Myrick. The vote ought to be increased at any rate sufficiently to cover the claims of those British subjects who fish for Mr. Myrick, if not to cover his claims.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot alter it now.

Mr. BLAKE. There is an opportunity of increasing the vote, as the Minister of Finance has give us the pleasing intelligence that we are to have additional Supplementary Estimates. Unless the hon. gentleman does increase the vote, he will have to go into insolvency, and pay 60 cents in the dollar, because the acknowledged claims are much greater than the vote. So he had better, for the sake of his credit, invite the Minister of Finance to put in a little more.

Resolution, as amended, concurred in.

On Resolution 189,

Collection of Revenues—Customs..... $793,815 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister charged with this subject promised to give information on two points—first, as to the reason of the increase of $4,000 or $5,000 at Toronto.

Mr. McLELAN. It is owing to the transfer of a number of employés to the permanent staff, and the appointment of additional officers to attend to the delivery of bonded goods.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not account for the increase. It is really a change from one mode of payment to another.

Mr. McLELAN. That is the explanation given by the Department. There has been an increase of landing waiters, owing to complaints having been made that there was great detention of goods coming in in bond.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the hon. gentleman told us that he would inform us what was to be done with reference to a certain complaint presented by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Irvine), respecting the employment of a merchant as a preventive officer.

Mr. McLELAN. The Department has not yet sent me the information with respect to that. I will get it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will remember that he was distinctly begged to get this information, and was

referred to a person not very remote from him, who would supply him with the full information—the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman gave me the name, and I sent it to the Department. It has not reached me, and I will have to call upon the Department for information.

Mr. BLAKE. If there should be any difficulty in getting it from the Department, and there may be, because my hon. friend from Carleton commenced this enquiry more than a year ago, in my hearing in the House, and has been prosecuting it ever since without result, I would once again beg my hon. friend, if he is on speaking terms with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, that he should ask him, though, of course, I would not like to produce any disagreeable intercourse or familiarity between the hon. gentleman and his colleague.

Mr. McLELAN. It would be better to have the information officially.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As to what the hon. member for Carleton has said, I know this gentleman by name very well, and I believe he is a merchant, though I have no personal knowledge of it. I may mention that it has been generally understood that persons appointed in the outside service of the Customs Department have never been prevented from engaging in other business unless they drew salaries exceeding $400.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When they receive less than a certain salary, they may earn money in some other way, but not by selling goods which are dutiable articles. That was never allowed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When I was Minister of Customs, we had, in different parts of the Dominion, persons receiving from $80 to $100 a year, especially in the Lower Provinces, engaged in business in that way. A deputy collector in receipt of $300 a year was engaged in business, and after the conversation here I addressed a note on the subject to the Minister of Customs, and he replied that the Audit Act prevented any Civil Servant from engaging in any other employment when his salary was $100 per annum or upwards.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That has no connection with the case.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With reference to this case, the party receives $100 or $200 and is engaged, I believe, in business. But there is a good deal to be said, though not as a general rule, why a person engaged in business in a locality in the country not far from the boundary line where the smuggling is very general on the part of the residents, would make the best revenue officer, because his business is affected materially by such smuggling. There is nothing in the law against this. When I was Minister of Customs, we had a gentleman in the county of Westmoreland, Mr. Scholer, who received $300 a year in that capacity; that was the maximum, I understood. There is no law in the matter; it is a question of policy and propriety.

Mr. IRVINE. Notwithstanding all I have said, the hon. Minister seems to misapprehend my remarks or he does not quite understand the situation. The hon. Finance Minister would leave the impression that there is a real necessity for an officer there, but until 1874 there was no officer at all there. The Mackenzie Government appointed a preventive officer four miles from the American boundary, Mr. Scholer, at $300 a year, and every one knows that this officer was quite sufficient to do the work. But four miles from Centerville where Mr. Scholer resides, the Government appointed Mr. Kearney, a few days before the last elections. Instead of this office being necessary there for the protection of the merchants, it has given bitter dissatisfaction to the trading community in that neighbourhood. I say further, Mr. Kearney is not an ordinary merchant, but does the most business of any man in that neighbourhood; he does a very large country business. I might give some reason here why he was appointed, but I will not do that. I bring no charge personally against him, but I only say what I said before, that he being a trader and merchant doing the largest business there, his appointment gives general offence, the people thinking he has privileges he should not have over the other merchants.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not at all understand it to be said there is a law of which this is a violation. I understood the hon. member for Carleton, when he brought this question up last year, to say the preventive officer was also the largest trader in the vicinity, and he complained of the incompatibility of the positions. I understood the hon. Minister of Customs who, unfortunately, is not in his seat, to say he did not know this officer was a trader, and the point at issue was whether he was a trader or not. The Minister of Customs did not affirm that it was proper, under the circumstances, that a preventive officer should be a trader, but said he would ascertain whether he was or not. The question has gone on for a year until now, and we have got pretty well down to the view that he is a trader; because, although the acting Minister has not been able to find out from the hon. Minister of the Department whether he is or not, the Minister of Inland Revenue has come forward under a subpœna and declared he has no doubt he is a trader, and the Minister of Finance has gone into the question whether, being a trader, it is fit he should be a preventive officer—from all which it is pretty conclusive he is a trader. The hon. Minister of Customs, last year, did not say it was proper he should be a preventive officer, but said he was going to enquire whether any incompatibility existed; and it seems to me there are very obvious reasons, although no law, against the same man filling the position of importer of dutiable goods and being besides a preventive officer.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 191,

Collection of Revenues—Culling timber: salaries, culler's fees and contingent expenses $71,800 00

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Before this vote is passed, I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue to the question of the salary of the supervisor of cullers at Quebec. I observe the amount in the Estimates is $2,000, which is the same salary that was paid for the same service thirty years ago, though it must be manifest that the cost of living has very materially increased in that time. I can testify to the efficiency of the supervisor of cullers at Quebec, and I might point out to the Minister of Inland Revenue that the position of deputy supervisor, which has not been filled since the resignation of Mr. Fraser two years ago, might very well be abolished, and a portion of the salary of the deputy supervisor given to the supervisor. Thus the cost of the service would not be increased and the efficiency would be just as thoroughly maintained as if a deputy supervisor were appointed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The salary of the present supervisor has been fixed at $2,000, because, although his predecessor was getting a larger salary, it is generally ackowledged to be a sound principle to appoint to a new position at a less salary than that received by an old servant, whose salary is often increased on account of long service. I have every reason to believe that the supervisor at Quebec is a first-class officer, and I thought of recommending an increase this year, but he is only newly appointed and there is no doubt his services will be recognized, and his salary may go up towards what is was before.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think, until gentlemen interested in the lumber business make good the difference between expenditure and revenue, it is hardly a time to advocate higher wages. The Dominion at present loses $30,000 a year or thereabouts by having this in hand. It is quite evident that, if the expenses are to keep even with their present ratio as to receipts, the receipts must be increased in some way. I would like to know from the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue what has been the exact loss in the last year or in the last four or five years?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot state the exact figure, but I can bring it down.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I hope there will be no attempt to raise salaries while we are losing money.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the tendency will be to decrease the expense of that Department.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). If the hon. gentleman goes back some years, he will find that a considerable surplus has been obtained from that office in former years, which may very fairly be applied against any deficit there is now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman foreshadows the policy of the gentleman in front of him, but I think, from my recollection, that at present the surpluses are very nearly used up.

Mr. WHITE. I do not think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were, very nearly, in my time, and they have deen going on getting less.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 205,

Collection of Revenues—To meet the cost of working steamer *Newfield* when required on cable service.....	$5,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the reason for a vote for this particular service? Is not the steamer in working order all the time?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then what does it mean?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of this vote is that should the *Newfield* be required for this service, as she has been several times before, the extra expenses may be met.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there a refund off the other vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If she is not required, then the other vote will supply the expenses for the *Newfield* at some other service, but if she is required for this service, we will take out of this grant what is required for that service, and it will be saved on the other.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 210,

Post Office.....	$2,469,966 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When this item was under discussion, I called the attention of the Postmaster-General to the desirability of knowing what was the estimate of the sum he would pay the Canadian Pacific Railway during the present year, and how much had been paid to them last year? He promised to bring down a statement. Will he be good enough to make the statement now?

Mr. CARLING. The amount paid to the Pacific Railway for the year 1883-84 will be $74,000; the estimated amount for 1884-85 will be $96,000.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 221,

Board of Civil Service Examiners—To provide for the payment of expenses.....	$3,909 10

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice, in looking over last year's account, that no less a sum than $1,270 appears to have been paid to the assistant librarian for acting as Civil Service examiner. I dare say that gentleman may be a very fit person to assist in the preparation of papers and to act in that capacity, but it appears to be a very questionable proceeding to use the assistant librarian to the extent to which he must have been used to entitle him to demand $1,270; and I do not see myself, if an assistant librarian is wanted, as I suppose he is, how he can spare the amount of time which it appears to be necessary for him to have expended in that service, in order to earn that sum of money. The sum is entered in the Auditor-General's report. I should like to know, in reference to this vote, whether it is going to be repeated or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is not in my Department, but in that of the Secretary of State, who is not here. But I know something about the circumstance. The assistant librarian, Mr. Decelles, is one of the Commissioners, and being an officer of the Government in the Library, he receives, I think, $5 a day for the time he is employed in that capacity.

M. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is stated distinctly in the Auditor-General's report that he received $1,270 last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I say nothing to the contrary.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is more than $5 a day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He had to go out of town for the examinations twice last year and, of course, he had to pay his travelling expenses and board while he was away, which must have increased the total charge. But I know that the salary, according to the Civil Service Act, was $5 a day; and the number of days now is fixed by the new Bill at eighty, and, of course, hereafter he will not be employed more than eighty days in one year. Then if he has to go to Montreal for the examination as he did twice last year, he will have to be paid his $5 a day during that time, as the others are paid, plus travelling expenses.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The fact remains, that this gentleman is paid a salary of $2,400 as assistant librarian, and he obtained $1,270 for acting as Civil Service examiner, charged under head of miscellaneous, so that he received altogether $3,670, considerably more than a good many Deputy Ministers. Now, this is entirely wrong. If he could be spared out of the Library for other work, and he chose to do that work, it should be retained out of his salary as assistant librarian. It is an easy matter to give an enormous salary in this way, and this system is constantly increasing. Some salaries are increased twice their usual amount in this manner. It seems to me altogether inexcusable. Now, if the Minister of Public Works will tell me how many days this gentleman was engaged, we will see whether his statement of $5 a day is in accordance with this payment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say the number of days. The Secretary of State was unwell this evening and could not be here, but he sent me a note saying that a statement of the employés appointed to conduct Civil Service examinations under the Civil Service Act was ready, and would be laid before the House to-morrow; also, a statement of what their expenses have been during the year, which would be laid before the House to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In the meantime, the facts appear to be as I have stated.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the details; it is not in my Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no detail about it. There is the amount that has been paid him according to the Auditor-General's statement. But I want to know from the Ministry before this is concurred in whether they approve of salaries being paid in this fashion; whether they are disposed to continue this outrage I should say upon ordinary practice. Does the hon. gentleman, speaking for the Ministry, approve of making the salary of the assistant librarian $3,670 instead of $2,400?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has a right to put it in that way. I may say this, however, that under the Civil Service Act, as it stood last year, and as amended by the Bill passed a day or two ago, the Civil Service examiners may be paid $5 a day for the time they are employed, the number of days not to exceed eighty. If he is employed as an examiner he will be paid $5 per day and his travelling expenses. If he is employed eighty days, that time at $5 per day would amount to $400, and ten days more for examining papers, at $5 per day, would make $50 more, and expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty is, that the figures in the Public Accounts indicate a state of things entirely different. The amount paid to Mr. Decelles was $1,270. At the rate of pay in question, he must have been employed over 200 days, and yet he is engaged as an employé of the Library.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year was an exceptionally heavy year in respect to Civil Service examinations. The number of candidates who came forward for examination was very large. The Commissioners who had revised the papers had very heavy work to do, and it was two months after the examinations had taken place that the list was published. We think that in future the number of days now fixed by law will be sufficient for the examination of candidates and for correction of the papers. Of course, the remarks made by the hon. gentleman will induce me to call the special attention of the Secretary of State to this matter, so that if there is any abuse a remedy can be applied at once.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The old Act limited the time to sixty days, but it appears tolerably clear that Mr. Decelles must have received payment for a much longer period. This clause in the Act was inserted to prevent abuse. No man can discharge the duties of examiner and attend to his duties in the Library at the same time, and I apprehend that half that gentleman's time must have been taken up in connection with those examination papers.

Mr. BLAKE. This payment is not merely improper, in the sense that a Civil Servant has been thus engaged a large part of his time in performing examiners' duties, but there has been a violation of the law, because the Act provides only for payment for sixty days, and payment has been made for about 240 days.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the vote to pass, and a statement will be brought down, and the hon. gentleman will be able to take up the subject any other day he chooses.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 225,

Legislation—House of Commons..... .....$47,840 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps the hon. Finance Minister will give some explanation respecting the item $2,000, to cover extra claims of certain returning officers at the last general election.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These are claims made not only in connection with Montreal, but with respect to other localities, where no provision is made by law for the copying of the votors' lists. The matter was referred to the Auditor-General, and he reported that the parties are fairly, if not legally, entitled to compensation, and a sum has been placed in the Estimates to meet the case. Therefore, it is proposed that we should place a sum in the Estimates in order to meet such cases, there being one or two other places where it is likely to arise. It is with reference to the copies of the voters' list. In Montreal the city is divided into districts, where there are not 200 votes, and these lists have to be furnished by the registrar or some other officer. There is no provision in the Act to pay for this service, and it had to be done at a considerable expense to the returning officer. I think there have been legal proceedings, and a judgment has been found against him. Some person was employed by the Auditor to investigate the matter, and he has reported that they are entitled to consideration, though there is no law providing for it.

Mr. BLAKE. I recollect the discussion which took place in the Committee, and I think it was clearly understood that we should have fuller information on Concurrence. We have not been informed how it is that the city of Montreal occupies an exceptional position—a position different from any other part of the Dominion. All over the Dominion, wherever there are lists of voters, there is provision under which these lists are to be obtained by the returning officer. They are the foundation of his work. And how can it be, that in the city of Montreal alone extra expenses are incurred, and not in the other 200 odd electoral divisions, in which also voters' lists have to be obtained? I cannot see that there is any reason for it. Then it was said that this was only part of the expenditure, and I pointed out what I thought at the moment seemed to impress hon. gentlemen, though it does not seem to have done so, that if they want to have constant difficulties with the returning officers, let them propose votes like this. If the law is not wide enough to make legal all claims which ought to be legal, alter the Act and make it wide enough to embrace them, but do not propose extra and supplementary votes for claims which are not according o law; because these returning officers, it is known, are constantly sending in claims beyond what the law allows, and if they find Parliament setting this bad precedent of passing a special vote for the payment of some sums which are not warranted by the law, then you will find that course largely pursued, and the Government would be pressed to repeat the operation of a special vote. If, therefore, it be the case that there is something peculiar in the city of Montreal, which requires a special vote to discharge the duty of a returning officer there, let us have an Act of Parliament providing for the payment and then it will be under the law; they will know then what they are bound to do, and what they are entitled to get, and they will not be dependent upon the generosity of Parliament, or the opportunity they may be able to exert, in order to procure a special vote. We were told that this was the only thing of the kind. The form of the vote is objectionable in the last degree. It speaks of extra claims of certain returning officers. Can the hon. gentleman tell me how many extra claims were made by returning officers, and what were the amounts? But we do not know which returning officers or which claims; all we know is that they are extra claims. What does extra mean? It means beyond and outside. They are claims not warranted by the general Act, and therefore we are asked to pass this vote. It seems to me to be a very objectionable vote.

Mr. GAULT. I believe the hon. Secretary of State has a factum of this case. I may say that one of the returning officers was sued, and judgment was given against him for a large amount, and I know that they have had a great deal of

trouble in Montreal, so much so, that in future, if this vote is not passed, we will not be able to get anyone to accept the position.

Mr. BLAKE. We will have to do without a member, then.

Mr. GAULT. I know that several have declined already.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They cannot decline. I will read the law on the subject:

"The returning officer shall obtain the different lists of votes, or copies or extracts thereof, from the registrars, town clerks, clerks of the peace, or such other officers as may by law be the proper custodians of such lists, or of duly certified duplicates or copies thereof; and every such officer who shall omit or refuse to furnish such lists, copies or extracts of the voters' lists, within a reasonable time to the returning officer requiring the same, shall incur a penalty of not less than two hundred and not exceeding two thousand dollars."

Now if we are to admit that because returning officers neglect their duty in Montreal, if we make that a reason for voting money in the case of one electoral division, it is equally a reason for voting money in every other electoral division. It is perfectly clear from the information we have before us that we should not be called on to vote this sum until we know precisely what the difficulty was, and then we will be able to judge where the sore spot is.

Mr. HESSON. I know for a fact that there has been difficulty in the matter of this sub-division of the voters' lists. The clerk of the peace is furnished with a certified copy of the list, a revised copy of the roll, but he is not compelled to put them into sub-divisions, as required by law, for the use of the voters. They are not required to go outside a certain division, and they must be embraced within certain districts in which there are not more than 200 voters. The clerk of the peace will not furnish it the sub-divisions of the wards of towns or cities for polling or other purposes, and it falls on the returning officer, who is not in a position to make the sub-divisions, and as he has not the time, he has to employ some person to do it. This difficulty does not apply only to the city of Montreal, but to every town in Canada, where provision is not made by law to sub-divide the municipality into sub-divisions not including more than 200 voters. Many corporations have not done so, because they require to be revised from time to time, as the population increases or decreases. I know that in Stratford, my own town, the ward sub-divisions were not prepared, because in some cases there were some 300 or 400 voters appearing at the polling sub-divisions. These had to be prepared by the town assessor, who knew the residence of each voter, and having taken the list prepared by the clerk of the peace, he was enabled to sub-divide them within certain bounds. Now, it is impossible for any returning officer to accomplish that work. Neither the time nor the money allotted to him will permit him to do it. I think they are paid something like $75 for their services, and I know for a fact that it would be difficult to get any respectable man to undertake such work again, from my experience of what has taken place in the past, and because they have been threatened with suits. In such cases they have appealed to the Government, and very naturally, because it is from the Government that they receive their commissions.

Mr. BLAKE. According to the statement of the hon. member, it is all the more necessary that we should have the information, because he says the appeal has been made, and I suppose is to be granted, with reference to other places than Montreal. We were promised on Concurrence to have the information that would enable us to discuss this vote. We have no more than we had in Committee. I think, under the circumstances, that that the vote should stand. We are sorry that the Secretary of State is not here, but that is no reason why this vote should pass.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman says, the vote should stand, because the information is in the hands of the Secretary of State, and we shall have it to-morrow.

Resolution allowed to stand.

On Resolution 234,

To pay Thomas Temple, for the use of the Temple & Miller patent flanger, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, during the winter of 1880-81..... $300 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some information was to be given about this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to be able to give the hon. gentleman information that will be quite satisfactory. When my hon. predecessor was in office, an arrangement was made by Mr. Brydges with Mr. Temple for a patent flanger for use on the Intercolonial Railway, for which the then Government paid him $4,500. The invention is one of such approved merit that it is also relied upon on the Grand Trunk Railway, for which it has been purchased for a large sum of money. When we undertook to operate the Canadian Pacific Railway, we also sent this flanger to be used on that road, for which a claim was made of $750, and it was finally settled for this $300.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 235,

Canals—Chargeable to Capital.

St. Peter's Canal—To pay H. F. Perley, C.E., for four years' service, to 31st December, 1883, enlargement of the St. Peter's Canal $1,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the reason for this vote? This is another case of an increase of salary by separate charges.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not exactly that. The hon. gentleman will remember that when the St. Peter's canal was constructed—as it was under his administration—Mr. Perley had the supervision of this work, and was thoroughly acquainted with it. Since then, I have availed myself of his services in everything connected with the St. Peter's canal. He has been good enough, though not in my Department—for he is now the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department—to give me his services; and this vote is asked to pay him for duties performed outside of his duties as Chief Engineer of Public Works, and I am satisfied that under the peculiar circumstances it will not be regarded as an improper one.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 236,

Welland Canal—To meet payment of the balance of unpaid labourers' wages and board accounts *in re* J. V. Browne & Co.'s abandoned contract. $2,436 08

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was asked what had been done with the deposit which the contractor had been obliged to deposit with the Government. I am glad to be able to inform the House that the amount of work performed when Mr. Browne ran away and the amount of his deposit remaining, will be more than sufficient to discharge the entire payment of all the labourers' wages; but a question was raised by the auditors, and we were obliged to have the money voted by Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, the vote indicates that the money in hand will not be enough.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The vote is asked because it was considered that we were not in a position to use the deposit. But the deposit will be sufficient, with the amount estimated impaired, to discharge the entire liabilities and leave something over.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 240,

Canals—Chargeable to Income.

Welland Canal.....$48,180 69

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The opinion of the Minister of Justice, concerning this question of damages to the cargo of the *Jennie Graham*, $19,624.74, was to have been laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This claim was made by Messrs. Mowat & McLennan, acting as solicitors for the insurance company, and they put forward a large number of English cases, which they considered entirely met the question of the liability of the Government to the insurance company, in a case in which negligence could be proven. This was brought forward in 1879, and has been the subject of discussion between the Department and the claimants from that time. An elaborate opinion was given on the subject by Mr. Lash, when acting as Deputy Minister of Justice, which opinion I hold in my hand. It was conceded a case which would warrant reference to arbitration; arbitrators, under that advice, went into the investigation and found the accident due to negligence on the part of the Government in the management of the canal, and they gave an award, of which this is the amount.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why not have gone to the Exchequer Court, where it could have been treated legally?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not found the Exchequer Court much better than arbitrators.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I know a case where the court found there was $12,000 due to the Government, and the arbitrators found over $100,000 due to the contractors.

Mr. BLAKE. I have just read this opinion in a very cursory manner, and it seems to me to read different from what the hon. gentleman represents. As I read it, Mr. Lash states that the parties claiming compensation base their claims on the ground that the damage was sustained by reason of the negligence of the officers in charge of the canal, but that they state further they are advised they have no remedy under the Petition of Rights Act. This being admitted, he considers he is relieved from the necessity of expressing an opinion whether their claims could be enforced under the Petition of Rights Act. They, however, submit their claims as a question of justice and equity, and he proceeds to treat the case as between subject and subject. In this respect, the well settled law, he states, is, that where a canal is owned or worked by a company, or by an individual, who impose tolls, the common law imposes the duty on the proprietors or lessees to take reasonable care that the canal may be navigated without danger to life and property.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the point.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it is. Mr. Lash then proceeds to state that the question whether or not there has been negligence is a question of fact, to be determined on consideration of all the circumstances, and he does not understand his opinion to be asked on this question, as that is a question of fact and not of law. He sums up his opinion as follows:—First, there appeared to be no liability on the part of the Crown which could be enforced under the Petition of Rights Act; second, the claims having been submitted to the decision of the Crown, it is for the Government to determine whether, under all the circumstances, any compensation should be made, and the authority of Parliament should be had before any payment should be made; third, if it be determined to make any compensation in the case of negligence, it will be necessary to investigate fully the circumstances of the accident, unless the Minister is prepared to come to a conclusion on the question of negligence; fourth, the legal right of the claimants to seek compensation in their own names may be doubted, and although he inclined to the opinion they possessed that right, they should be required to procure an assignment to them, from the owners of the cargo, of all claims. As far as I can understand this opinion—the only perusal I have made of it being this—it is that, firstly, there is no legal liability; and secondly, the law is stated as it would be between subject and subject, where a canal exists on which parties have a right to impose tolls, and the Government then has to determine, in the first place, whether they will or not adopt the proposition that compensation shall be payable in the case of negligence. If they determine this, then the question is, whether there was negligence, and the question of damage has to be investigated as a question of fact. The question which the Government had to determine was on what principle they would carry on the canal. There is a very wide difference between the control of a canal by the public, upon terms or tolls which we know are not compensating terms, and the control of a canal by a private party who works it at a profit. The circumstances are entirely different in this other respect also, that claims of a much more preposterous character are more liable to be established in the case of a Government working a canal, owing to the general current and drift of opinion against a Government in such matters, than in the case of private individuals. Mr. Lash suggests, should the Government adopt the principle that compensation should be made in case of negligence, that the matter should be referred to one or more arbitrators, to enquire into and report on the facts of the case. We have not before us the award of the arbitrators.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is here.

Mr. BLAKE. We have not it before us. We have not the evidence in the case. We do not know what the facts are, or whether from these facts a lawyer would draw the legal conclusion that there was negligence which would, as between subject and subject, have made the Government liable, because that is a mixed question of law and fact. Was there a report from the Minister of Justice or his Department upon this evidence, to the effect that it established a case of that description of negligence which would, if between subject and subject, make the owner at all liable? If there was not, there ought to have been, because it is quite clear that the arbitrators are not persons competent to form a conclusion on that subject. They can get at all the facts and make their finding, but after all, when they have got at the facts and made the finding, we have to see whether the negligence is of such a character as would, as between subject and subject, import a liability, and having done that, we have to see whether it is reasonable to apply the same rule to the Crown, working the canal not for a profit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is an old maxim that common law is common sense, or if it is not, it ought to be; and I read the report of the Minister of Justice as establishing incontrovertibly the fact that, under the circumstances, he is relieved from the necessity of giving an opinion as to the legal claim. He sets out with that. In the next place, he states that he will deal with this as a question as between subject and subject, and he then clearly establishes, to my reading, the fact that a case is made out for investigation, and that it would be impossible to say what the liability was unless evidence was taken. He states clearly and distinctly that parties operating a canal and charging tolls for vessels and cargoes going through it, are bound to avoid wrecking those vessels through any negligence, and then he states that he is unable to give any opinion as to that question, because that is a question of fact and one that must be proved by evidence, and he finally says that, in case it is found that in consequence of the negligence of the Government or the officers of the Government this vessel was wrecked, Parliament should be asked to make the appropriation. Everything that Mr. Lash suggested as right and proper in the case has

been followed exactly. The Government recognized the force of his statement that, as between subject and subject, negligence would involve responsibility; that that could only be settled by an investigation and the examination of witnesses under oath, and under these circumstances, the arbitrators, the officers of the Government, were instructed to take that testimony and report their finding to the Government. I will read the report of the arbitrators for the information of the hon. gentleman, and I think he will then see that we could not do less than put the item in the Estimates:

"And whereas the Anchor Marine Insurance Company, now known and designated as the Anchor Insurance Company——"

Mr. DAVIES. Is the hon. gentleman reading the submission or the award?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am reading the award.

"hath preferred a claim against the Government of Canada for damage to the cargo of the schooner *Jennie Graham*, on the 25th October, 1875, on account of said schooner having sunk in the canal below the lock at Allanburg, through the alleged negligence of the officers in charge of the canal at this point, in this: that the schooner *Jennie Graham*, laden with a cargo of 21,000 bushels of barley, in attempting to enter the said lock, struck upon obstructions negligently left therein, and a hole was thereby made in her bottom so that she immediately sank."

And then they go on to say:

"Do adjudge and determine that the said Anchor Insurance Company be paid the sum of $12,514."

Mr. BLAKE. What is their finding as to wreckage?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have stated their finding.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the recital of what the claim was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They find that it is due to negligence, and they find that "in attempting to enter the said lock she struck upon obstructions negligently left therein."

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman re-reading what he read before, or is he reading something new?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am reading what I read before.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the statement of the claim, not the finding of the arbitrators.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is signed by Cowan, Compton & Simard. I will send it to the hon. gentleman, and he will find that it is a statement that it was caused by obstructions negligently left there, and they adjudged we should pay $12,000 for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was also to have given us some special information as to the length of time which had elapsed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said this was preferred by Mowat McLennan, on behalf of the Anchor Insurance Company, in 1877, and has been the subject of discussion and controversy ever since.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is rather remarkable that the previous Government did not see that this opinion led to a favourable consideration of the case at all. I think I am right when I say that the Superintendent was not called before the arbitrators at all to give evidence. It was alleged that a piece of iron, or something of that sort, stuck in the bottom of the vessel, which made a hole and allowed the water to enter. The Superintendent had the chamber of the lock carefully dragged, and found nothing there, and so reported in his evidence, and gave very strong testimony to the effect——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What period are you speaking of now?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am referring to the vessel.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do you refer to the evidence given before the arbitrators in 1878?

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; I am told he was not called before the arbitrators at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is he not in British Columbia?

Mr. MACKENZIE. He is, but British Columbia people can get here on business.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whatever evidence was taken before would be submitted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. His evidence was most conclusive in the matter. I do not know what evidence they could have had stronger than his. He had the bottom carefully searched, and found nothing of the sort, and we found no ground upon which a claim could be entertained. But it was a sufficient reason for the hon. gentleman that the claim had been rejected by us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not consider that it had been rejected at all.

Mr. BLAKE. It is obvious that the hon. gentleman has put this in the Estimates under a misapprehension, and I have no doubt he will withdraw it. He thought the arbitrators had found that this loss was occasioned by negligence. The award does not find that at all. What the hon. gentleman read himself, and read to the House as a statement of their finding, is merely a recital of what the claim of the company was:

"Whereas the Anchor Marine Insurance Company, now known and designated as the Anchor Insurance Company, hath preferred a claim against the Government of Canada for damage to the cargo of the schooner *Jennie Graham*, on the 25th October, 1875, on account of the said schooner having sunk in the canal below the lock at Allanburg, through the alleged negligence of the officers in charge of the canal at this point, in this: that the schooner *Jennie Graham*, laden with a cargo of 21,000 bushels of barley, in attempting to enter the said lock, struck upon obstructions negligently left therein, and a hole was thereby made in her bottom, so that she immediately sank; and whereas the Minister being the Head of the Department, having been unable to effect an amicable settlement with the company, hath referred the claim to Cowan, Compton and Simard; now therefore we, having taken upon ourselves the charge of the arbitration, &c., do hereby make and publish this our award, and adjudge and determine that the said Anchor Insurance Company be paid the sum of $12,514."

And I see the copy is certified by the hon. gentleman's biographer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is enough to settle it.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, if the award had been made by the hon. gentleman's biographer, we would have taken it with the same degree of pleasure as a certificate of the state of facts, as we take the biography. Unfortunately, it is only certified by him, and therefore we must consider it a little. There is therefore no finding by the arbitrators on the question of fact. They jump at a mixed conclusion of fact and law. Has the hon. gentleman read the evidence on which this report is based? I would like to know.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government dealt with this subject in my absence. They had the advantage of the presence of the Minister of Justice at the Council Board, and the subject was duly considered, and a report to Council adopted, deciding to put this item in the Estimates. I have given the hon. gentleman the evidence now, that the investigation took place under authority of the opinion of Mr. Lash; I have given him the fact that the arbitrators, after having the case referred to them, and with that opinion in their hands, adjudged and found payable this amount; and yet the hon. gentleman finds fault because there is not some roundabout, legal phraseology, which will cover two or three sheets of foolscap with what an ordinary person could put in half a dozen lines of plain English. The hon. gentleman wishes to raise the question that no finding has been had, that they did not find any negligence. They have recited the negligence, and they state, with the opinion of the Deputy Minister of

Justice in their hands, that they could only find the Government liable, and that payment could only be required in case negligence was established.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman got the evidence?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can obtain it.

Mr. BLAKE. I felt we ought to see the evidence. It is quite clear the hon. gentleman has not read it. This report was received at his office on the 13th of March, 1883, but I suppose he was then making preparations for his departure and did not see it. It was dealt with in his absence; therefore, he cannot say what occurred; but no member of the Government is able to say that the evidence itself was considered. It will be observed that the statement of the Deputy Minister is, that the evidence is conflicting—the evidence of the officers is conflicting. As far as one can judge from the Minister's statement, the evidence of the Chief Superintendent of the canal was not obtained, because the hon. gentleman said: "Isn't he in British Columbia?" There is no reason why his evidence was not obtained in this case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt it was obtained.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, I think we are not in a position to deal with this item.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have brought all the papers the hon. gentleman has asked for; if he wants more, I will bring him more.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well; if the hon. gentleman will bring the papers that will satisfy me this vote ought to go, I will be delighted. Perhaps, at the same time, the hon. gentleman would inform us what has become of the officials who were found by the arbitrators to have been guilty of negligence?—because, of course, if $26,000 damages has been caused by this gross negligence, some condign punishment must have been administered to those who were guilty of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Can the hon. gentleman mention the names of the owners of the vessels?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The insurance company made a claim; the owners had not a claim. The claim is made by the insurance company, the cargoes were insured, and the company were compelled to pay; and having paid it, they made their claim upon the Government, so that the parties with whom we had to deal were the Anchor Insurance Company.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But I think you will find, in the Department, correspondence with the owners.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The correspondence placed in my hands was that of Mowat, McLennan & Downey, acting for the Anchor Insurance Company.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This particular case occurred in 1875; the Deputy's report was made in 1877. The hon. gentleman came into office in 1878, and he allowed this to remain for nearly five years before taking any action upon it, showing that he entertained a very similar opinion to my own, as to the merits of the case.

Resolution allowed to stand.

On Resolution 241,

To pay L. W. Marchand, advocate, for professional services rendered 1857-58-59 in connection with the settlement of the claims arising out of the construction of dams at the head of Beauharnois canal.....$1,207 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. If this claim is entertained at all, it is to be charged against the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, for by arrangement with those Governments many years ago, it was understood no payment would be made or recommended here until their assent was obtained. If you make this payment without their assent, you cannot charge it to them. I wish to know whether the Government has communicated with them with respect to this item?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then you cannot make a claim against the two Provinces for it and say the claim is a just one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has never been the custom with these small matters to make such communication, and if both Ontario and Quebec refused to pay this claim and it was found to be a just one, we are bound to pay it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. On the contrary, you are bound not to pay it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I say the Union Act put upon this Government the responsibility of paying all just debts due in relation to public works; if under the Union Act they were passed over to the control of this Parliament, and if Quebec and Ontario both refused to entertain the claim, and the parties established their claim against this Government, I tell the hon. gentleman that we would be obliged to pay it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then I have very little respect for the hon. gentleman's constitutional law if he says that. We are bound to pay acknowledged debts, but you have no right to adjudicate upon debts of the old Province of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing about acknowledged debts in the Union Act. The hon gentleman is obliged to give an interpretation to the Act which it will not bear. There is nothing about acknowledged debts; it is debts, and debts are due whether they are acknowledged or refused. To say that debts made payable by law shall be at the option of the persons owing the debts is, I think, adopting a line of argument which the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to sustain.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think I will. If a party comes in and gratuitously offers to settle a dispute that he is not authorized to settle, will that be law?—and that is what the hon. gentleman is doing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is precisely the case—there is no ground whatever for any other contention. We followed the principle out when I was in office, even with regard to the price of a map.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The enormous length of time which has elapsed since this occurred, renders it a very questionable claim indeed. These professional services were rendered twenty-five years ago. Now, no man could conduct his business on the principle the hon. gentleman is apparently laying down, of recognizing claims of this kind after a lapse of a quarter of a century without, so far as I can judge, the smallest means of checking these claims. We do not know how many days this gentleman seems to have been engaged; we do not know, in point of fact, anything about him, except that a claim of $1,200 is preferred by him. The gentleman is asking for the money, and after twenty-five years we give it. A very curious claim, indeed. I would like to hear from the First Minister about it, as a legal gentleman of eminence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This was fully explained when the item passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; it was not. Statements were made which were pronounced exceedingly unsatisfactory by everybody who spoke about it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They may have been unsatisfactory, but they were fully made. I read the report of Council, and gave details.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman stated pretty much what I have stated. He said the other day:

"The Minister states further, that his Department had no means of certifying to the number of days during which Mr. Marchand was engaged; yet the list of cases prepared by him agreed with the returns of the arbitrators."

And that was all.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to make one observation and to withdraw one statement which I made when this matter was under discussion. I pointed out that the services were rendered in 1857-58-59, and that the hon. Minister read a paper which seemed to indicate that no claim was made prior to 1868. I pointed out that there was another interval, from 1868 to 1884, during which there had been no further application made, and I said that, so far as I knew this was the first instance I ever heard of in which a lawyer delayed fourteen years or more without asking payment of his bill, particularly when he had such an exceptionally good client as the Dominion of Canada. I am obliged to, withdraw that difficulty in the way of payment of the claim, as I have learned that this lawyer departed in 1868 to a region where bills of costs are not rendered. While I withdraw that difficulty in the way of the account being paid, I think it affords an insuperable objection to our paying this item, because it is proposed to pay L. W. Marchand, who is now in heaven.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is living.

Mr. BLAKE. If he is still alive, I want to know how it is that he waited fourteen years for payment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Minister of Railways said that both the Governments of Ontario and Quebec refused to pay the account. How is he aware of that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never said anything of the kind. I have not the slightest doubt either Government would pay it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How do you know it is not paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The payment must be made here.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How does the hon. gentleman know it is a just debt?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have taken all the proper means to ascertain.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Did you refer to the Local Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Local Government could not tell us anything about it. They have nothing to do with the Beauharnois canal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The old Province of Canada had to do with it.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman know whether the claim has been assigned to any other party?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware that such is the fact.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose a claim for interest for twenty-five years will appear in the Estimates next Session, following precedents.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope not.

Resolution concurred in on a division.

On Resolution 249,

Harbours and Rivers—Prince Edward Island...	$56,222 19

Mr. DAVIES. Can the hon. Minister give the House any further information as to the Minute of Council which came here from Prince Edward Island, respecting the proposed vote, remonstrating against the Government asking for a discharge in full before the vote was passed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand a document of that character has been received, but we have not yet had time to look over it.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 270,

Miscellaneous.

To pay James Barry, for preparing tables of imports and exports of fish.....	$28 00

Mr. DAVIES. What tables are these? Are they in the Minister's Report?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; the report of last year. The tables were prepared and issued by the Commissioner last year—that is, for the year ending the 30th of June, 1882.

Mr. DAVIES. Is Mr. Barry an officer of the Department?

Mr. McLELAN. No; he is an officer of the Customs Department, and the tables were prepared from the books of that Department.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 273,

To pay the account of the Hon. Boucher de la Bruère, publisher and proprietor of *Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe*, for the printing of, and the type for, the Civil Service Lists, in French and English	$7,688 74

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a most objectionable item. It is clear as daylight that $2,000 more than the work could have been done for is to be paid to this gentleman for the type and the printing of these lists. I say that although the amount is not a very large one, this is about as gross a job as ever was prepetrated for the benefit of a supporter of the Government.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 277,

For the purchase of new type for printing the Report of the Commissioners, and for printing the Consolidated Statutes.....	$11,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where is this new type?

Mr. CARON. I believe it is in the Secretary of State's office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is the printing going on there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that this type is in the hands of the printers, who are now doing the work. When that work is done, the type will be put into the hands of the Government, and under the care of a proper officer.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 288,

Customs—To provide amount required to complete the Service	$25,860 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister was to state generally what that was for.

Mr. McLELAN. There was a balance on the year previous of $7,000, which accounts for the difference the hon. gentleman found between the vote of this year and that of 1885. The remainder is for the increases detailed in the vote for 1885.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 49,

Immigration.....	$526,375 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg to point out to the House, that with respect to the immigration statistics that have been furnished to us, there are two or three things which have not yet been dealt with at all by the Depart-

ment. In the first place, the Department have not contradicted, nor do I see how it is possible that they can contradict the evidence deduced from the Census of 1871 and 1881, which go to show that of the 340,000 immigrants, or thereabouts, who came into Canada in those ten years, barely one-fourth of the number—90,000 in round numbers—have remained in Canada. Neither have the officers of the Department brought forward, as yet, any sort of evidence in contradiction of the statement—which appears to be perfectly clear from the Census—that the total population of Canada, wholly apart from the question of additional immigrants settling in the country, has fallen considerably below the natural increase during those ten years. Nor have they dealt with the other fact, which also appears from the statistics of Ontario, that there has been an enormous reduction, taking into account the natural increase of population, in Ontario itself. Now, Sir, the other evening I called to the attention of the Minister in charge of the Department that, as was perfectly apparent from the returns of the Department, the strong presumption was that those people who have come in since 1881 cannot have stayed in Canada, but that even admitting, as is physically possible, though very improbable, that they did stay in Canada, then two things have occurred: In the first place, a very large additional displacement of our own people has taken place, and in the next place, there must have been a very large settlement in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, which nobody has heretofore claimed. Sir, I am not going to detain the House on this subject. But I simply point out further, that if the hon. gentleman's figures are correct—that 112,000 immigrants came in in 1882, and 130,000 in 1883—the equally strong presumption is, that the vast majority of these people have left this country and are not to be found here. I will merely content myself, on the present occasion, with making that statement.

Resolution concurred in.

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 139) respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Beaty.)

SUPPLY—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry to have to ask the attention of the House at this late hour, but this is the first opportunity I have had since the publication in the *Globe* newspaper of an article which reflects on myself, not only as a private individual, but as a member of this House and a Minister of the Crown. If the matter referred to me only as a private individual, I might, as I have done many times before, when attacks have been made against me in the press, have passed them without calling the attention of the House to the matter, but I consider that my honour is not my property alone in the position I occupy. It is the property of my party; it is the property of this House; it is the property of the public at large; and therefore, when my honour is attacked in the way it has been, it is my duty to explain to the House how the matter stands. Of course, of the writer of that article or the writers of the *Globe* newspaper, I shall say nothing. I leave them and their articles to be appreciated as they should be by the public and this House; but, Mr. Speaker, in this correspondence from Ottawa, to which I refer, in the *Globe* newspaper and in an editorial in that paper also, it is stated that last year I received from my friends a testimonial which, of course, had nothing to do with this House and which could be presented to me as others have been presented at different periods to other public men. But the articles go further; they say that contributors to that fund or testimonial were contractors or other parties having to deal with my Department, and that their contributions to that testimonial have affected my independence as the Head of my Department, and have induced me to decide cases against justice and against my duty as a Minister of the Crown. I feel it my duty to call the attention of the House to the different cases in relation to which these charges have been brought against me. I shall be very short, because I do not want to delay the business of the House, but I must clear myself of these accusations; I must show to the House and the country that they are without foundation. The first case brought against me is that of Mr. James Goodwin, whose claim was settled by my Department. Mr. Goodwin was a contractor for the wall surrounding this building, and the contractor's claim, after he had been paid for this work according to his contract, amounted to $9,500. That claim he made in 1879, but having other contracts to perform and having contented himself with making the claim without giving the details, his claim had to remain over until he could send in the details. He chose to send them in only two years afterwards, in 1881, and his claim was then estimated by the officers of my Department. The Chief Architect states in his report:

"That the construction of the work was attended with many difficulties unforeseen at the time of tendering; that the specification called for excavation to an average depth of five feet: that therefore the excavation below that depth should be considered extra and the contractor paid therefor at increased rates, as is the usual practice and as was the principle recognized by the Royal Commission appointed, in 1872, to report on the works connected with the Ottawa Public Buildings. The amount allowed Mr. Goodwin was arrived at as follows:—

"'Additional rock excavation below five feet to be allowed at $1 a yard, previously returned at $1.37 a yard, or 1,517 yards at $1.63 a yard, $2,521.65; additional excavation in clay to be allowed at $1 a yard, previously returned at 37c. a yard, or 1,675 yards at 63c., $1,055.25; then the pumping, sheet piling, scaffolding and staging, $700, making a total of $4,276.90. Add to that the balance due on the estimate for his contract, $1,082 60, and you have a total of $5,359.45, allowed him on his claim of $9,500.'"

This I reported to Council, and Council adopted the claim. It was put in the Estimates; it was discussed in Parliament and passed. That is the claim of Mr. Goodwin, and it was a claim respecting which, any one who had it before him, would have done what was done in this case and have allowed it. I wish to show by this that there was nothing exceptional in this case, but that it was treated as all others have been treated that have come before the Department. The second case is that of Mr. Dunsmuir. Mr. Dunsmuir never had anything to do with my Department. He never had a dollar from my Department. He never had any dealings with my Department; and, if to-day he has anything to do with the railway in British Columbia, it is the action, not of my Department—it is the action of the whole Government, it is the action of Parliament, it is the action of the British Columbia Government and Legislature, and therefore I do not see how, if Mr. Dunsmuir has contributed to that testimonial, which I do not know, that could have affected this contract of Mr. Dunsmuir, with which I have had nothing to do except as a Minister of the Crown, assenting to the proposal which was laid before Parliament and sanctioned by this House. The third case is that of Mr. Charlebois, the contractor for this building on Wellington street. Well, I see to-day in the papers—though, of course, I could not say whether it was the case or not, because I do not know the names of those parties who were kind enough to contribute to that testimonial; the list was never shown to me, and therefore I do not know the contributors—I see in the papers a statement which is evidently coming from that gentleman, in which he says that he never contributed to the fund. At all events, what is the case about Mr. Charlebois? Public tenders were called for for these buildings. The tenders having been received, were as follows. There were eight of them re-

ceived. Mr. A. Charlebois was the lowest by far, and a report was accordingly made by me to Council, and Council passed an Order in Council assenting to the tender of Mr. Charlebois, and Mr. Charlebois has had the contract. Therefore, this is another of those cases in which the contributions to that testimonial must have affected this decision! Well, I leave this also in the hands of the House to say whether there is any foundation for that accusation. There is then another name brought forward, that of Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis was not and has not been a contractor of my Department since I have been there in 1878, and therefore that is another of those charges without any foundation whatever. The other charge is that Mr. H. J. Morgan, the Chief Clerk in the Department of the Secretary of State, has contributed $200 to that fund, and that in consequence of that I gave him a promotion when I was acting Secretary of State, whilst the present Secretary of State was away last year, and that therefore the subscription of Mr. Morgan must have affected my action in that case. First, I am not aware whether Mr. Morgan has subscribed or not. I know nothing about that. And secondly, Mr. Morgan was not promoted or appointed whilst I was acting Secretary of State, but was appointed on the recommendation of the present Secretary of State. The report is dated 30th May, 1883, signed J. A. Chapleau, Secretary of State, and is as follows:—

"The undersigned has the honour to recommend to the Privy Council that Mr. H. J. Morgan, now Keeper of Records, and Chief Clerk in the Department of the Secretary of State, be appointed to the office of Chief Clerk in the Correspondence Branch of the Department, in the room of Mr. Grant Powell, appointed Under Secretary of State, at his present rate of salary."

Therefore, that is another of these baseless accusations brought by that correspondent, and I am sorry to say, endorsed by the editorial staff of the *Globe*. I should not have been treated so by the organ of the great Reform party of Ontario. Though I have always been an opponent of theirs, I should have been treated fairly. They should have considered my reputation as a public man the property, not only of my party, but of their own, of the whole people; and therefore, I should not have been treated so, and I shall be very much surprised if the leader of the Opposition sanctions these attacks on the leading men on this side of the House. I am surprised that this should have been done after the great invitations and approaches made quite lately again by that paper, to the people of the Province of Quebec, those whom I am specially supposed to lead in my Province, that fair treatment they should have, and would have, from that paper and its friends; and I have been selected, no doubt, because I am the leader of these men, and their leader in my Province, to be treated in that way, and to have my reputation destroyed if they could do it. I must say that, after having been twenty-seven years a member of Parliament, after having been appointed a Minister of the Crown twenty years ago, and having filled an office as Minister of the Crown for sixteen years, after having had millions and millions of dollars passing through my hands in my official capacity, and not a word having been said against the disposition of that money, the treatment I have received at the hands of these men is one that must be condemned all through this country and by this House. I must apologize to the House if I show some feeling in this matter. It is because I feel that, after having consecrated the best years of my life to my country, I should have had better treatment on the part of that paper and its friends.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

297	Department of the Interior—Further amount required for Departmental Printing.....	$10,000 00
	Additional amount required for the Caretaker of the Geological Museum.....	50 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is all this $10,000 for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For departmental printing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIHHT. We can read that without the hon. gentleman informing us. We want to know why?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is an estimate of what will be required for the printing of the Department. The printing is enormous, of every kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the reports require this additional sum?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; there is printing of every kind; there is supplying the officers with books, papers, and paper; maps, plans, matters of that kind.

Mr. MILLS. I observe in the expenditure made last year there are twenty or thirty newspapers which received patronage for advertising. It seems a large amount.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has been bullying me a good deal for not offering everything to public tender, and those offers must be advertised, and, if advertised, must be advertised somewhat extensively. If we are going to sell lands or offer timber limits or anything of that kind, we must advertise in the different papers. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman knows the value of advertising to merchants or sellers in the disposal of any article. The Government does not sell a patent article, or, though it is a patent article in one sense, it is not a quack article. Then there are the mining regulations, and the land regulations, if for sale, &c., and all that costs money.

Mr. BLAKE. An additional amount of $10,000 for departmental printing in one lot is rather alarming, and I would like to know how it compares with previous years. Advertising is one thing—I do not understand this vote includes advertising. I think there must have been a considerable expenditure in maps; but this is a supplementary estimate for the financial year ending 30th June, 1885; therefore we have had probably as expensive a distribution of maps in former years. I think the hon. gentleman ought to have been supplied by the Minister of the Interior with more information on the subject of this vote than he has communicated to us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it that the votes which I see paid in 1883 under the head of subscriptions to, and advertisements in, newspapers, and of printing, binding, and stationery, represent the total expenditure that was required for this purpose by the Department in 1883?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because, if that be the case in 1883, which was in all human likelihood as expensive a year as this, all that was required was about $8,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Besides the printing I have mentioned, every township, as it is surveyed, is lithographed by a special process, which is carried on in the Department itself. The expense has been greatly increased by that operation, but the speed has also been immensely increased. Formerly, we had this done under contract by Burland & Co., I think, at not more than half the expense. Now, everything is done by a new process. It does not look so well, but the map is substantially as good as if done by a regular engraver. Of course, they are printed in large quantities, and sent to agents where the land is open, and wherever else they are required. That is a very large item of itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This ought to be added to contingencies in reality.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is too large an item to put in the ordinary contingencies of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where would the hon. gentleman put it, then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will tell the hon. gentleman before the Committee rises.

298	Department of Indian affairs—To provide for the statutory annual increase of salary to four recently appointed probationary third-class clerks	$ 200 00
	To provide for the salary of a clerk to be appointed	400 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The increase in the number of clerks is necessitated by an enormous increase in the work. Though we have a very industrious, active, and zealous set of officers, they were not able to do all the work, so much so that one or two complained that they could not keep up with the work. One of the most valuable officers, Mr. Sinclair, stated he could not remain unless he got assistance. There is a very much larger amount of work done in British Columbia, as the Indians are brought down on the reserves, and correspondence with the different agents has largely increased. Settling them in bands under special agents has also increased the work. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Department is not overmanned.

299	Inland Revenue Department—To provide for increase and promotions (subject to the Civil Service Act as to promotion examination) under new theoretical organization, which, though estimated for 1883-84, has not yet been carried into effect. The Estimates for 1884-85 have been based upon actual pay list, irrespective of such reorganization:—	
	C. R. Hall, promotion to 1st Class	$150 00
	N. Stewart, promotion, 3rd to 2nd	100 00
	W. Himsworth, as Chief Clerk of Correspondence	175 00
	John Byrne	100 00
300	Department of the Secretary of State—Amount required to provide for the statutory increase, omitted in main Estimates, to the undermentioned Clerks and Messenger, from 1st April to 30th June, 1885:—	
	A. O. Mousseau	$12 50
	G. Andrews	12 50
	A. Elie	7 50
301	Department of Marine and Fisheries—To provide for new appointments and other expenses in connection with the new proposed division of this Department	$4,600 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will perhaps explain this vote.

Mr. McLELAN. The work of the Department has grown so much since it was first organized that it is impossible for one Deputy Head to properly manage both the Marine and Fisheries Branches. The Marine Branch of itself has so largely increased that it is quite sufficient for one man. On the organization of that Department, we had about 227 lighthouses in charge; now the number has grown to 600. The buoy service has very nearly trebled, and six or seven steamers have been added to the service. The harbour police at Montreal and Quebec have been added, which take a good deal of attention. Among other subjects may be mentioned the registration of shipping, which has been transferred from the Customs Department; examination of masters and mates; and the meteorological service, which has grown to very large proportions and requires a great deal of care; collection of dues for wharves and piers; the shipping of seamen; inspection of steamboats and of machinery and hulls; examination of engines, life-saving apparatus and the steamboat service at Prince Edward Island. These matters have become as much as it is possible for one Deputy Head to look after, however efficient he may be. The fishery branch is of very great importance and magnitude in this country. Returns show a value of $17,000,000 as the result of the fisheries; but outside of this, there is a large quantity of fish for home consumption which does not come within the returns. That is a branch of the service in connection with which we have about 600 officers employed, and considering the amount of work thrown on the Deputy Head and the importance of the fishery branch, I thought it was necessary, in the interest of the fishery branch, that it should be made a separate branch, independent of the other branch of the Department, and under the charge of a Deputy Head. It is with a view mainly of improving the efficiency of the fishery branch of the service that I desire to make the division and to reorganize that branch of the Department.

Mr. AMYOT. Does this item cover $1,000 for a marine school in Quebec, which is so much desired by all mariners in that Province?

Mr. McLELAN. This item does not do so. But there is an examiner of masters and mates now in Quebec, as there is a similar officer in other Provinces, under the pay of the Department, and I think he is giving every satisfaction there. It will depend on circumstances how long we may find it necessary to continue him in that Province. That gentleman who is in Quebec was employed some years ago in teaching a school of that kind; he gave great satisfaction, and he is giving satisfaction now.

Mr. AMYOT. That gentleman is employed for the examination of mariners, and earns from $50 to $75 a year. That is not sufficient to keep up a school. The Local Government furnishes the house and materials, and only a salary of $1,000 a year is required from the Dominion Government. We are told that in other Provinces schools are maintained without such assistance. This is because there are more mariners there; Quebec has not a sufficient number. As the law provides that masters and mates must have certificates, the Government must place them in a position to obtain the necessary training. If the Government thinks that $1,000 is too much to pay, in order to secure a good body of mariners, then I do not see that we are in a position to give very much money for any other object. We are sometimes told that this does not belong to the Federal Government. It belongs as much to it as do militia matters. It is never claimed that the Local Government should have to pay for military instruction; and they should not have to pay for naval instruction. I deeply regret that the Government do not think fit to yield to the prayers addressed to Parliament on this subject. I still insist on pressing this matter, and I hope the Government will yield on the point

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has not given the information sought. The hon gentleman asks for $4,000 to provide for expenditures in connection with the proposed division of his Department. Now, the hon. gentleman has a right to explain to the Committee what new appointments are to be made, what salaries are to be attached to those appointments, and what special work is to be done by the appointees, as well as what other expenses in connection with the Department he proposes to ask for.

Mr. McLELAN. As I said to the hon. gentleman, the proposition is to appoint another Deputy Head over the Fisheries Branch, with a salary of $3,200.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that to be in lieu of the Commissioner?

Mr. McLELAN. I expect to make such arrangements with regard to the Commissioner and the inspectors that there will be a considerable saving in this respect, and I do not calculate by any means that this whole sum, or any considerable portion of it, will be an increased expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, the hon. gentleman will be able to reduce the other votes?

Mr. McLELAN. Some of the others will not be used.

Mr. BLAKE. But you should reduce them.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not been able to perfect the scheme, so as to give all the details. Of this sum of $4,000, $3,200 will be for the Deputy Head, and I hope that in the re-arrangement the remainder, or perhaps more than the remainder, will be saved.

Mr. DAVIES. What is this $800 for?

Mr. McLELAN. We will probably require some additional expenditure in the reorganization of that branch.

Mr. DAVIES. Do you propose to appoint another clerk?

Mr. McLELAN. That will depend altogether on the amount of work thrown upon the Department. There are now a number of men engaged temporarily as extra hands, and I think it is better that as many as possible of those should be put on the permanent staff. The addition of the work in connection with the bounties and other extra work has necessitated the employment of these extra men, but I should like to get that branch of the Department in such a state that there would be very little necessity for employing these extra hands.

Mr. DAVIES. But the hon. gentleman asks for a specific sum of $4,000, and I assume he has made up his mind exactly as to what appointments will be required, and that he has not fixed upon this scheme without due consideration, or in a haphazard manner. I think, therefore, he should tell us for what this $800 shall be required.

Mr. McLELAN. As I told the hon. gentleman, the scheme has not been perfected, so that I cannot give him all the details, to the last dollar. I told him that the largest portion of it was necessary for a Deputy Head. We expect to make a saving in connection with the commissionership and some of the superintendents and inspectors, in connection with the outside service. But this $800 is asked in case it is found necessary to make some appointments, or to put some on permanently who are now temporarily employed, or to make some increases of salary. All the chief clerks are occupied in the Marine Department mainly, while the clerks in the Fishery Branch have the lowest salaries of any in the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the Commissioner's salary?

Mr. McLELAN. $2,400.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the House should know, before it is asked to pass this vote, what the hon. gentleman's plans are. Presumably, this matter has been present in his attention for some time, and I suppose the commissionership is vacant.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. In consequence of the retirement of Mr. Whitcher, who has heretofore practically performed the duties of Deputy Head, and has been in charge of that branch of the Department. Now he proposes to dignify that office with the title of Deputy Head, to give an equal rank, an equal facility of access to the Minister with the Deputy Head of the other branch. But I do not conceive that it is at all fitting to establish two officers, practically of the first-class, for the Fisheries Branch—a Deputy and a Commissioner; and I think it was the hon. gentleman's duty, when he was about to reorganize his Department, to have laid down a scheme before asking for the vote—not perhaps as to the minor details, the smaller clerkships, though there is no reason why that should not be done, but certainly as to the capital expenses of the reorganization: first of all, as to the deputy headship, and, secondly, as to the commissionership. For my part, I do not see why there should be a commissionership at all. I do not understand the object of having both officers. I believe, myself, that the hon. gentleman might have a first-class clerk under his Deputy, but no officer of the character of a Commissioner, and therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should have brought down such a scheme with regard to this reorganization as would be proper, showing the necessity for appointing a Deputy Head, if he intended appointing one, and giving the salary of a Deputy Head, and showing, as I believe, that there is no longer any reason for keeping up the commissionership.

Mr. McLELAN. The Commissioner was not appointed under the Act, but by Order in Council. It is merely a title.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman says he proposes to reduce the Commissioner's salary—indicates that he intends to keep up that office, though he hopes to make the salary less. I say abolish the office altogether, and if you want to have a Deputy Head have a first-class clerk under him if it is necessary. The hon. gentleman makes another observation, pregnant with significance, in connection with the reorganization. He says the high class clerks in his Department at this moment are mostly in the Marine Branch, and the low class in the Fisheries Branch. But how long does he suppose the low class clerks will be in the Fisheries Branch if he makes it a separate branch, with a Deputy Head. There will be what always has been in such cases—a comparison of the two branches, a comparison of each branch with the other, and with other Departments, and it will be pointed that these clerks are away down in the third-class, though they are running this important branch of the Department. With a Deputy Head over them, whose dignity requires a certain number of highly paid high class clerks, the hon. gentleman will find that whatever takes place this year, next year at any rate, this will involve a considerable increase in expense. He says that the present Deputy is a very efficient officer, but he is not able to overtake the work. I presume it was because he was not able to overtake all the work of the Department that this exceptional arrangement of appointing a Commissioner of Fisheries was made—a person who should occupy a higher position than that of an ordinary clerk, who would have greater responsibility, and would probably be in more immediate communication with the Minister. I am afraid that the plan the Minister is about to adopt will result in a very considerable increase in the expense of the Department as soon as he brings into practice that theoretical organization of the Department which he has not yet worked out, and which, I think, he ought to have worked out before he asked us to pass this vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot for the life of me see why the Deputy Head should be held to be necessary for the purpose of attending to the fisheries alone. The total sum we vote for that service is $105,000; and, with all respect to the objects of the hon. gentleman—which are important enough—I do not see that we are called upon to have, for administering that amount, a distinct branch, which will sooner or later cost $15,000. You have a responsible officer at $2,500; he will have under him probably a couple of chief clerks; they will have other clerks under them, and so it will go on until the expenditure at headquarters will be out of all proportion to the disbursements. The hon. gentleman did not state to us that Mr. Whitcher had found any great difficulty in administering this Department when he was Commissioner of Fisheries. I must say that I think it is very unfortunate that the hon. gentleman has been led to erect this into a branch by itself. There is no doubt, as my hon. friend beside me has said, that the moment you erect any of these services into a separate branch, every man in it expects and contrives to get a large increase of salary in a short time, and it is practically made

an excuse for giving maximum salaries to three or four men whose services otherwise would not get them. I am afraid it is going to be a very injurious vote.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. Minister's reasons for this change in the Department are not good. He does not allege that the business of the Fisheries Branch, or that the responsibility of the head of that branch has increased, but that the Marine Branch has had a lot of extra business in the last few years. That may or may not be so; I believe it is to some extent; but the House has not heard that the Deputy Head of that Department complains that he has more responsibility than he is capable of assuming. For extra work extra clerks are generally appointed. One Deputy is enough for the Marine Branch, and the fact of increased work in the Marine Branch is no reason for the appointment of a Head in the Fisheries Branch. The question is: Is the work in that branch so increased, or is the expenditure so great, as to justify this increased expenditure? The hon. gentleman speaks of the increased number of lighthouses built during the last few years; but, if I am correctly informed, the building of these is not now in his Department.

Mr. McLELAN. It is.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood that the construction of these lighthouses was carried out by the Public Works Department.

Mr. PAINT. No; only when they are above $10,000.

Mr. DAVIES. Whether they are or not, the increase is in the Marine Branch, and not in the Fisheries Branch. I think a little reflection will show the Committee that so far from there being any increased work in that particular branch, it has decreased and it will continue to decrease. The hon. gentleman knows that a great part of the work in the Fisheries Department has consisted of the granting of licenses for fishing in rivers and the supervising of licenses. But he knows that by a recent decision of the Supreme Court, the whole of that work has been taken away from his Department, and the licenses that used to be issued by his Department and the fees returned from them, have ceased. Therefore, the reason for an increase does not exist, and will not exist in the future. With regard to the fish hatcheries, which the hon. gentleman says are increasing, I think he must acknowledge, from the debate that took place the other night, that that system is at least a tentative one. He has not yet arrived at the conclusion that the fish hatcheries are a success.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Have the Government arrived at that conclusion?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, all I have to tell him is, that a gentleman who occupies at least as high a position as he does in the Government—the Minister of Justice—has announced the very contrary. He has proclaimed, not what I have said, that the hatchery scheme is a tentative one, but that it is a failure. The hon. Minister of Marine was in England last year, and I received a pamphlet from his Department the other day about "Canada at the great International Fisheries Exhibition." I found from this pamphlet that the hon. gentleman presided at a conference held on July 2nd, 1883, at which a Mr. Joncas, who, I believe, is an official under the hon. gentleman, made the statement that these fish hatcheries were a success. This is his language:—

"Officers have been appointed to enforce the law; the coasts and rivers are well protected; from the eleven fish breeding establishments we are under the control of the Government, millions of young salmon are distributed yearly in our rivers, and we have every cause to hope that in a few years our rivers will be replenished, and we shall be again able to procure and send to foreign markets, at moderate prices, this delicious fish which ranks so highly amongst the luxuries of the table."

And then are printed in italics, so as to call attention to them, the following sentences:—

"This view is fully borne out by the official returns of our inspectors of fisheries and overseers, whose returns for the year 1882 give a most satisfactory account of the greatly increased number of salmon in the rivers and coast fisheries of the Dominion. Specially is this noticed in the rivers where young fry have been distributed from the hatcheries. I am happy to say that letters addressed to me from Canada last week, state that the catch of salmon this season will be, according to all appearances, superior again."

Now, this was mentioned with the hon. gentleman's approva and published by him.

Mr. McLELAN. Not published by him.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand that this is published by his Department. It is a report of what took place. It says that the hon. Mr. McLelan, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, occupied the Chair, and the following remarks were made by L. Z. Joncas. I deny that the statements made there are borne out by these official returns. I challenged the hon. Minister the other night to prove his statements. The Committee had a right to hear from him and to have some justification of these statements, but the hon. gentleman has never given us any justification of them; he gave us some general information; he said he thought the hatchery was a success, but when asked to show by the official returns a verification of this statement, he did not do so. That statement was made the 2nd July, 1883, and at the very time the hon. Minister of Justice was paying a visit to the other end of the Dominion, and from the language he used there, I presume he had formed an opinion on this point. I find him reported in the *Evening Post* of the 3rd August, 1883, to have said:—

"Sir Alexander Campbell said the experiments in artificial fish hatching east have been so far unsuccessful, and he could not hold out much encouragement of further experiments being made in the Province."

To show the Committee that was no haphazard statement, I will call its attention to a speech made by him the very next day before the Board of Trade, and reported in the *British Colonist*:

"Sir Alexander Campbell explained to the Board of Trade, as a reason for not expending the money voted by Parliament for a fish hatchery in British Columbia, that the establishment of fish hatcheries was of questionable utility. It was undecided in the last whether the quantity of fish was increased or not by artificial hatching."

On the 15th of August, he is reported in the *Weekly Standard* to have said:

"Relative to fish hatcheries, Sir A. Campbell said that the experience of the past had proved that they were not a success in the Dominion."

Here we have the hon. Minister of Justice in British Columbia making, day after day, statements that the fish hatcheries, for which we vote from $30,000 to $40,000 every year, are a failure. We have more than that; we have a gentleman who has occupied the position of Commissioner of Fisheries for the last twenty years, publishing an open letter last year at this very time, in which he collates the statistics that were published in the Census returns and shows from those statistics that Sir Alexander Campbell's conclusions are correct. The hon. gentleman, when I referred to this in a general way the other day, said something about Mr. Whitcher's motives. What Mr. Whitcher's motives may be I do not care; I understand he committed a breach of duty in publishing the letter at all. I do not defend the publication of the letter in any way; I am only concerned with the statistics he published as taken from the Census returns, and those show, so far from this experiment having been a success, it has been a failure. I will read what he says:

"Canada has eleven Government fish hatcheries now in operation, eight of which are occupied in hatching salmon eggs only, besides two private ones, which also hatch the true salmon; two are employed in hatching salmon, whitefish and trout eggs, and one hatches whitefish and pike-perch. The earliest of these hatcheries has been in operation for about fifteen years, and the latest for two years; the principal ones

have existed since 1873. The entire cost of these public establishments to date is $259,400.

"The whole number of fish bred and distributed from 1868 to 1881 is about one hundred and five millions, of which about twenty and a-half millions were salmon, and about sixty-nine and a-half millions were whitefish.

"The total catch of these two kinds of fish in the five Provinces where hatcheries exist is given in the Census returns as follows:—

	1871.	1881.
Salmon.....	3,263,200 lbs.	4,754,800 lbs.
Whitefish.....	4,603,400 lbs.	7,848,200 lbs.

"This difference is 17 per cent. under the natural increase during the decade next preceding. Considering the increased numbers of fishermen and amount of netting in the last ten years, and the actual yield from new places and districts far removed from areas of the deposit of fry from the hatcheries, the general evidence of this exhibit is not thus far assuring of commercial benefit. Unfortunately the proof in special comparative instances is even less encouraging. Taking, for example, the two hatcheries which represent the leading fish products of the maritime and lacustrine sections of Canada raised in their precincts, salmon and whitefish, namely, the Bedford Basin Salmon Hatchery, at the sea-coast of Nova Scotia, near Halifax, and the Sandwich Whitefish Hatchery, between the great lakes, in Ontario, as easterly and westerly exemplers. Both of these hatcheries were started about the same time, and have been some seven years in operation. There is an ample margin of time for realization; and to be perfectly sure, I reckon, along with the salmon fry at Bedford, those hatched at Sydney, Cape Breton, also in Nova Scotia, and I add to the whitefish hatch reported at Sandwich the hatch returned from Newcastle, Ontario. The number of salmon fry distributed was 6,250,000. The catch of salmon in that Province, by the Census of 1871, was 843,600 lbs.; and for 1881 it was 316,600 lbs., the decrease in ten years being over 50 per cent., notwithstanding other causes which should improve the yield, such as protection, fishways, &c., &c. The young whitefish distributed in Ontario, between 1876 and 1881, numbered 65,700,000. The catch of whitefish in the same Province, by the Census of 1871, was 4,289,000 lbs.; and by that of 1881 it was 7,660,200 lbs. This improvement in the whitefish may be due in a measure to artificial hatching, but is most noticeable in localities dependent entirely on natural sources; and it is indisputible that the yearly catch, from 1875 to 1881, in the immediate vicinity of the Sandwich Hatchery, has declined.

"The state of the salmon fishery in Nova Scotia is undoubtedly against us. But the weakest of all is the case where we ought to be strongest—at the parent institution, from which 5,600,000 young salmon have been distributed. The catch of salmon in Ontario, by the Census of 1871, was 17,800 lbs.; and by the Census of 1881 it was nil. The Superintendent's report for 1881 states that, so far as returns go, it is a complete failure. This settles the point that absolutely nothing has resulted in fourteen successive years from the repeated deposit, prolific incubation, and annual distribution of salmon at the parent establishment.

"If, then, as it appears, the economic results from this large outlay and enormous distribution of salmon and whitefish, in two exemplary instances on the sea coast and inland waters of Canada, within the period of ten years are, as the official returns establish, comparatively insignificant, is it not fair to assume and wise to acknowledge that the time has arrived to ask ourselves, if there may not be something wanting perhaps in our nursing and rearing of the broods, which want defeats fruition from the tried methods of impregnation and incubation that have thus far, from ova to fry, proven remarkably successful?"

Mr. DALY. Does the hon. gentleman maintain that the fish hatcheries are not doing good?

Mr. DAVIES. I am trying to establish, from the best evidence——

Mr. DALY. Do you confirm these statements?

Mr. DAVIES. I am reading the evidence.

Mr. DALY. Do you concur in it?

Mr. DAVIES. Would the hon. gentleman like me to read the opinion, on the point, of two hon. Senators who represent Halifax?

Mr. DALY. What is your opinion?

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps you will allow me to give the evidence on which I base my opinion before I give my opinion. The gentleman who was Commissioner of Fisheries for twenty years based his opinion on certain statistics drawn from the Census return, and if these returns are correct, the only conclusion to be reached is that the fish hatcheries are absolute failures. That is the official report on which he bases his conclusions. I give you, in addition to that, the opinion of Sir Alexander Campbell, Minister of Justice, who, I presume, has had access to these returns and other data, and whose authority and opinion is stronger even than that of the ex-Commissioner of Fisheries. I give you, on the other hand, the opinion expressed by Mr. Joncas, an opinion based, as he says, on the returns of 1882, which I have examined, and which I say do not support his opinion. I say the statistics to which he refers point to a conclusion exactly the opposite of that which he drew and submitted to the conference in England. The conclusion I come to is that at the most it is a mere experiment, the success of which is far from proved and is more than doubtful; and if the hon. gentleman wishes to have the opinion of those who are more experienced than myself, if he will turn to the Senate debate——

Mr. DALY. I have looked at it already.

Mr. DAVIES. He will find that both hon. gentlemen from Halifax expressed as strong an opinion as I have, if not a stronger one. The junior member, Mr. Almon, expressed a much stronger one, and pronounced it a failure, and the Senator from Lunenburg went, I think, as far. So far from the evidence before the Committee justifying us in launching out in further expenditure in that branch, it points to our, as prudent men, curtailling it. At any rate, if it is desirable to increase the expenditure, let the expenditure not be increased in the direction of appointing new and unnecessary officials at Ottawa, but let it be increased if necessary at all, in developing still further your fish hatcheries and testing wherein the cause of the failure lies. Failure there has been. It may be in the mode in which you have attempted to carry out the fish hatchery system. Some say you do not put them far enough up the rivers. That may be the case or it may not. The hon. gentleman might be justified in asking a vote to build a new hatchery on another system, to build one further up the river, to try another experiment, but he is not justified, in the face of the information we have, and in the face of the opinion of his own colleague, the Minister of Justice, and the opinion of the late Commissioner of Fisheries, in increasing the officials in that Department and appointing a new Deputy Head. As I have shown, the work of the Department is decreasing.

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. DAVIES. That branch of the Department.

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. DAVIES. All the work, and a great deal it was, in issuing licenses to private parties to fish in the rivers, and the revenue derived from the licenses, has ceased.

Mr. McLELAN. That was comparatively small.

Mr. DAVIES. It was comparatively large, and the supervision required over those rivers was very great. I have looked at some of these Commissioners' reports, and I find that the Commissioner of Fisheries spent a great deal of time over that branch of his Department, which is now swept away. His time was occupied very largely in carrying on correspondence and controversies with the licensees and those who objected to their exercising the rights granted under the licenses, and carrying on lawsuits and writing about them from time to time; and I have no hesitation in saying, from reading the Commissioner's reports, that the work in that branch of the Department has largely decreased and is now decreasing. I therefore submit to the Committee that no case whatever has been made out for the hon. gentleman asking us to establish a new Deputy Head, and we have my hon. friend in front of me and my hon. friend to the left telling the Committee what has been the inevitable result of appointing a Deputy Head. It means the appointment of a long tail of officials, whose dignity and pay must agree with the dignity and pay of those employed in the coördinate branch of the Department. It means not only this $4,000, but probably another $4,000 next year. What work is this new Deputy going to do? All the statements of the Minister had reference to the Marine Branch

and not to the fisheries at all. What is the Commissioner of Fisheries going to do, if you put a Deputy Head over him? I think this is totally unnecessary.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in his statement that the work of the Department is decreasing. There have been a few licenses for up river withdrawn from the Department.

Mr. DAVIES. From all the rivers.

Mr. McLELAN. From all the rivers above the tidal waters, but if the hon. gentleman were familiar with the work of the Department, he would know that the number of licenses in the tidal waters and in the lakes has largely increased, and added to that there has been the distribution of the bounty, involving an investigation of a very large number of claims, and the issue of about 40,000 cheques a year for that branch of the service which has been lately placed upon the Department. So, the work has very largely increased, and, as I stated to the Committee a short time ago, the outside officers connected with the protection and care of the fisheries number between 600 and 700, and these have to be all corresponded with and kept in order. The hon. gentleman has referred to the question of fish hatcheries, and has quoted the statement of the Minister of Justice in British Columbia. The Minister of Justice denies that his statements were as strong as reported. He expressed a doubt—an individual doubt—as to the success of the fish hatcheries that have been established by the Government; nothing more than a doubt as to the success of them. I stated to the House, when the Estimates were under discussion, my opinion as to the success of the fish hatcheries, and the grounds upon which I hold the belief that they have been successful. I take it from the reports of all the fishery overseers, and I find from those reports that, in the salmon rivers, wherever we have placed, and have been for years placing the young fry, those rivers have held up or increased in their production, while rivers that have been continuously fished through that period, and have not been supplied with fry, are nearly fished out and have decreased in the yield. And so with reference to the figures given by the Commissioner. They show a considerable increase of between 30 and 40 per cent. in the total catch between 1871 and 1881. Taking the whole, there is that increase. but while there has been an increase in the whole, there has been a large decrease in the rivers that have not been supplied with the young fish and fed from the hatcheries, while all the reports from the officers for 1883, and for 1882 as well, show that the rivers that have been supplied with fry have maintained their yield, or largely increased it. The home consumption of salmon has very largely increased from what it was ten years ago, and the facilities given for distributing fresh salmon from the fisheries, by the opening of the Intercolonial Railway, have facilitated that distribution so largely that I do not believe we get a return of all the catch of salmon on the coast and in all the rivers of New Brunswick and Quebec. In addition to that, the establishment of freezers, I think, tends to keep us from getting the true returns. The mode of management of the freezers is this. The owner of the freezer makes his rounds in boats or canoes or vessels during the night, and gathers up the fish from the different fishermen, and takes them to his freezers as rapidly as possible, and there preserves them. It is the interest and custom of all the men engaged in freezing to keep secret the quantity of fish that they have in stock, in order that it may have an effect upon the Boston and New York markets in the winter. One of the gentlemen engaged in the freezing operations writes a letter in August, 1883, in which he deals with that question and explains why the official returns do not show as large an increase as is given by the river. He gives names of the different parties and of the amount they had in stock at that time, making 142,744 pounds; the figures given in Mr. Verge's report make a total of only 93,000 pounds, while the quantity actually in stock was 141,000 pounds. Now I believe this custom has spread through all the districts where the preservation of salmon by freezing has been followed. I refer to the districts of Restigouche, Bathurst, and a number of districts in Quebec. I make this statement, which is borne out by the returns of the fishery officers, that wherever we have planted fry in a river that river has maintained its yield or increased it, and in rivers where we have not yet placed any fry, the catch has rapidly gone down from year to year.

Mr. VAIL. Has the hon. Minister any report from Sackville river?

Mr. McLELAN. We have, in the office. The general returns from Nova Scotia state that the catch of salmon has been about the same as last year, which showed an increase of more than 100 per cent. over 1881. The catch of salmon in the whole Province was, in that year, 383,550 pounds; in 1882, it was 580,000; in 1883, 575,910.

Mr. DALY. I gave my testimony of what I actually knew in the rivers of Nova Scotia, as a fisherman. There was an improvement in the river that had been stocked from the Bedford hatchery. I may further mention the fact that in 1878, when the then representative of the county of Halifax was addressing the electors, he took particular pride in referring to the fact that he had done a great thing for his county in establishing within it the fish hatchery at Sackville, on the Sackville river. He pointed to that as likely to produce in the future great results for that county. I am glad that that gentleman was able to point to that single thing as the work of his hands, and I am glad to say that, in some respects, it has met his anticipations, although not to the extent that we had hoped. But that the expenditure made from that time to this in this respect has been thrown away, I entirely deny; and I will put my evidence as a practical fisherman, having fished in rivers in Nova Scotia that have been stocked from that hatchery, against the opinion of Mr. Whitcher, or that of the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., when they say that this experiment is still of only doubtful efficacy. I know it has been a benefit. I have had personal experience that the result of the fish hatchery has benefitted the rivers supplied from it. I am very sorry that the hon. gentlemen now opposite seem inclined to detract from the laurels which Mr. Jones assumed in 1878, before the people of the county of Halifax, when he spoke of this fish hatchery as one of the great achievements he had effected for that county; but now it appears, according to the representations of hon. gentlemen opposite to be, at most, of only doubtful utility.

Mr. VAIL. I have no doubt the former member for Halifax took credit for having established that hatchery. It was to some extent an untried thing, and the experience that other gentlemen had had in the hatching of fish led the public to suppose that the establishment would produce great advantages. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Daly) knows that Sackville river formerly was a salmon river, and I would ask him if he has heard in the last three years of a single salmon having been caught in that river. I do not want to depreciate these hatcheries, but I think they have been established long enough to show some results by this time.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman knows that the hatchery is not built on the Sackville river for the mere purpose of stocking the Sackville river; it stocks all the different counties of the Province. I have given from the general report figures showing that the catch has been very large. From Colchester county the overseer reports fine runs of salmon in the North

and Salmon rivers in October and November, and that several thousand frys have been put in those rivers. In Guysborough there has been a large increase in the catch of salmon, and salmon are now plenty in that county. In Halifax county salmon had not been so abundant for many years. In 1883 the catch of salmon was about the same as in 1882. All the counties show somewhat similar returns and show that wherever the rivers have been stocked with fry there has been an increase, but where no fry has been placed there has been a diminution in quantity; and so it is in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for Halifax seemed to import some political feeling into this debate. I do not care what the motives of the hon. gentleman may have been in establishing the hatchery; we are concerned with the very important question whether it is successful or not. Senator Almon said:

"I think we are indebted to the senior member for Halifax for having brought this question before the House, because I think the subject, particularly of renewing the fisheries by means of placing young fish in the rivers, has not been properly understood. I myself think—though my opinion on the subject may go for nothing—that the system is an entire failure. I judge from the results of experiments in the Sackville river, which flows into the basin near Halifax. There is a fish-breeding establishment at the mouth of that river, where Mr. Wilmot, one of the greatest authorities, I believe, on the subject, resides. There are few or no mills on the river; it was always a good salmon river, and it has been a protected river, yet I am told by the people who inhabit its banks (and it is only nine miles from Halifax) that fewer salmon rise in it now than before it was protected and spawn was planted."

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with a good deal of attention to this discussion, and I desire, even at this late hour, to offer a few remarks. This is a subject which has been very unfairly dealt with to-night; and in my observations I will spare neither the Minister, on the one hand, nor hon. gentlemen opposite, on the other. I will endeavour to give fairly and candidly my opinion, not only in regard to the proposed division of the Department, but on the question of fish-breeding, and I will point out what the duty of the Government and the Department, in my opinion, is. First, with respect to fish-breeding, I hold myself responsible for having introduced the system of fish-breeding into Canada. While Minister, I took a great interest in this matter. I had a good deal of trouble to convince my colleagues, and after them the House, to give a moderate vote for the establishment of but one hatchery, and I think the House and the public have come to the opinion that fish-breeding, if properly conducted, can be made a success. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. Davies) has made some statements on this points, statements that are worthy of every consideration; and I will not say that I agree with those who pretend that our fish-breeding, as at present conducted, is an entire success, but it certainly is not a failure. There is to be considered, in relation to fish-breeding, this fact: that elsewhere fish-breeding has been a success. We go to Germany, France and the United States, and there we find, that so far from fish-breeding having fallen into disuse, and public sentiment being opposed to granting money for its maintenance, the system is a success and is every year growing in public estimation, and moreover that *savants* and others have decided that fish-breeding is quite a success. In Canada it has been a success up to a certain point; but difficulty has been experienced after the fish have been bred. I have talked with Mr. Whitcher, a man of great information and great resource, who has studied the question, and with Mr. Wilmot, the father of the fish-breeding branch of the Service, and with other persons connected with it during the time I was in office, and since, in order to find out where the difficulty lies. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite who are decrying the granting of money for this purpose, when they are pointing out the defects and failures which, no doubt, do exist, to find out where the fault lies, and let it not be said that we in Canada are less successful in promoting this great industry, which will be so fruitful in the future to the prosperity of our people, than other countries have been. I am told by some persons who know a great deal more than I do, that up to a certain time the fish-breeding is a success. Let anyone go to a fish hatchery. He will find thousands of salmon fry floating in the water, some of which have grown to very respectable dimensions. It is admitted that nature for the first ten days supplies, by means of a sack under the throat, food for the fry. After that food is exhausted, the young fish have to obtain their own supply, and it is a matter of great doubt in the minds of those with whom I have conversed, as to whether the difficulty lies in the further development of the fish some time after they have been brought to life, or whether the difficulty arises from the fact that those fish, being cared for during three months, lose their natural instinct of self-preservation and power to obtain food for themselves. It may be, as some contend, and I believe it is, the true theory, that the trouble arises from the fish not being kept sufficiently long in a protected state, and means should be taken to test the opinion as to whether, if fish kept for a season in a protected state, greater success would not attend fish-breeding. There is another theory connected with fish breeding, and I refer particularly to salmon, because it is the great commercial fish of our country, and that is, that the young fish are put into streams that are too often unsuited to them. They are deposited in streams where the water is too pure or not pure enough, or in streams where predaceous fish, such as trout and perch, frequent the shallow waters and prey on the young artificially-bred salmon. I would say to hon. gentlemen, and I say it in all good part, that this question should be treated apart from any party feeling of triumph over the Minister. We should endeavour to make as perfect as possible an institution which should be a credit to this country, and we should endeavor to find out faults, if faults there are, in the prosecution of this work, so that in the future fish-breeding may become a source of national wealth in place of being pointed at as a national disgrace. I will say no more on this point, because the hour is late. In regard to the other point started by the hon. member for Queens, if I were on his side of the House I no doubt would have acted as he has done. I would no doubt have taken up the report of Mr. Whitcher as condemning the course of the Marine and Fishery Department, and would have also read the speech of Sir Alexander Campbell, in British Columbia. Let me tell the House what I think of that speech. The fact that Sir Alexander Campbell dared to denounce the policy of one of his colleagues, and denounce a policy which was established not only by the Government of which he was a member but by Parliament, which is his master—this action was such an outrage on the other Cabinet Ministers, that if I had been the Minister the Council Chamber would have been too small to have held both of us. I do not know what passed between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Sir Alex. Campbell, when the latter returned from British Columbia, and the former from England—I suppose they had a pretty lively time: certainly I would have had one had I been Minister. With respect to Mr. Whitcher's course: the hon. gentleman has quoted Mr. Whitcher's statement in regard to the failure of fish-breeding. I have great respect for Mr. Whitcher and his statements? He served under me eight years, and I found him a faithful, upright and active officer. And I may say that I do not believe there exists in the Dominion of Canada a man who possesses so much varied information, which can be brought into practical use in the service of the country, in this connection, as Mr. Whitcher possesses. But, Sir, he was like all men who get disgusted with the position in which they are placed. He, Sir, it was, who helped to get up the case for the Washington Treaty. He attended at Washington with Sir John A. Macdonald, and rendered the very best service to his country there. He got up, under my direction, the case which resulted in the Halifax

award, and if I am rightly informed, he got very little recognition for his services and very little compensation for them. Mr. Whitcher, with his peculiar temperament and disposition, a man of his proclivities, his knowledge and the power which that knowledge gave him, felt that he had not been properly treated. His temper got soured, and his judgment perhaps, not at the best of times the strongest, led him to do what no subordinate ought to have done under the circumstances, and led to his subsequent removal. I may say that I met him shortly after this event occurred, and he complained to me about his suspension. I say this, now, of a man I think well of, and a man who, I think, has not been rightly treated. I said to him: Do you know what I would have done to you if I had been the Minister and had found that that circular had been issued? I would not have suspended you, but I would have dismissed you, and you deserve to be dismissed. The man had mourned over his supposed wrongs, he had complained to one and another until he had got into a morbid condition, and I believe that the paper he wrote was the result of that condition. Sir, I know, beyond a doubt, that to Mr. F. W. Whitcher, in his perfect self, with the faculties of his mind all present, and his intelligence actively at work, I could quote hundreds of instances, penned by himself or under his direction, in the reports of the Department, which would have contradicted the statements he made there, and I say this with no desire of detracting from Mr. Whitcher, or attacking him. On the contrary, I do not think he has been as well used as he ought to have been by the Government he served. The head of the Department of Fisheries has given his reasons for this change in the arrangement of the Fisheries Branch, that the different branches of the marine service had increased so largely in numbers. Now, there is not a single one of those he enumerated which did not exist when I was in the Department. It is true they have extended, the country has grown, but we had British Columbia then as we have now. But the business has developed and I have no doubt the duties of the Department have grown and increased. But, Sir, the real reason why, in my opinion, it is justifable to divide this Department, has not been stated. I recollect when I formed that Department, and I think I can appeal to the country to say that it was formed on a basis which worked successfully, my recommendation was—and I speak in the presence of my old colleagues—that there should be two Deputy Heads, because the two branches of the Department are so distinct and so unlike, that a man who is fitted for the one, like Mr. Smith, the present deputy, would be utterly unfitted for the other. What value would the present Deputy Head put upon a salmon? Why, Sir, he would value it at so much per pound? And what is the actual value of these salmon to the country? You cannot estimate it by the pound. It is the money they bring and the sport they give to the men who come in by the hundreds, during the season in our own country, to obtain sport by catching these fish, which cost them, in many cases, from $5 to $10 apiece. It is the trade they bring, the intercourse they are the means of establishing with a foreign element, the traffic they give to railways and steamboats and hotels—it is these considerations which give value to the fisheries of the country. It is true they have also a commercial value, but that is not lessened by the fact that this nominal value exists and that it should be cultivated and developed. I believe it is in the interests of the country and the Department that the Department should be divided, and that a Deputy Head should be appointed over the Fisheries Branch co-ordinate in power with the Deputy Head of the other branch. I do not think, however, that there is any necessity for a larger expenditure than $3,200, and therefore, I think the hon. member for King's (Mr. Davies) was right in taking exception to the continuance of the office of a Commissioner of Fisheries, in addition to the Deputy Head of the Department. The Minister should at once state to the House that he intended to abolish the commissionership of fisheries, for there is no necessity for such an office. I will tell the House why Mr. Whitcher was appointed. When the Government of which I was a member refused to carry out my recommendation, and said that it was inconsistent and impolitic, to have two Deputy Heads, I recollect the opinion entertained of the Department when I took charge of it. My right hon. friend told me, when I took it as a choice between it and the office of Secretary of State, then and now one of the largest of the Departments, he said that the Department of Marine and Fisheries was just like the fifth wheel of a coach—there was nothing for it to do. However, I took it, and I said that I thought I would show that there was a good deal for it to do, and I think I did show that it was a Department which, at all events, had a good deal of work before it, and that it did good service for the country. I found Mr. Whitcher in connection with the Department joined on to the Board of Works. I found that he was an able man, and after six or seven months' experience with him, finding that he was not receiving the recognition which he deserved, and when I could not get him as my Deputy, I endeavoured to make him a Commissioner or something else, which would show that his services were appreciated; and the result was, that when I was in the Department I could always get him to work for me, day or night, because he felt that his services were recognized and appreciated. Now, I think a deputy over the Fisheries Branch is absolutely required. It has been said that there is less license work to do now than formerly. So there is, but there is the additional bounty work, which involves the making out and sending of 40,000 or 50,000 cheques annually with the accounts and correspondence, which adds immensely to the labour of that branch, and more than compensates for the lessened work in connection with the licenses. If there had been a Deputy equal to his work you would never have seen these cases entered in the courts, for the question would not have been allowed to get headway. These questions were as rife in my day as they have been since, but I always endeavoured to stop them and prevent collision, and during my time there never was a case in court as to the rights of the Dominion as against the Provinces. What is the duty of the Department and the Government to-day? We are granting subsidies to Quebec and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and these are really the three Provinces on the Atlantic where it is of great advantage to secure the fisheries—each of these Provinces is about to receive large subsidies from the Dominion, and if I were Minister of Fisheries I would have endeavoured to bring before the Government, and impress on the Premier while granting these immense sums of money to the Provinces to relieve them from their financial difficulties, the duty and necessity of getting back from them what is of no use to them and what would be of great service to the country, the duty of repurchasing from them the fishery rights they possess, because the Provinces will not protect the fisheries. Can it be expected that they will protect them, when the Dominion derives the benefit of them? I think this is an appropriate subject on this occasion, and I am sorry the hon. Premier is not here to hear my observations. I have just one more remark to make, and it is this; I notice by the papers that were laid on the Table to-day that a message has been sent by Lord Derby to Lord Lansdowne calling attention to the fact that we shall very soon again find ourselves presented with the question of the treaty rights of the Americans. If there ever was a time when we should buckle on our armour and prepare, it is now; and I hold that this is a fitting time to put at the head of that Department a man of intelligence and industry, whose taste will accord with the duties he has to perform, and whose capacity to grasp the duties of his office will enable him to take those precautions which are so desirable in the interest

of the country. I do not know what means have been taken to face the difficulty that will in a little time confront us, but if immediate steps are not taken we will find ourselves unprepared to meet—what? Every day, since the Commission sat in Halifax, the Americans have been preparing. They have their deep-sea dredges at work; they have scientists on board their vessels, Consuls at every port, and people around our shores, gathering information; and instead of our being prepared and they unprepared, as was the case the last time, it will be just the reverse—they will be prepared, and we will not. I say, therefore, that it is very desirable that a person should be appointed over that Department, whose special duty it will be to prepare for the coming event. There are some other observations which I would like to make, but it is too late; but I thought it was my duty, as it has been my pleasure, to give the House the benefit of any experience I have had in relation to this subject.

Railways and Canals.

	To pay F. A. Dixon, 1st class clerk, amount by which his salary was increased, as shown by the Supplementary Estimates of 1883-84	$125 00
304.	*Optional Subjects:* To pay to the undermentioned clerks, upon their passing the examination before the Civil Service Board:— *Department of the Secretary of State.*—F. S. Goldthrite, two optional subjects...	$100 00
	N. Larochelle do ...	100 00
	Indian Department.—H. McKay, three optionals	150 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these all additional?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These are third-class clerks in the service. If they pass optional subjects they receive $50 for each optional subject, but that does not apply to clerks with salaries above $500.

Mr. BLAKE. We had the statement the other day that two clerks had not been able to avail themselves of the Order in Council on this subject, because they had passed their examination before that Order passed. Are these new clerks, or are they old clerks who were in before the Order was passed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think they are new.

Mr. CASEY. Is the opportunity of earning this increase offered annually, or once for all?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Once for all; and then they get the statutory increases the same as other clerks.

Mr. CASEY. Then, clerks in the Department after this will not have the opportunity of offering themselves.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Oh, yes. Suppose a clerk offers himself at the examination next May, and at the same time wishes to pass in two optional subjects, for example, précis writing and shorthand; if he succeeds in these two, he will be appointed at $400 as a third-class clerk, and he will have $50 for each of the two optional subjects, which will make $500, and the next year he will get $50, like any other clerk.

Mr. CASEY. Are the subjects technical, subjects of use in the Department, or purely literary, as a rule?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are subjects determined by the Civil Service Board, and are such as are useful in the Department.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

306.	To pay G. Duval Précis Writer of the Supreme Court, statutory increase of salary for 1883-84, $50; and for 1884-85, $100	$150 00

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand this. This gentleman was appointed under special Order in Council, which prescribes a salary of $1,800, with an annual increase of $50, until it reached $2,000, at which it was to stand. He was not a Civil Servant under regular Civil Service orders.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think he is now.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know anything that has placed him there. I think that the hon. gentleman will find, that four years after his appointment, which was, I think, in 1876, he reached his maximum, and his salary has been standing at $2,000 ever since. I am not objecting to the item, but I do not understand it to be a statutory increase.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will allow the item to pass, and I will give him an explanation on Concurrence.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a matter of considerable importance to the bar of Nova Scotia, in connection with the reports of the Supreme Court of Canada. At present, parties are compelled in many cases to wait for months after the decision is rendered before they can become acquainted with the reasons either of sustaining or dismissing the appeal. This causes considerable confusion and difficulty, both to the bench and bar. For instance, cases involving the same questions and the same rights as those which have been settled by the Supreme Court at Ottawa are often brought before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and could the reasons for the decisions of the Supreme Court at Ottawa be published in time they would be of great value in the discussion of similar cases in the Court at Halifax. And I might say, also, that to my knowledge many causes—over half-a-dozen, I think I am safe in saying, of important causes—have been decided by the Supreme Court of Canada on appeal from the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia years ago, and have never been reported; and I do not suppose, ever will be reported, because causes which have been decided since are reported. That, itself, is a matter of great dissatisfaction to the bar in Nova Scotia, and I might suggest to the Government, if it is possible to carry out the suggestion, which I do not know; but a very reasonable way would be found to meet the difficulty, and that is, that in causes from Nova Scotia—and the Government will understand that there are very many causes on appeal from that court to the Supreme Court at Ottawa, because it is really our only Appellate Court—it should be managed that a manuscript copy of the decision be forwarded to the prothonotary at Halifax. Then a copy of the decision could be had there, and these difficulties would be surmounted. I hope the Government will take this question into consideration, as it affects the profession in Nova Scotia very seriously.

Mr. HESSON. In view of the statement made by the hon. gentleman, I would draw attention to one point. The same gentleman who is paid $2,000 a year as précis writer is also in receipt of $100 for reporting cases for law journals and a further sum of $820 for law books, supplied I suppose by that gentleman. I think that ought to be taken into consideration. It appears to me to be an extraordinary charge, in connection with the fact just stated by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that he was to be entitled to $2,000 as the extreme limit of his salary, and yet he is allowed $100 for supplying reports, I suppose as part of his duties. He is paid $850 for books supplied and other services; and now an additional item is included in the Supplementary Estimates for the current year.

Mr. BLAKE. As to the $820, my recollection is that we voted last year a sum for the purchase of a portion of the library of the late Chief Justice Duval, for the use of the judges of the Supreme Court, and I presume that is what is referred to. I do not recollect about the $100 item the hon. gentleman speaks of, and therefore I can say nothing about it. The difficulty the hon. gentleman from Pictou

has mentioned, is one which is of considerable importance. I may say to him—he may not know it, but it is true—that the bar of the other Provinces has some interest in the question of reports from the Supreme Court. He seemed to imagine that it affected only Nova Scotia.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not know enough about the other Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. He will observe that there is no special delay with reference to the Nova Scotia cases, and the general delay affects the bar of the other Provinces as much as that of Nova Scotia. I do not think the remedy he proposes is the fit one. I suppose any practitioner who is interested in a cause can obtain a manuscript copy of the judgment by paying a fee for it, and to require that the copies of all judgments—some are very long, too long in my opinion; I am not speaking of the Supreme Court alone, but the judgments, generally, of judges, have grown very long of latter days—should be supplied, would be an expensive thing, and we could not, I am afraid, decide that it would be a special remedy for Nova Scotia. It would have to go everywhere. I think the difficulty is one that ought to be got over by some effort to obtain an earlier issue of the Supreme Court reports than has hitherto occurred. I cannot say where the fault lies. I fancy, to some extent, perhaps, it is in the circumstances that there is a habit of giving a great number of judgments in each case. Almost every judge gives a judgment, and then we all know that it is difficult to get the proofs, the devises of their judgments from all the judges, and that probably makes the delay all the greater, when you have six judges to handle in place of only three. I do not know if it is in that, or in the printing office, or in the officer; but however it may be, the hon. member is perfectly right in saying there has been too great a delay in the issue of the reports; and perhaps this conversation and a suggestion by the hon. gentleman who has this item in charge, to the Minister of Justice, may produce some explanation upon Concurrence. We would not tolerate such a delay at all in the publication, in the Province from which I come, with reference to our own provincial reports. There we have a system of check by the bar society. The law society publishes the reports, the reporters are under its control, there is a committee which looks after the reports, and it is necessary for the reporters to present certain certificates, and the work is kept up, I do not say quite satisfactorily, but it is kept abreast pretty nearly as well as you can expect; perhaps in two or three months you get the reports out. I know there are cases which have been some years here; I believe we are measurably more than a year behind with Supreme Court decisions. We have no right, I may say, to expect that all the decisions will be reported. There may be decisions which are very important for the litigants, which involve a large sum of money, but which may not involve any general principle, and we must not expect that they will encumber the volume of report, unless some general principle of law, which may be a guide, and which may be useful in other cases, is evolved by the decision. I would therefore be sorry to say that every decision by the Supreme Court should be reported, but I quite agree that we ought to get an earlier report than we do.

Mr. TUPPER. I wish to disavow any selfish object in having referred only to the Nova Scotia bar. I spoke from a provincial point of view, because I was not sufficiently familiar with the circumstances in other Provinces. I disagree with the leader of the Opposition in one matter. I think that all decisions ought to be reported. One reason I have heard given for not reporting some of the causes appealed, is that the case involved questions of fact or turned mainly on questions of fact, and therefore it was unwise to publish it. But that is a very nice question often. whether it is a question of fact or a question of law, and the court from which the appeal was taken may have decided, and often has decided, the question to be a question of law, when the Supreme Court has decided that it mainly turned on the facts. In a question of that kind, it would be well to know how the Supreme Court reached the decision. As to one's being able to obtain copies of the decision on application, I want to say a word to fortify the position I have taken in bringing this matter to the attention of the Government. I do not want to reflect upon Mr. Duval in the slightest degree, because I know nothing to the contrary of his being a very efficient officer and a good reporter. He may have many difficulties—some mentioned by the leader of the Opposition—difficulties in getting manuscript from the judges themselves. Whatever the difficulties may be, I know applications have been made to Mr. Duval not only by members of the bar, but by members of the bench, for the manuscript copy of decisions given in causes affecting Nova Scotia cases, and it has been found impossible, in several cases, to obtain those copies.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that ought not to be. I think the Minister of Justice, on application, will probably cause such a communication to be made as that the manuscripts will be in the possession of the officer of the court, and that a rule of court will pass that copies should be available on payment of the prescribed fee. But I think that is only a partial remedy, and that we ought to see a more expeditious printing of the reports.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The attention of the Minister of Justice will be called to this conversation.

LEGISLATION.

House of Commons.

	To provide for payment of the deductions from the Sessional indemnity of Mr. M. Catudal..	$112 00
	To provide for the increase of salary of ten clerks, viz.: one, $200; eight, $100 each; one, $50	1,050 00
	To provide for the salary of an assistant clerk of stationery and assistant proof-reader	600 00
	To provide for the difference of salary of one junior clerk at $1,000, 1883-84, and two junior clerks, 1884-85: one at $300, and one at $600	400 00
	To provide for the increase of two permanent sessional clerks, at $100 each	200 00
307	To cover additional amount required for stationery	2,500 00
	To meet additional expenditure in connection with the publication of the Debates (increase of staff and additional number of copies of Debates issued to members)	16,144 00
	To meet additional expenditure in connection with the sessional messengers of the House, viz.: increase of allowance from $200 to $250 per Session to 37 messengers	1,850 00
	To meet additional amount required for contingencies, housekeeper's department	200 00

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

	To provide for the statutory increase to the salary of this officer	50 00

Mr. BLAKE. This item of $112 to pay the Sessional indemnity to Mr. Catudal is a vote of a similiar character to several passed already. In reference to a conversation that took place the other evening, it has been intimated to me that during last Seession of Parliament an hon. member who became a member by virtue of a decision of the Supreme Court in an election trial in the course of the Session, received the full Sessional indemnity. If this is so, it is not according to law.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was not by a special vote of Parliament but must have been done by the accountant.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the same law ought to be applied to all members of Parliament alike, with reference to these

exceptions from the general law. In this particular case, one hon. member was representing a constituency of the Dominion for a certain portion of the Session. The law provides that when a member is a member for part of the Session he receives pay on a certain principle, but another member who is a member for part of the Session receives pay on another principle. This gentleman received, of course, his proportion of the pay, and the other hon. gentleman, although a member for only a portion of the Session, received the whole Sessional indemnity, and that without a vote of Parliament. Now, it is apt to create a feeling of natural discontent when one finds the law strained in one case and an hon. member paid for the whole Session when he has not been here the whole Session.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the case of Mr. Robertson.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In that case the Internal Economy Commission made an order that he should be paid the full indemnity, because he had been in attendance from the first day of the Session.

Mr. BLAKE. He was in attendance, not as a member of Parliament but as a suitor before the court. He was a member of this House for only part of that Session, and until the period at which that return came down, and when he took his seat here another hon. gentleman was member for that constituency, Mr. Jenkins, and the Internal Economy Commission violated the law, and took money without the warrant of Parliament when they ordered this payment to be made. If it was intended to make this payment it should have been put in the Estimates and then it could have been discussed.

Mr. MILLS. I think in all these cases we ought to have a report from the accountant laid before the House regularly, of the amount of allowance received as Sessional indemnity, and the amount of mileage. There is no more reason why the accounts of the accountant should be kept secret than any other portion of the public expenditure. I think the public are entitled to know this, and we have a right to know precisely how that portion of the public funds are administered.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The increase in the salary of ten clerks really corresponds to the statutory increase that is made in the other Departments. This Department, as the hon. gentleman knows, is not regulated by the Civil Service Act, and there are no statutory increases. These gentlemen who have increases have been very long in service in the House, and their present salaries are very moderate indeed.

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:45 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT—GOOD FRIDAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the First Minister, I beg to move that, when the House adjourns this day, it remains adjourned until Saturday next, at three o'clock, and that Government Orders have precedence on that day.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SCRIVER, in moving that the Third Report of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament be adopted, said: This report only contains the substance of the first report, referred back to the Committee for reconsideration, less that portion referring to the transferrence of the law books from the Library of Parliament to the Library of the Supreme Court, that portion being omitted.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

MANITOBA AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to make a free grant of not more than 6,400 acres per mile in Manitoba, and 12,800 acres in the North-West Territories, in aid of the construction of a railway from Manitoba to the Hudson's Bay.

Mr. BLAKE. Make it Saturday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why not to-day?

Mr. BLAKE. Because the rules of the House say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the rule when it is a vote of money, but this is not a vote of money.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the same thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, on Saturday.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the northern boundary of Manitoba just now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really cannot tell my hon. friend unless I look at the Statute. It is a parallel of latitude, I think, but I forget.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Sir JOHN A. MACDOALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend "The Liquor License Act, 1883," in several respects, and especially as to the time for applying for and taking out licenses, as to the appointment of Commissioners and as to legal proceedings enacted and the penalties imposed by the Act, and by providing that any deficiency in the license fund, in respect of expenses, may be made good out of moneys voted by Parliament for the purpose.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would move that the Committee adopt the Resolution *pro forma*, as discussion really only can take place on the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. We would like to know what it is now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well. Owing to the special circumstances that exist in British Columbia it is proposed to make an amendment with regard to the Commissioners, and to have the Warden of the county one of them, and another shall be both Warden and Mayor. In Chicoutimi, Saguenay, Gaspé and Bonaventure, where there is no organised machinery, the Governor in Council is to appoint the Commissioner. The clause in the Act providing that the licenses should be on stamped paper was considered inconvenient and is repealed. It is proposed to extend the time for the application of licenses till the 15th of May, and in British Columbia until the 15th of June. It is proposed that in case of application for hotel, saloon or shop license by a person who is not a holder of a license and for premises not then licensed, the petition shall be accompanied by a certificate signed by one-third of the electors of the polling district in which the premises is situated. There is a necessity for an amendment of the clause which provides that every hotel shall be a separate building, and that no other shops of any kind shall be attached to it. It is found that cuts off the Windsor Hotel, the Rossin

House, the Russell and a number of other houses, where the ground floor is occupied by shops, although they are separate establishments. There is a number of suggestions made which it would be no object for the Committee to learn now, inasmuch as they will have the Bill before them immediately for the purpose of amending the Act and making it more workable. It is also proposed to make a change in the clause which was introduced by an hon. member from Quebec respecting the practice in municipalities up to the time of Confederation. It is proposed that all those by-laws which were carried out in consequence of the law which obtained before Confederation and were not repealed, shall be in force, up to the time of the passage of this Act. After full consideration it is not proposed to put in a clause doing away with the penalties by enactment. Most of the penalties are for breach of the terms of which the party is licensed; of course, those cannot be done away with, and the only other penalties will be for not taking out a Dominion license. Well, as it was stated here the other day in discussion on the point, it is settled that there will be an immediate reference to the Supreme Court to decide upon the constitutionality of the Act, and the Government have determined that they will remit all fines, and of necessity exercise the power of Parliament on—they will remit all fines and penalties where parties are prosecuted for not having taken out a Dominion license before the constitutionality of the Act has been decided. Those are the principal provisions in the Bill which will be founded on these Resolutions. It is proposed to strike out the last part of this Resolution, namely: "And by providing that any deficiency in the license fund in respect to expenses may be made good out of moneys voted by Parliament for the purpose." I move the adoption of the Resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state how many clauses there are in the proposed Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are nineteen.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has dealt very fairly by the House in some respects with this measure. We had before us this Resolution of the hon. gentleman with reference to making a charge upon funds to be voted by Parliament, or of expenses for carrying out the Act, and the motion in the Estimates was referred to. I pointed out that if salaries were to be assigned, &c, it should be done by Statute, and we certainly understood it was to be done by Statute. Now, the hon. gentleman says, "I have got a vote in the Estimates for $10,000," a bulk sum with reference to which no explanation has been made, and we certainly expected that that would be done in the Bill which ought properly to be done, full explanations being made, and a full provision being made, in the clause for the expenditure of public money. We are not to have an opportunity, according to the hon. gentleman's proposal, to strike out the clause, of learning what the disposition of the public funds is to be, who is to be paid, at what rate, and from what source; but a vote in the Estimates is to be taken. The hon. gentleman knows that this is not the proper way of paying salaries under the Bill; and this clause proves it, because he proposes to introduce among other amendments to the Bill this very clause providing for the payment of those moneys, but he now proposes to strike out the clause, and leave Parliament without any opportunity of considering, of being informed, and of confirming the disposition of the money with respect to the salaries. In another respect the hon. gentleman is not dealing fairly by the House. The motion of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), was defeated by the amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Public Works, which amendment was sustained by a Ministerial statement upon the faith of which the House was asked to act, and that was that these penalties would be suspended and that provision would be made for an appeal to the Privy Council or the Supreme Court. Now the hon. gentleman says that after full consideration he proposes not to suspend the penalties, not to keep faith with the House, not to do that which he pledged he would do, and which was the means of inducing the House to accept his amendment to the motion of the hon. member for Maskinongé. It is now proposed to do something very different, to give an intimation in Parliament that in case any man is prosecuted, and in case the penalties are imposed, the Government will exercise the power of the Crown to remit them. But that leaves the dealer subject to prosecution—it leaves him liable to payment of the costs of prosecution—it leaves him still open to the expense, annoyance, and trouble of prosecution in the meantime. It is different in substance as well as in form from the course which the hon. gentleman told the House he would follow. The hon. gentleman minimises another statement. He says arrangements will be made—we do not know how, or with whom—for a reference. When the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) said that arrangements would be made, I asked how? Of course, he said, for a reference to the Supreme Court per Bill; and that answer was repeated by the hon. Minister when my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made a similar enquiry as to how the reference would be made, the hon. gentleman stating that provision would be made by Bill. But the Bill does not contain any provision for the reference, which is yet essential in order to the proper treatment of the question. The mode which the hon. gentleman announced in that discussion as that which would be provided in order to obtain a decision on the constitutional question is therefore not to be followed up, and some other mode—we know not what, we know not how, we know not with whom—is to be adopted for a reference to the Supreme Court. But the Supreme Court is not the final tribunal. It cannot finally dispose of the case. It may be a convenient thing to obtain the opinion of the Supreme Court; but the question will not be settled by it. In many cases, as we know, that court has unfortunately erred in the interpretation of the law, and any individual may take the case to the Privy Council, and the decision of the Supreme Court may be reversed, as some of its decisions have been reversed. Nothing will be satisfactory except the decision of the court of ultimate resort, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman's statement that he does not propose—although he said he was going to propose by Bill—for a reference to the court of ultimate resort, is also very unsatisfactory. I was not able to gather what the hon. gentleman said with respect to special changes in the Province of Quebec. So far as I could judge, it is something rather minimising, or altering the effect of the clause passed last Session; but as to that I am unable to form an opinion. Then the hon. gentleman said it was proposed to extend the period for taking out licenses to 15th May; but he did not tell us why. What is the reason for the extension? The hon. gentleman has proposed an alteration in the law, but he has not given the House the least reason for proposing the alteration. Then the hon. gentleman said there was an infinity of amendments to be proposed, but he afterwards corrected that statement, and said there was a large number, with which he would not trouble us now. We heard a good deal last Session about this Act being a perfect piece of legislation; the labours of the Committee were spoken of as reflecting the greatest credit on the Committee, and the Ministerial party took the sole responsibility for the legislation, and declared it was a most excellent and admirable Act. The Act has not yet come into practical operation, yet we are told by the hon. Minister that there is proposed an infinity of amendments, perhaps not an infinity, but a great variety of amendments. Under these circumstances I regret that the hon. gentleman has postponed to the dying hours of the Session the very first stage of this

measure; that we are now told that we are practically to have but very little opportunity for considering the Bill, after it is printed and distributed; and in the proposal as regards the several respects to which I have referred, the hon. gentleman has fallen, I think, very far short indeed of fulfilling the expectations that he held out to the House, nay, of the pledges which he and his colleague gave to the House upon the occasion of the former debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no pledge broken in this case. I told the hon. gentleman that the Bill would contain all the amendments required. I stated that instead of the penalties being suspended, the Crown would exercise its undoubted right to remit all the penalties. That is the most speedy, efficient and satisfactory way of acting, because the moment it is known that the Government will remit all the penalties, that moment no penalties will be sought by any informer. With regard to the minimising of the arrangements made, this is not so, on the contrary they are enlarged and made more workable. Under the original Act passed last year the time for applying for Dominion licenses was limited to 1st March. The Act did not come into force until 1st January; the machinery could not go into force; and the time was found too short to enable persons to put in applications. Under these circumstances, and in consequence of the time for receiving the applications being extexded, the time for issuing the licenses has been extended also. As regards the work of ascertaining the constitutionality of the Act, how that can be done by Bill I do not understand. It can be done only one or two ways. First, by a reference by the Crown under the special power it possesses to refer any question of law to the Supreme Court; and second, by proceeding by way of appeal. The first mode can only be followed by a reference by the Crown, and it is proposed to invite all the Provinces to appear by counsel and discuss the constitutionality of the measure. If by way of appeal, this can only be done by the ordinary mode. I do not propose—I do not think it is the duty of the Government of Canada—to ignore the existence of the Supreme Court, a tribunal created by itself and called into effect by this Parliament. We should give due credence to our own court. The motion moved in amendment by the hon. Minister of Public Works was to remit the question as to the constitutionality of the Act to the Supreme Court, or to the Privy Council, or both. The Government are quite ready to have the question submitted at once, and to one court after the other, either by asking Her Majesty to submit the question to the Privy Council, or by this Government asking the Supreme Court to answer certain questions, or it may be raised in the ordinary mode by way of appeal. I hope this discussion will be allowed to stand until the Bill is before us, when the House will be better able to discuss it.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 143) to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883.

Bill read the first time.

THE JUDICIARY OF MANITOBA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient that a salary of $4,000 be provided for an additional Puisné Judge of the Queen's Bench in the Province of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Last Session the Province of Manitoba passed an Act providing for two additional Puisné Judges. The Bill provides that three Judges shall form a quorum, but after full consideration the Government have resolved not to ask for a salary for more than one Puisné Judge. The statement is very strong from Manitoba that the business of the court is getting hopelessly in arrear; I do not know whether it is from the litigious character of the people up there, or the numerous questions involved in contracts created by the sale of property and such matters during the boom. It is considered that it does not at all follow that there will be permanently such an amount of business as is now before the courts, but under the circumstances the Government thought it right and proper to apply to Parliament for the salary of only one additional Judge. The Act of Manitoba which I hold in my hand was passed in July, 1883, and it provides that the Court of Queen's Bench shall consist of a Chief Justice and four Puisné Judges, and the second clause provides that three or more Judges shall constitute the court. If we provide a salary for one Judge, there wil be a court of four, so that they can always have a quorum of three. The suggestion that we thought it our duty to make to the Province was this: that they should increase the jurisdiction of their County Court Judges, instead of increasing indefinitely the number of Superior Court Judges. As I understand the jurisdiction of the County Court Judges in Manitoba is not not at all so extensive as that which obtains in Ontario, where it is found that the ordinary business of any kind in the county, can be well conducted by the County Court Judges at less expense, with less delay, and with greater satisfaction to the interests of justice. I have no doubt they will accept the proposition, and that next Session they will increase the jurisdiction of the County Court Judges, and thus relieve to a considerable extent the pressure on the Court of superior jurisdiction. It is to be remembered, however, that the business of the courts in Manitoba is not confined to litigation arising in that Province only. It is provided that there is an appeal in certain cases, for a particular amount, or of particular importance, from the decision of the Stipendiary Magistrates in the North-West who are Judges, to the courts in Manitoba, and this greatly increases their business. At all events it is quite certain that they are not able to overtake the work, and therefore it is thought well that we should grant the salary for one additional Judge.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is quite impossible, except for those who are charged with the responsibility of enquiring into these matters, to form any definite opinion excepting this, that it is obvious to us all that the business of Manitoba has largely increased. Whether or not that increase will be maintained is a matter as to which the hon. gentleman expressed an opinion, which it is perhaps difficult to verify. But I suppose he has satisfied himself—I have not looked at the Provincial Statutes—that the appointment of one judge will make the Statute workable in all respects, that it will not require an alteration in the Statute to make the judicial system there complete, and that the details as to the circuits, &c., are such as can be worked with four judges instead of five. I do not mean to say that it necessarily follows that if they are not we should appoint five judges; but it is a question of whether there shall be immediate relief or not. The question with reference to the mode in which the judicial system of Manitoba can best be managed is one which it would be very difficult to answer just now. I think it will be prudent in the present condition of the Province, and until we know in what direction particularly the population spreads, to adopt as a temporary measure at any rate, the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and rather enlarge the jurisdiction of the inferior tribunals than appoint Superior Court Judges, until the Province settles down to something like its normal condition, when we will be able to see what is best suited to it. But

there is no doubt a very large area of territory, and there will, I think, be a necessity for a greater decentralization in certain sections in the administration of justice. I would not have it supposed that I am a friend of decentralization —I believe that is bad for the country—but there will be a necessity of having justice administered nearer every man's door in minor cases, probably than we can at present have, whether by Superior or County Court Judges. I do not make any further observations on the hon. gentleman's proposal, but I would make this enquiry, whether it is proposed to carry out for Manitoba the principle that prevails in the other Provinces, and it seems to me that that Province is now ripe for its adoption, that the Judges shall be chosen from the members of the local bar?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first point mentioned by the hon. gentleman struck me the moment this matter was proposed by the Minister of Justice, viz., whether, when the Act was passed for another Judge, we should not disorganize the whole Court, seeing that we only provide a salary for one Judge. I called his attention to that difficulty in the sense in which the hon. gentleman has spoken. The Minister of Justice is not himself satisfied that the appointment of one Judge will leave the Court thoroughly organized to work. As to the selection of the Judges from the local bar, that will engage the consideration of the Government when they are able to consider, on the report of the Minister of Justice, the appointment of an additional Judge under the Act which will be founded on this Resolution.

Resolution to be reported.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed Resolution (page 1444), respectiag subsidies to railway companies of Canada, said: Mr. Speaker, at this late period of the Session, I propose to condense into as brief a space as I possibly can the observations that it is necessary for me to make in regard to the very important Resolutions that are now submitted for the consideration of the House. I need not say, Sir, that all countries recognize the construction of railways as one of the greatest, probably the greatest and most important, means of promoting the advancement and progress of a country; and I need not say here that Canada is not behind the rest of the world in that regard—that in no part of the world is the important factor, that the construction of railways affords, more thoroughly recognized than it has been in Canada where the efforts that have been made within the last few years—the very great efforts—I think I may say the unequalled efforts, that Canada has made to span this continent from ocean to ocean, will compare favourably with any that have been made for the development and advancement of any country. The House, I think, will agree with me when I say that the Province of British Columbia — because I will begin on the Pacific coast — has not been neglected in the provision made for railway construction. We have not only provided for the rapid completion of our great national work, the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the Harbour of Port Moody at Burrard Inlet, but we have during the present Session also made provision for extending a line of railway from Nanaimo down to the Harbour of Victoria, thus providing very fully and efficiently for the development of that section of this great Dominion. Then, Sir, I need not remind the House that the great North-West, which but yestesday was a trackless desert, is now not only spanned with a line of railway throughout its entire length, from the boundary of Ontario to the boundary of British Columbia, but that, in addition, arrangements have been made—in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by aid furnished by the Government—for the construction of branches connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway with very important and leading sections of country. The Resolution which my right hon. friend has just submitted to the consideration of the House provides for an additional outlet for the great North-West—provides for an enormous grant of land as a free subsidy and contribution to promote the construction of a line of railway from Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay, with the view of obtaining an additional outlet for several months of the year for that great country. The appropriation of 6,400 acres of land per mile within the Province of Manitoba, and 12,800 acres of land per mile outside of that Province, to aid in the construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway is an evidence to the world of the great importance that the Government attach—and, when the Resolution passes, as I have no doubt it will pass, by the common consent of this House—of the value this Parliament attach, to affording every possible facility for the development of the great North-West. Nor need I remind the House that, in the carrying out of this great work of an inter-oceanic railway, we have provided for the rapid construction of no less than 650 miles of road from Port Arthur to Callander, involving the expenditure within the Province of Ontario of over $20,000,000 in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, Sir, my hon. friend who preceded me in the office which I have now the honour to hold, obtained from Parliament authority to give $12,000 per mile as a subsidy for a road from Callander to Pembroke, as a link to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway down in this direction, to connect it with the Canada Central Railway at Pembroke, involving an additional expenditure for that service of $1,400,000. The House is also aware that this Parliament has provided, during last Session and the preceding Session, for a subsidy of $12,000 per mile for 110 miles of road, from Callander to Gravenhurst, to connect the great cities of Ontario and the Great Lakes with the Canadian Pacific Railway, by the shortest, and most practicable and best line that could be obtained; and I hope to be able, before this House rises, to lay upon the Table of the House a contract, made with a company incorporated for the purpose and acting in conjunction with the Northern and North-Western Railway Company—a contract for the prompt undertaking and completion of that work, so as to have it practically open in the early season of 1886, by the time the Canadian Pacific Railway will be completed. That embraces an expenditure within the Province of Ontario of some $22,760,000 in connection with the construction of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway lying between Port Arthur and Callander between Callander and Pembroke and between Callander, and Gravenhurst. We now come to the Province of Quebec; and I may say no person in this House will question for a moment the fact that if provision had not been made by the Province of Quebec for the construction of a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, this House would have regarded, the country would have regarded, the Canadian Pacific Railway as entirely incomplete, and would have been prepared to deal with that branch of the question just as our hon. friends opposite dealt with the question of connecting the Canada Central from Pembroke to Callander, by an appropriation of a sum of money sufficient to accomplish the purpose. The fact that the Government of Quebec anticipated that action, the fact that the Government of Quebec have since Confederation expended from their own treasury a sum, I believe, of over $14,000,000 in the construction of railways within the Province of Quebec, instead of diminishing their claim to consideration at this late hour, strengthens it, I think, very much; this fact increases the strength of their position in approaching the Government as they have done and asking to be recouped a fair amount of that money and to be placed relatively in somewhat the same position as that which they would have occupied if

they had not been so forward to promote that which is admitted on all sides to be the great national work of this country. Under these circumstances, the Government of Quebec, having contributed, as I say, over $14,000,000 in railway construction in that portion of the Dominion, came to this Government with a claim for fair and just consideration as regarded that section of the railway construction which they had engaged in and completed and which might fairly be regarded as a portion of the great inter-oceanic line of railway connecting, in fact, across the entire Continent, through Canadian territory, the two oceans. After full and fair consideration of the proposals that were made and of the fact that they had exhausted the resources of the Province of Quebec in this effort, this successful effort, to construct this most important link of the great national work, the Government came to the conclusion that the Government of Quebec were entitled to a grant of $12,000 per mile for that portion of the road that had already become a link and a section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that portion lying between the City of Montreal and Ottawa; and as regarded the other portion, the only hesitation, the only doubt that existed as to the propriety of expending the $12,000 per mile from Montreal to the Harbour of Quebec arose from the fact that the Government of Quebec had parted with that portion of the railway, and that, at this moment, it did not afford that short and unrestricted line of communication for the Canadian Pacific Railway to make the Harbour of Quebec that which it is believed, in the interest of the whole of this country, it is desirable it should be made, namely, the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Under these circumstances, it was thought judicious to appropriate $6,000 per mile to the Government of Quebec for that portion of the line extending from Montreal to the Harbour of Quebec, and to ask Parliament for an appropriation for an equal amount $6,000 a mile for the purpose of ensuring the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its present terminus at Montreal to the Harbour of Quebec; and the Resolution states very explicitely the mode in which that appropriation will be used. I may now say that the amount embraced in these Resolutions for the extension of what may be called the national line of railway from the shores of the Pacific to Quebec, and its exteension from Quebec to the Maritime Provinces also embraces a connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the international boundary. It is proposed to ask for a subsidy for sixty miles of railway, extending from Quebec and covering the distance from Beauce Junction on the Quebec Central to the international boundary, which will add the sum of $211,200; this will make an appropriation, under these Resolutions, for the purpose of obtaining the shortest inter-oceanic line of communication from Quebec and through Quebec to the Canadian Pacific Railway proper at Ottawa, of $3,565,200. Then a very strong feeling has grown up in the Maritime Provinces, and not only in the Maritime Provinces but throughout Canada, because, I believe, that from British Columbia down through the North-West Territories, through the Province of Ontario, and in the Province of Quebec, there has been a strong and general sentiment that this great inter-oceanic line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be incomplete if we were obliged to have our Atlantic terminus in a foreign country. I believe that sentiment is not at all confined to the Province of Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, or the Province of New Brunswick, but I believe it has taken just as deep a hold of the minds of our friends in the other Provinces almost as it has in the Maritime Provinces. Although every effort has been made to render the operation of the Intercolonial Railway as successful as possible, although more has been accomplished in the development of the country, in the development of the trade and business of the country through the agency

of the Intercolonial Railway than any person on either side of this House a few years ago supposed to be possible, still we have found we were too heavily handicapped by the distance, and that we could not—reluctantly as we were driven to the conclusion, we have been driven to the conclusion, by the force of circumstances and by the practical results, that it is impossible for the ports of St. John and Halifax to compete with the nearer ports of Portland and Boston, in the United States. Under these circumstances, the attention of the Government has been drawn, as I have said on one or two occasions before in this House, to the best means by which we might secure a realization of that which we all desire, the Atlantic terminus being in Canadian territory as well as the Pacific terminus, and thus be placed in a position to fairly compete for the great transcontinental trade and traffic that we all know must flow over that line. Although that may involve the necessity of passing for a certain portion of that line through a foreign country, we believe that even that is a comparatively insignificant point compared with the great importance of having the ocean ports both on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts within the borders of our own country, and using the trade and business of that great railway to build up great ports and points of communication for the traffic of the eastern and western world, for the purpose of practically extending the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal, its present terminus, to St. Andrew's, St. John, Halifax and Sydney, it is proposed to ask a subsidy of $200,000 per annum for fifteen years, in addition to the present subsidies that have been voted on a portion of that line, being the extention to Sydney, of $180,000. That amount of $200,000 per annum for fifteen years capitalized at 5 per cent. represents about $2,075,932. Add the amount of subsides granted during the last two Sessions for the same purpose, and you have $2,555,932, and it is proposed to give in addition to that, the 80 miles of railway from New Glasgow to Sydney, recently acquired, as the House is aware, under the authority of Parliament, provision for the acquisition of which has been made by the Legislature of Nova Scotia and the legislative action of this Parliament. It is true we paid $1,200,000 for that road and the Pictou Branch, but the House is quite aware that that it was not because it formed any portion of our policy to acquire the railway from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso. The object of that appropriation was to enable us to obtain back into the possession of Canada the fifty miles of railway between Truro and Pictou, that had cost the Province of Nova Scotia over $2,000,000 to build—I think about $2,200,000, if I remember rightly at this moment, but certainly not less. Under that appropriation, we obtained back that which it was found necessary, in the interest of the whole country, we should obtain and retain, that is that portion of the Intercolonial Railway extending from Truro to Pictou. The eighty miles from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, as was frankly admitted in this House, we did not expect to derive any large return from, but it was acquired in connection with the acquisition of that portion which was found to be very important, and indeed essential in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway. I have stated the position in which this question stands from its national and larger point of view, and I believe I may confidently rely not only upon the kind support of our friends on this side of the House for carrying out a measure which has been considered by the Government in all its aspects and in all its bearings, with a view to the promotion of the best interests of the country, but I believe I can rely with equal confidence upon the support of gentlemen opposite in carrying out what we all recognize as most important, making a complete line of communication through Canada, and enabling us to have the great ocean termini, on the Atlantic as well as on the Pacific, within our own borders. The result of this short line railway will

be to bring the port of St. Andrew's, which is not only an admirable harbour, but the port of all the ports in Canada the nearest to Montreal, within 377 miles of Montreal, and I believe that is only seventy-seven or seventy-eight miles further than it is from Montreal to Portland.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How much?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is about 299 miles from Montreal to Portland, and this will bring St. Andrew's within 377 miles, which will be about seventy-eight miles only further from Montreal than the port of Portland is; and my hon. friend will see that, if we could make a gallant struggle as we have made, to carry the traffic for Montreal and Toronto over the Intercolonial Railway, handicapped as we have been by such an enormous disparity of distance, if we can get a port in Canada within seventy-eight miles as near as Portland is, and a better port than Portland is to-day, and from fifty to 100 miles nearer to Liverpool than Portland, we have not only a fair prospect, but a perfect assurance that we will have within our own territory a Canadian terminus for the great Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, the port of St. John, which comes next in point of proximity to Montreal, will be brought within 427 miles, the port of Halifax will be brought within 672 miles, and it is found practicable to obtain a line which will bring the port of Sydney under the effect of this subvention, within 774 miles. There will thus be saved in the present distance from Montreal to Sydney, 219 miles, in the distance from Montreal to Halifax, 173 miles, and the distance to St. John will be reduced 159 miles. I have only to read these figures to the House, I think, in order to show that the Government, in asking for this aid in extending practically the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, involving as it will the transport of the traffic of both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway down to our own coasts and our own ports in the Maritime Provinces, are asking aid which will, without any question, assure the completion of that work. I have already stated that it is proposed that this shall not only be the shortest line to Montreal but the shortest line to Quebec, that the provision asked for by these Resolutions from Beauce Junction to the international boundary will bring Quebec by the shortest line that can be obtained to the ports of St. Andrew's, St. John, Halifax and Sydney, and I am assured by the gentlemen who are connected with the Quebec Central Railway, that the subsidy which is provided in these Resolutions, with such aid as the Province of Quebec has already given to that work, will ensure the prompt construction of that line. In fact, I believe that, within a very brief period —I have stated four years as the term in these Resolutions —this line of communication will be perfected, and we will have the satisfaction of finding that we have the complete realization of our hopes and expectations in reference to the transcontinental traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway being brought down to our own ports. The House is aware that I have on former occasions discussed the propriety of this Government giving subsidies to local lines of railway. The questions with which I have been dealing up to this point, of course, are based upon broad and national considerations. They are founded upon a policy that is recognized and has been recognized from the first as the first duty we owed to our country, and that is to obtain by the construction of a national line of railway the closest possible intercommunication between one section of our country and another. The great disadvantage under which Canada has laboured, if it may be regarded as a disadvantage, was the remoteness of important sections of our common country from one another, and we have all regarded it as a first duty we owed to the country to endeavour to remove and obviate that as far as possible by diminishing the distance between all the important points of communication in the several sections of our country, thus bringing them as closely as we could together. Not only commercially but socially, the greatest possible advantage may be fairly expected from shortening the distance of intercommunication between the great commercial centres of the country and the outlying portions of it. I may say, however, that I rest the application to Parliament for aid to lines of railway that may be, to some extent, regarded as local, upon different considerations and upon other grounds; I rested my application to Parliament for the aid that was asked two Sessions ago, last Session and this Session upon the the broad principle that the construction of railways, wherever found to be practicable is the surest and best means for the development of the country; that the Government of the country, whoever they may be, will always find that there are no means of so surely and so successfully promoting the development and expansion of the country as by giving such facility and such aid as may be in our power to the construction of important lines of railway that are required to develop the resources of the country, and by giving a certain amount of aid for that purpose. Now, Sir, if I were proposing to this House to enter upon the construction of purely local lines of railway, apart from the agency of private capital, I should feel that it was a proposition that might fairly be challenged. But, Sir, I believe that the small amount of aid which we are asking for the construction of these local lines of railway, if judiciously apportioned and applied only where there is every possible reason to expect that the construction of those sections of railway will give such an impetus to the development of the country as will increase the trade and business of the country—I think, under these circumstances we may fairly anticipate that the indirect advantage to the Government in the increase of revenue derived from the increase of trade and business, will give a full return for the aid judiciously expended that was asked in the Resolutions of former Sessions, and is now asked for the lines of railway that may be to some extent regarded as local lines. I admit this is a policy that will have to be most carefully guarded; I admit it is a policy that will require the greatest possible care and consideration in the appropriation of aid, and in restricting it only to such roads as the Government have reason to believe that small amount of aid will place upon a commercial basis along with the aid of private resources and private capital, and such roads as will secure such a development, and such increased prosperity for the country as will fairly warrant the Government in anticipating that it will be done without any increased charge to the country. I say, Sir, if the appropriation of $3,200 per mile will draw into our country the additional capital that may be required to construct the railway, if it is applied in such a way and on such local lines as are adapted for great development, I say the Government may fairly anticipate that they will create no additional charge, because they will find that the policy will be attended with a corresponding increase of revenue that will equal, if not overbalance, the amount that will be charged against that appropriation, and under these circumstances I think the House will regard it as a wise and judicious policy within these limits. I will now briefly draw attention to the roads that it is proposed in these Resolutions to provide for, in addition to those I have already referred to. It is proposed to give a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $160,000, to the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company for a line of railway from the Victoria Branch of the Midland Railway to the Village of Bancroft, in the township of Dungannon, County of Hastings. Now, Sir, I am instructed, and I have taken pains to get the best information I could in regard to it, that the construction of that fifty miles of railway will open up one of the most valuable districts to be found within the bounds of Ontario. We know

that the Governments of Ontario and Quebec have subsidised very liberally numerous lines of railway, and have pursued this policy to the utmost limit of their ability. So I say that the construction of this link of fifty miles will intersect one of the most valuable iron and timber districts to be found, perhaps, in the whole Province of Ontario. I may say here at the outset that this $2,300 a mile will never be expended, every dollar of it will reman in the Treas ury forever, so far as these resolutions are concerned, unless that section of country is sufficiently tempting to commercial enterprise, unless the advantages of constructing a railway there are sufficiently tempting to induce capitalists to come forward and furnish the large amount of money that will be necessary to enable them to obtain the advantage of this subsidy; because it is only as sections of ten miles of railway are constructed, and only after agreement has been made with responsible parties for the purpose of insuring the construction of the whole line that a single dollar is taken from the Treasury under these Resolutions. I have no reason to believe, from what I have learned, that this line will not only afford facilities for an immense traffic in iron ore, but from the character of the country, from the character of the forests in that section of the country there is every reason to believe that the construction of this road will lead to the establishment of blast furnaces and the manufacture upon a large scale of charcoal iron. Then, Sir, these Resolutions ask for the appropriation of $32,000 a mile, or a sum not exceeding in the whole $272,000, for 85 miles of railway from Aylmer to Pembroke, provided the Ottawa River is crossed within the County of Pontiac at some point not east of Lapasse. I believe there has been a very great desire on the part of the inhabitants that that section should be opened up by a line of railway communication, and with such favour did the Government of the Province of Quebec view that undertaking, and so important did they consider it for the development of that Province, that they have offered a subsidy of no less than $6,000 a mile for the eighty-five miles between Aylmer and Pembroke. It was found, however, that that subsidy was not sufficient to provide for the construction of this line of railway, and the efforts that were made to carry it through had come to a sudden collapse. But it is believed that a line affording to that large section of country a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Pembroke, will be attended with great advantage in the development of that section of country. Then, Sir, it is proposed to ask for a subsidy to the Gatineau Railway Company, for a line of railway from Kazubazua to Le Desert, a distance of fifty miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding in the whole $160,000. It will be remembered that Parliament at its last Session granted a subsidy for the first fifty miles of that road, of $160,000 in all, but it has been found that it was not sufficient to enable the company who were organized in connection with that work, to obtain the capital that was necessary. My hon. friend (Mr. Wright) I am glad to see, has just taken his seat and he will come to my rescue if I fail in demonstrating to the House the great importance of the construction of the Gatineau Valley Railway. That hon. gentleman on more than one occasion, has drawn a picture of that country which I believe, from all I can learn from outside sources, is not at all too highly coloured, notwithstanding that he has a command of the English language which, I may say, is unequalled. I believe that the section of country which this line of railway proposes to open up affords an opportunity for successful development that is not equalled in many portions of the older Provinces of Canada. But I am informed they found in impossible to finance this railway, to obtain the outside aid that was necessary to secure its construction, for the reason that the fifty miles was regarded as too short a line to warrant the railway company in organizing for the construction of a line to reach that country which has been most improperly called "desert," and which I think should rather be called "garden." I think that the extension proposed by these Resolutions will enable the company to obtain the necessary capital. I may say that the Province of Quebec has given the best evidence it could of the value of opening up that country if possible by railway communication, for the Province has subsidized that line to the extent of 6,000 acres of land per mile for 75 miles. I hope and trust, in fact I have reason to believe, that this additional subsidy, without increasing the amount per mile, but extending the distance fifty miles, will enable that company to make arrangements for the prompt undertaking of the work, and I believe we will all be gratified on finding that the company with the subsidy given by the Province of Quebec, and the small subsidy asked from this Parliament, have been able to open up so interesting and important a section of country. Then I am asking for the extension of the subsidy granted last year to the Napanee and Tamworth Railway Company for a line of railway from Tamworth to Bogart and Bridgewater, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $70,400. I am quite certain the hon. gentleman who represents the county will join most heartily with me in asking from this House this additional aid for a railway to which we granted a subsidy last year. It was a subsidy of but $3,200 per mile for 28 miles; and yet I believe it has been found sufficient to induce capitalists to undertake to carry on that work, and that 28 miles are in a forward state of completion. The subsidy, I think, has been drawn on some 10 miles of that line already, and it is believed that the effect of this subsidy will be to enable that Company to vigourously prosecute the work and extend the line to a point which will enable the Company by a line already constructed to Bridgewater to connect with the Ontario and Quebec Railway. It is not necessary for me to detain the House at any great length in regard to a description of the country through which this railway and the railway to which I have just referred will pass, because I endeavoured last Session to depict its importance and the results which are likely to be attained by opening it up. Then it is proposed to ask a subsidy for 50 miles more railway belonging to the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from the end of the line subsidised last Session (because I find there is an error in the Resolutions) towards Le Désert, which is an extension of the line of railway from St. Jérôme, to which corporation a subsidy for 50 miles was given last year. But that enterprise stands in the same position as the Gatineau Valley Railway, the promoters being unable, in consequence of the fact that the short distance of 50 miles does not form a sufficient basis on which to organize a company to proceed with the work; but I have reason to believe, and I do sincerely hope, that the effect of granting this subsidy, as in the case of the Gatineau Valley Railway, will be to enable the promoters to obtain from outside sources the additional aid required in order to accomplish the work. This Company have an additional subsidy from Quebec of $4,000 per mile for 18 miles, and $2,500 per mile for 12 miles, together with 4,000 acres of land per mile for 35 miles. With these combined subsidies I trust the work will be carried forward, and I am sure when I mention this is the road that is required to open up the splendid section of country that Father Labelle has been so successfully engaged in colonizing, I can make no statement to this House that would more commend the road to its favourable consideration. I regard the work in which that reverend gentleman is engaged as one entirely suited to the sacred office that he holds. I believe that next to religion there is nothing that so commends a man to the confidence of his fellowmen as patriotism, and I believe if there was ever a

true patriot found within the borders of Canada that patriot is Father Labelle. I believe it would be impossible to overrate the value of the successful exertions that reverend gentleman has been making in opening up and developing one of the most important tracts of country to be found in the whole of Lower Canada. I believe he is not only detaining hundreds and thousands who otherwise might find their way across the borders, but he is steadily paving the way and providing the means for drawing back his compatriots from the United States, and at no distant day we shall see one of the most thriving, one of the most fertile sections in Canada repatriated by the sons of Quebec, who will be brought back, and who will devote their energies to the development of that section of country. It is proposed to grant a subsidy for forty miles to the Miramichi Valley Railway for a line of railway from Fredericton to the Miramichi River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole (instead of the subsidy proposed in 1883), $128,000. At the last Session I asked this House to appropriate an amount of $102,000 for the purpose of constructing some thirty-two miles of railway from the Intercolonial at the other end of this line. No work has up to the present time been accomplished further than surveys and preliminary operations in regard to undertaking construction. But upon reconsideration of that question, looking at it in all its phases, the Government arrived at the conclusion that it was a wiser course instead of appropriating that subsidy of $102,000. For the construction of 32 miles of the Miramichi Valley Railway, from the Intercolonial Railway to Fredericton, we believe it would be wise to construct, as a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, 14 miles to that important point, connecting the Intercolonial with very large lumbering operations, and affording an admirable feeder to that road; and we ask Parliament to appropriate for the extension from the town of Fredericton to the Miramichi River, so as to afford communication from Fredericton to the Intercolonial at that point, by means of a line constructed under this subsidy, and the water communication afforded by the Miramichi. I may say that the Government of the Province of New Brunswick have also provided a subsidy of $3,000 per mile for the entire extent of this road, from Fredericton to the Intercolonial. Gentlemen of both sides of the House are aware that a very lively controversy has been going forward in regard to the proper location of that portion of the Miramichi road, where it intersects the Intercolonial. I may say that it has, I believe, originated largely in a controversy between two rival towns in the County of Northumberland, namely, Chatham and Newcastle. My hon. friend who so ably represents the County of Northumberland, will be better able to deal with this question than myself, but when I say that the course the Government have adopted in regard to this matter has the entire and cordial approval of that hon. gentleman, that it has the hearty support of the gentleman who represents the County of Northumberland in the Legislative Council of New Brunswick, and the hearty support and co-operation of two of the local members—and gentlemen of very high standing and ability they are—in the Local Legislature of New Brunswick, I think I have given the House the best evidence that the Government have not made a mistake in the proposal they have made with regard to that work. Then, Sir, I may say that we propose to ask the House for a subsidy for thirty miles of the Erie and Huron Railway for the line from Wallaceburg to Sarnia, the subsidy not to exceed $3,200 per mile, or not exceeding in the whole $96,000. Hon. gentleman who have looked at the map of that part of the country will find that the construction of these thirty miles of railway, extending the forty miles already built from Lake Erie to Lake Huron, will connect Lake Erie at Rondeau Harbour, on the one side, with Lake Huron at Point Edward on the other, by the best line of communication that could be obtained, and a very important and valuable section of the country will be opened up by the construction of that line.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Opened up?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When I say opened up, I mean that it will have facilities of railway communication; and I need not tell the hon. gentleman that at this period of the nineteenth century people imagine they are devoid of the advantages of civilization if they are not in close proximity to a railway somewhere; and therefore, I say, that these important townships will have new life and vigour given to them by the connection of the waters of Lake Erie with the waters of Lake Huron, by means of the construction of this section of thirty-two miles, and if it can be secured, as I am told it can, by this insignificant subsidy of $3,200 per mile, I think the House will regard it as a wise and judicious appropriation of public money. Then, Sir, I come to a still more important section of the country—the subsidy on the eighty-two miles of railway by which it is proposed to enable the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company to construct a line from Cornwall to Perth—a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, or not exceeding on the whole $262,400. I need not say to the House how valuable that connection is, because that section of the country is so near to us that I hope we are all aware of the value and importance of establishing that connection, and if that Company can, by the aid of $3,200 per mile, for eighty-two miles, secure the capital outside and enable them to effect its construction, an enormous distance will be saved between these two points. The branch which the hon. gentleman who has been engaged in pressing this work, has asked to connect with the city of Ottawa is not embraced in this Resolution, but I dare say that if they are able to secure the prompt construction of the other section of the road, by this small subsidy, I think he will be able to come back with a good deal of confidence, and ask for a branch to connect it with the city of Ottawa. Then, Sir, it is proposed to ask for the Kingston and Pembroke Company,—of which possibly you may have heard—a subsidy for a line of railway from Mississippi to Renfrew, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding on the whole $48,000. I may say that that Company have been making great efforts, and most successful efforts, to push a line of railway connecting Kingston with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Renfrew; and I believe, Sir, in their struggles their resources have been largely exhausted. I am in hopes that this small subsidy for which I am asking Parliament, and which I have no doubt Parliament will readily accord, will enable them promptly to secure the completion of that line, and we will have that important section of the country served by the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, brought into communication with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Renfrew. Then, Sir, it is proposed to ask a subsidy for ten miles of the Great Northern Railway Company, for that portion of their line between St. Jerome and New Glasgow, in the County of Terrebonne, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, or on the whole $32,000. I am glad to see my hon. friend the Secretary of State in his place, because he will be able to give to the House, as he has given to me, such a picture of that section of the country as I am sure will satisfy the House as it satisfied me, that it will be wise and judicious to vote this small amount to accomplish so important an object. Then, Sir, it is proposed to ask the House for a vote of $200,000 for the purpose of constructing a link of about three miles, and a bridge, between the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near St. Martin's Junction; and here I may say that I propose to insert the words "or some other point," connecting the Jacques Cartier Union Railway with the North Shore Rail-

way proper, the subsidy on the whole not to exceed $200,000. This question has been in a peculiar position, owing to difficulties between the North Shore and Canadian Pacific Railway Company there has been a great block in the traffic of a large portion of the Province of Quebec, and a great body of the people have been greatly excited in consequence of having suffered greatly, owing to the difficulty of getting over these few miles, and establishing communication between these two roads. I do not know, Sir, that it will be found necessary to expend this money, but if it is necessary we ask this Parliament to provide $200,000 to overcome the obstruction to the traffic and avoid the injury and difficulty which have been sustained by a large portion of the people of Quebec, I believe we are thoroughly warranted in asking Parliament for this appropriation. I am in hopes that having the power to make that expenditure will render it unnecessary to expend it. The Government have not the power of dealing with that question; they found it could only be dealt with by a process of litigation, in the courts of law, of which no person could foresee the ending. Under these circumstances, we have thought it right to ask Parliament to enable us to cut the Gordian knot by this appropriation of $200,000, to be expended if it be found to be absolutely necessary. Then, I propose to ask for a subsidy for seven miles of railway, from Richibucto to St. Louis, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $22,400. I may say that though a subsidy voted by the Province of NewBrunswick, of $3,000 per mile, and the aid in furnishing the rails granted by this Government, 28 miles of railway have been constructed, connecting the Intercolonial Railway with this section of country at St. Louis; and it is proposed to ask for this subsidy of $3,200 per mile for an additional seven miles of Railway, to extend that line from Richibucto. My hon. friend, the member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry) will be able to fully explain the importance of that small appropriation, and the great advantage that it will be to complete that line of communication.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I hope he approves of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I am afraid that is not the hon. gentleman's ground for complaint. I am afraid that his grounds of complaint would not be that we had made this small contribution, but that we had not been able to meet his views in reference to larger works which he desired should be projected in that county, but which we were compelled reluctantly to postpone, at all events, for the present. Then, Sir, we ask, in order to extend a line of railway from Hopewell to Alma in Albert County, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $51,200. Through the aid furnished by the Government of New Brunswick, that railway has been pushed down to its present point, and it is felt that it would be extremely important to give it these 16 miles of extension, which would enable it to secure water communication, and to become a still valuable feeder to the Intercolonial railway than more it is at present. Then, it is proposed to ask, for a line of railway from St. Andrews to Lachute in the county of Argenteuil, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor in the whole $22,400. Any person familiar with that section of country is aware that the construction of these seven miles of railway will being into connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway the important town of St. Andrews, or a town that will become a very important town when this railway communication is obtained; because not only the picturesque beauty of this section of contry will render it extremely attractive, but the water power, I am instructed, that will be reached and developed, by this short line of railway, will give a most valuable impetus to the creation and development of industries in that section of country. Then it is proposed to ask for a subsidy for 68 miles of railway from the Grand Piles, on the river St. Maurice to Lake Edward—there is a clerical error in the resolution—not exceeding $3,200 per mile nor in the whole $217,600. Some portion of that line of railway has already been constructed, and the construction of this branch will open up a very valuable timber interest, and give it communication with that important line which was subsidized two Sessions ago, running from Quebec to Lake St. John. For a line of railway from Annapolis to Digby, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy is proposed, not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $64,000. My hon. friends on the other side of the House who represent respectively the County of Digby (Mr. Vail) and the County of Annapolis (Mr. Ray) know very well the immense importance of putting in this short link of communication between Annapolis and Digby. I may say that an appeal of the very strongest character was made to me for aid in this regard by my hon. friend, the member for the County of Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney), who is quite as deeply interested as the hon. members for Annapolis and Digby are, in seeing this short line of communication completed. When I tell the House that from Halifax to Yarmouth, from the commercial and political centre of the Province of the extreme western point, a line of railway communication is already constructed with the exception of this twenty miles between Digby and Yarmouth, it will be understood what important and larger results may be expected to flow from the completion of this work. The subsidy, though small, is such as I hope will induce the Western Counties Railway Company, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, and the Province of Nova Scotia by combined action, to secure the construction of this twenty miles of road, which at the present moment leaves broken the railway communication for the whole of the western shore of the Province of Nova Scotia. I am quite certain that I need not say another word to secure the hearty approval of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for the small appropriation asked for this service of $64,000. Then, Sir, we ask for a branch line of the Central Railway from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, between Sussex and St. John a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $128,000. I may say that, in connection with the short line of railway, it is expected that a railway will be constructed from Fredericton to the Intercolonial Railway at Salisbury, near Moncton, and the Legislature of New Brunswick have already appropriated $3,000 a mile towards the construction of that portion of the short line railway. That furnishes a subsidy, both from the Provincial Government and from the Dominion Government, for about 40 miles of this line of railway, which is proposed to intersect the Intercolonial Raliway at that point, or at some point between Sussex and St. John, and connect it with the short line at Fredricton. In addition to opening up a very important section of country, I believe that this line will provide access with the only coal mining district in the Province of New Brunswick, independent of the asphalt district—the only coal mines from which it can reasonably be expected that a large and important supply of coal may be obtained; and any person acquainted with the advantage of the proximity of coal mines for the development of all the industries of a country, will see how important it will be for St. John and Fredericton, and all that region of country, to be thus brought into easy and near communication with the coal mining district that is likely to be successfully operated in the event of this subsidy being granted. I may safely leave any additional remarks on that subject to my hon. friend the member for Kirgs, N.B. (Mr. Foster). Then, Sir, at the last Session of this House we provided for a line of railway from the Intercolonial Railway to Caraquet, and it has been found, as in the other cases adverted to, that the line

was too short to enable the parties to make the necessary financial arrangements. It is now proposed to ask the House to extend the subsidy granted last Session for 24 miles further, from Caraquet to Shippegan Harbour, thus making that short line of communication, to which great importance was at one time attached, I know by this Government, and I believe also by my hon. friend opposite, from the Intercolonial Railway to the Harbor of Shippegan; and I am instructed by my hon. friend, the member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) that the appropriation of this $3,200 a mile for the additional 24 miles, will enable him to secure the prompt construction of the 40 miles between the Intercolonial Railway and Shippegan, furnishing, as I have said, a most valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. I also propose to ask for authority to construct a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, 20 miles from Metepedia eastwards towards Paspebiac. I may say that $3,200 a mile was appropriated last Session for, I think, 100 miles of road to enable the Paspebiac to be connected with the Intercolonial Railway at Metapedia, but it was found, although the Government of Quebec had provided an additional subsidy, that it was impossible to obtain the capital required for the construction of that work. It is felt by the Government to be very desirable to afford facilities for communication with the Intercolonial Railway in that section, and I propose in this Resolution to ask authority to construct the 20 miles I have already alluded to as forming a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from the Intercolonial towards Paspebiac. And I believe that, in connection with these appropriations asked for as branches of the Intercolonial Railway, we will find the additional traffic brought to the line will abundantly repay us for the outlay that is involved. I need not refer again to the concluding Resolution as I have already dealt with it—the fourteen miles in the County of Northumberland to connect the Intercolonial Railway from Derby station to Indian Town. I am glad to be able to say that I have got to the end of the Resolutions, and, for fear that hon. gentlemen might be alarmed at the total amount that is embraced in these Resolutions—I do not now refer to that amount that is necessary to do justice to the Province of Quebec, I do not refer to that amount that is necessary to do what I believe on both sides of the House we all earnestly desire, and that is to secure the Atlantic terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in a Canadian port. I do not refer to these large questions, but I refer to these smaller subsidies for lines that may to some extent be regarded in the light of local subsidies,—I say that, although the outlay amounts to a considerable sum, I am sure the House will be relieved when I tell them that the evidence the last two years gives us proves the soundness of the premises on which I have started, that we need not fear the expenditure of any portion of this money unless it is going to be attended with commensurate advantages to the country, unless it is going to bring such an amount of private capital into the country, unless it is going to be attended with such commercial development as will increase the trade and business and revenue of the country proportionately. I think I can give abundant evidence of that by reference to the experience of the last two years. The House was good enough to vote a sum of no less than $1,508,000 in the Session before the last for railways; they were good enough to vote at the last Session a sum of no less than $2,138,400; or, in the two Sessions, no less than $3,646,400. I may say to the House that, of that, the total amount expended up to the present moment, although $1,508,000 has been an appropriation made two years ago, and the whole of it has been made for over a year, the total expenditure under that appropriation of $3,646,400 is only $208,000.

Mr. HOUDE. Why is it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. I have endeavoured to explain to him why I think that is, because it is only where the appropriation of this moderate amount, it is because of the smallness of the amount of the subsidy, it is because the Government have been so careful to guard the public treasury of the country——

Mr. HOUDE. It is because the grants, as they are this year, are in many cases illusory, and the Government knows it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Precisely. The hon. gentleman may say that, and that is the very basis and foundation of the policy of the Government.

Mr. HOUDE. It is a wrong basis.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We do not propose to do anything illusory. I tell my hon. friend that, if he supposes one dollar of this money has been put in the Resolutions two years ago, or last year, or this year, for the purpose of leading the public to expect that something would be accomplished that we did not expect would be accomplished, my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. I never have done it, and I never will ask the support of my colleagues for the appropriation of a single dollar of public money for a work that, as I believe, is illusory or calculated to mislead. Instead of being an advantage to the country or to the Government, nothing could be a more mistaken policy. My right hon. friend has suggested what I was about to say, that there is not a dollar appropriated in any one of these years that has not been appropriated on the earnest application of the parties interested and their strong assurance that the appropriation would be likely to result in substantial benefit and advantage. But, while I say that, I say that the guarantee that the House and the country have that there shall be no appropriation of public money under these Resolutions and under the policy of this Government that is not warranted is to be found in the fact that we do not propose to construct local railways in this country. We only propose to give a moderate, a comparatively small amount of aid where we believe the advantages of opening up and developing a section of country are so great that, upon commercial principles and on a commercial basis, private capital will be induced to come forward and supplement the amount granted and enable the road to be constructed. I say that, if these enterprises are enterprises that have no commercial foundation in them, they ought not to go on; if these roads are roads which are not required in the interests of the country to be built, they ought not to be built; and I say the best evidence that they cannot be built and will not go on and that the treasury will not be depleted under these Resolutions by a single dollar, unless the enterprise is of a character to warrant the appropriation on the soundest principles of political economy, it to be found in the fact that the appropriation is only sufficient where there is a commercial object to be obtained and a country to be developed which, by this small aid and assistance, may be made effective and may be obtained. I might turn the attention of the House to the result of the past as the best evidence to prove that an appropriation of public money, however large, if given in this guarded way and upon this matured principle and upon the basis we have submitted to the House, will not endanger any raid upon the public Treasury or deplete it to any extent whatever. I say the evidence furnished by the past is, as I believe the evidence furnished by the future will be, that the policy we start upon is a sound one, that, if great national objects common to the interests of the whole country from end to end are involved, we are entitled to come here and ask for any sum of money that is required to carry out a national object, but for local roads and enterprises we must be restrained within such limits as will

give only such fair and legitimate aid and assistance to enterprises that have within themselves, sufficient commercial basis to enable them to be carried to completion. I submit these Resolutions to the House in the believe that they will not only receive the support of the great body of gentlemen behind me who have so generously in the past given their aid and support to the Government, in whom they have confidence and upon whom they know they may confidently rely to treat all these questions from the standpoint of what we believe, in the light of the best information we can obtain, is the best interest of the country, but I believe I may confidently rely upon the support of a large portion, if not the whole body, of gentlemen opposite to us, who, I am certain, are as deeply interested as we are, and I hope will not be less ready to promote the best interests of this country.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On paragraph 3,

> For the construction of a line of Railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route, a subsidy not exceeding $170,000 per annum for 15 years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on bonds of the Company undertaking the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to amend this Resolution by adding after the words "best practicable route" the words "after the report of competent engineers."

Mr. GILLMOR The hon. gentleman has omitted to mention St. Andrews.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Resolution covers the case as it stands, because you cannot get to St. John by the shortest route without getting to St. Andrews by the road already constructed.

Mr. GILLMOR. Still it should be mentioned. I do not like to see St. Andrews slighted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. St. Andrews never can be slighted, because nature has placed it in a position which gives it the greatest advantage over any other winter port in Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. I think I heard the hon. Minister name the capital sum represented by these annuities. I desire to ask the rate of interest?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Capitalized at 5 per cent., $200,000 for 15 years, I make $2,075,922.

Mr. BLAKE. But we borrow money at 4 per cent. and therefore the delay of payment in this case—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been no arrangement to capitalize at any particular sum.

Mr. BLAKE. But when we are considering what it will amount to, we want to have the calculation accurate. As the Dominion borrows money at 4 per cent. the value of the delay to the Dominion, should be based on a calculation at 4 per cent. and not at 5 per cent., and the cost therefore to the Dominion of the annuity for 15 years, ought to be calculated on interest at 4 per cent. and not at 5 per cent. The result at 4 per cent. would be, that for the $170,000 a year for fifteen years, the annuity is worth $1,890,000 odd, and the other $30,000 is worth $355,000 making an aggregate capitalization on the proper calculation, considerably more than that which the hon. gentleman has stated. I desire to receive some further information on this proposal besides that which the hon. gentleman has given. I observe the proposal is for the construction of a line connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and most practicable route, a subsidy to be given not exceeding $170,000 a year. The papers laid before the House consist of the petition of the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, to be hereafter known as the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company. We are acquainted with that company to some extent from the moderate and accurate and rigorously just description, which the hon. gentleman gave of it last Session, and the assurances that he gave to us upon the vote that was proposed as to their capacity with the aid he was giving, to carry out the work they were then undertaking. I should not be surprised if he had heard something from the counties of Pictou and Cumberland on more than one occasion since that period with reference to those assurances and the present condition of affairs in those interested counties. It is the same company which stands to the forefront on this occasion as the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company perhaps thinking that the sub-contractors and the farmers and the traders of Pictou and Cumberland would prefer to deal with them under some other name than that of the Great American and European Short Line Company, as which they know them too well. They say in their petition:—

"That the total length of this line is about 800 miles, of which there are, at the present time, some 290 miles in operation, leaving about 510 miles to be constructed.

"That during the past year your petitioners made extensive surveys over the greater portion of the line, and partially completed about 90 miles of it

"That owing to certain defects in the Act of Incorporation—now about to be amended—and their failure to obtain certain and sufficient subsidies, the work of construction has been temporarily suspended.

"That your petitioners and their contractors have already expended nearly half a million dollars in the prosecution of the construction of the said 90 miles.

"Your petitioners respectfully submit, that the construction and consolidation of the railways on the proposed route, as contemplated by your petitioners, are of great national importance, as it will be the natural extension of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Railway systems to the seaports of the Maritime Provinces, and will form the shortest practical route to all of them.

"Your petitioners believe that the completion of its system through Cape Breton will develop the large agricultural and mining interests in that Island, &c.

"Your petitioners therefore humbly pray, that for the completion of their railway between Montreal and New Glasgow, the annual sum of $300,000 may be appropriated for a period of at least fifteen years, to aid in the construction of those portions not already built between these points, and that the said aid or subsidy be granted and paid directly to the company as the work progresses; or in the form of a guarantee of interest on the bonds to be issued by the company for the purpose of construction.

"And for the completion of their railway and in continuation of it from New Glasgow to Louisburg, your petitioners further pray, that in addition to subsidies heretofore granted to them in Nova Scotia (which are wholly inadequate in view of the natural obstacles to be overcome) further aid be granted by transferring to them the Eastern Extension Railway with its present equipment."

So that the proposition of the Short Line Company was that it should, by the completion of the whole work, obtain an annuity of $300,000 a year, the continuation of the subsidy already voted, and the Eastern Extension Railway with its equipment. Then there is the report of the Chief Engineer, dated 27th March, to the Minister, in which he says:

"Having been instructed to report to you upon a scheme proposed for the establishment of a short line of railway between Montreal, St. John, Halifax, and Sydney, C. B., I have the honour to state, that very considerable concern appears to have seized upon the public mind of Canada at the prospect of the winter port of our great trunk lines being selected in the United States; and that a number of the representatives of the people assembled at Ottawa for their parliament duties, feeling how important it is that the trade of Ceatral, North-Western and Western Canada should find its way in winter to the seaboard of Eastern Canada, have petitioned the Government for the construction of a line of railway connecting our two great trunk lines, the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway, with the seaboard at St. John, Halifax, and Sydney, by means of a railway connecting with those lines at Montreal and proceeding by the shortest and most direct practicable route to be obtained. The action taken so far has resulted in two offers being made for the construction of such a line, one being for the construction of a road from Montreal to Halifax, St. John, and New Glasgow, for a subsidy of $300,000 a year for 20 years, and the other for a line from Montreal to St. John, Halifax, and Sydney, for a subsidy of $300,000 a year for 15 years, and the subsidy already granted on the sections between Oxford, and new Glasgow, and Canso, and Sydney, amounting to $480,000, in addition to the transfer, free of charge, of the line from New Glasgow to Canso, 80 miles in length."

Now we have not got the other offer. Amongst the papers the hon. gentleman has brought down we do not find any

but the offer of the European, American and Short Line Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I found that the letter was marked personal, and when preparing these papers for the public I had some doubt as to whether I should make it public.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, it is impossible that a man can tender for a public work, that this tender can be submitted to the Minister, that the Minister can order his engineer to report upon it, that the engineer can report upon it, and state its contents——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will show it to the hon. member.

Mr. BLAKE. I don't want to see it at all; the question is, whether Parliament ought not to see it, and whether the Minister can lay upon the Table a report describing the document without laying the document itself upon the Table. It is impossible for us to judge of it. The hon. Minister must take one of two courses—he can receive a personal tender——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not a tender.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, an offer, which is a tender. The Minister can receive a personal offer, an offer which is so laid before the House that he can use it in the public interest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was not in the nature of a tender at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it was an offer. The action taken so far has resulted in two offers being made for the construction of such a line—one being between Montreal, Halifax, St. John and New Glasgow, for $300,000 a year. Now we have only got one of these offers, the offer is not laid before us. Either the Minister ought to have placed himself in such a position as to be able to bring down that offer, or he ought not to have submitted it to his engineer, and he ought not to have brought the report to Parliament. At present we are not in a position to deal with this subject satisfactorily. Then the report goes on to give the distances, which I need not read, because they have been already stated. He goes on to point out the importance of shortening the distances, and he says:

"Should it be determined to grant aid towards the construction of such a line of connection, I beg to suggest that no particular company be specified, but that the subsidy be given to such company as shall satisfy the Government of its ability to carry the enterprise to a successful termination. I would also recommend that ample security be taken for the construction and efficient operation of the road, the conditions being that any failure, either in completion or in operation, be followed by forfeiture of the entire property. Of the two offers received, the first appears to be the most favourable and, in my opinion, affords sufficient inducement for the enterprise to be taken up."

Now, Sir, so far we have received the statement of the engineer that the Minister supplements now with two offers for the construction of this work, of which, he says, the first is the most favourable and affords sufficient inducement. But we have not got the first; it is not laid before us; the Minister says it is personal, and he does not feel that he can lay it before Parliament. That was on the 27th of March. What happened meanwhile we know not, but on the 3rd of April the engineer reports again:

"I have again the honour to report upon the scheme for a short line railway connecting Montreal with St. John, Halifax and Sydney, and I now beg to suggest the division of the line, for purposes of construction, into two sections, the western section, extending from Montreal to Moncton, the headquarters of the Intercolonial Railway, and the eastern section, from Moncton to Sydney. The length of road to be constructed may be estimated approximately at:

Western Section	323 miles
Eastern " (with Oxford Branch)	240 "
	553 miles

"The object of this proposed short line of railway is to bring the winter ports of Canada as near as possible to the wheat field of the west and North-West, and to enable them to compete successfully with the American ports for the ocean-bound business to and from the west and North-West and the pacific coast; and it is believed that this object will be attained by the consummation of the short line project.

"In my report of the 25th ult., I stated that I considered than an offer which had been received was sufficient to induce the taking up of the enterprise. This offer was to build the missing links necessary to complete the direct short line from Montreal to Sydney, for an annual subsidy of $300,000 for fifteen years, plus the subsidy of $480,000 already granted, and the free gift of the Eastern Extension Railway, eighty miles in length. I may now state, however, that the scheme might be undertaken on terms still more favourable, and I beg to submit the following suggestions:

"That, for the construction of the western section a grant of $140,000 per annum for fifteen years be made for a guarantee, or a similar sum as interest on the bonds of the Company undertaking the work for fifteen years, in aid of the construction of the shortest and best line to be found from Montreal to St. John and Halifax, in accordance with the resolution of last year, appropriating aid to the International Railway. In the case of the Eastern Section, I would suggest a direct subsidy of $60,000 annually for fifteen years, or a guarantee of a similar sum as interest on bonds of the company undertaking the work for fifteen years, also the present subsidy of $480,000, and the transfer in fee simple of the Eastern Extension with its present equipment; the conditions of such aid being the construction of a direct short line from Moncton to Sydney, comprising the section from Moncton to New Glasgow, with branches to Oxford Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Pugwash and Pictou (the line from Moncton to New Glasgow connecting with the Eastern Extension); also the section from the Gut of Canso, at the eastern terminus of the Eastern Extension to Sydney, Cape Breton.

"The standard of the road should be—Western Section, that of the Intercolonial Railway, both in construction and equipment; the Eastern Extension, that of the Eastern Extension Railway between New Glasgow and Canso. The location of both sections should be subject to the approval of His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

"I would also recommend that from any company receiving these subsidies an ample guarantee be taken for the completion of the work within three years from 1st July next; and that the contract should embody such safeguards as the Government may deem necessary to secure the public interest."

Now you will see that in the first instance the Chief Engineer recommends a certain plan consistent with one or other of the offers before him; that a few days later he reports, without any data, without any offer being made, without any suggestion that we know of, that the work might be undertaken under a more favourable plan by dividing it into two sections, and he proposes the allocation of the sum of $200,000, a year divided into two sums, $140,000 and $60,000. Well, that plan is not adopted. The Government has not adopted the suggestion of the Chief Engineer—I do not propose to deal with the other part of the line at this moment—with reference to the western part of the line, the incomplete links between Montreal and Moncton, where he proposes to give $170,000 a year instead of $140,000 a year as the subsidy. Now I should like some explanation of the reason why the report of the engineer was departed from, and why it is proposed to take for this a larger subsidy than he suggests. I should like further to know how it comes that proposals which seem to be much less than what are suggested in other quarters of his correspondence, are deemed by the hon. gentleman to be adequate to the accomplishment of the object in view. I will not, at this moment, use the expression which has been already used in this debate with reference to the several proposals of the Government, but I think the very circumstances to which the hon. gentleman alluded in proposing to give subsidies running into the millions, whereas up to this time there had been only a pledge of a comparatively trifling amount of $200,000, although we were assured on each occasion that these subsidies would be adequate to accomplish the object in view, which was the immediate commencement, and rapid construction of railways—I say these circumstances entitle us to some further information and some better assurances as to the financial basis and the statistical data upon which the hon. Minister to-day, with equal positiveness and, I apprehend, in many circumstances, with like results, assures us of the satisfactory character of the financial bases supplemented by this grant. As I have said, papers have been brought down which indicate a difference of opinion. I do not, however, wish to complicate this particular Resolution with that portion which belongs to the

eastern end, and these papers to a considerable extent apply to that end. But one paper which is laid before the House, dated March 13th, 1884, is a paper signed by a number of members of Parliament from the Maritime Provinces, and is as follows:—

"We, the undersigned members of the Parliament of Canada from the Maritime Provinces would urge upon the Government the extreme desirability of taking immediate measures for procuring the extension or connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Montreal to or with the following ports of the Maritime Provinces, to wit: St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax and Louisbourg, by the shortest practicable line, and having reason to believe that the appropriation of $300,000 per annum for twenty years to whatever company may have satisfied the Government of their ability to promptly complete the line, will secure the immediate construction of this important work, request that Government be asked to make provision for such a subsidy."

That seems to me to bear a very strong resemblance to the offer which the hon. gentleman calls a personal offer; in fact, as far as the description goes, it is the same thing—it was an offer for $300,000 a year for twenty years, and you find the request of a large number of members was that $300,000 a year for ten years should be appropriated for this purpose. The other material which applies to this portion of the line does not give any suggestion as to the amount of the aid. What I would therefore desire from the hon. gentleman is, further information as to the offer to which I have referred, and which has not been brought before us, further information as to the circumstances under which the Chief Engineer, between 27th March and 3rd April, presented different reports; further information as to the date on which the Chief Engineer proposed $140,000 a year as adequate for the construction of the link respecting which we are now asked to vote; further information as to the circumstances under which, and the data upon which, the Government proposed $170,000 a year as adequate for that purpose. So much in regard to the finances, and in this connection I have no doubt that the Government has had under consideration the question of the route, and to some extent the difficulties of that route. And they will be able to give us information which has not yet been furnished in sufficient detail, but to which the Committee is entitled before being called upon to pass this item. For example, I would like to know what the present view of the Government is as to the route to be adopted; the general direction of that route; how much will be within the Province of Quebec, how much within the State of Maine, how much within the Province of New Brunswick; what the general character of the country will be on each of the three different routes through which the road might pass; whether, speaking generally—I do not expect precise details—the character of the country for the purpose of railway construction is about the same, or are some parts much more difficult than others? Furthermore, I wish to know what mode the Administration proposes to adopt in order to grapple with the difficulty of subsidising the road, in so far as that road runs through the State of Maine? We recollect the mode by which they got rid of that difficulty, or evaded that difficulty, last year or the year before, when it was proposed to extend the Megantic line—I forget the technical name of the line—the Government asked the House to grant $3,200 a mile for a certain number of miles—I forget the number, but it was a considerable number.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was pointing out that difficulty had been experienced last year with respect to the extension to Maine, and it had been got over by the Government giving a grant to a railway already completed, as they said, with a view to its extension through Maine, but the grant was given on the mileage in the Province; and I fancy that the expenditure, the payment under that particular subsidy which was given to iron or steel rails once again for that completed road, is the main payment which has been made by the Government under the subsidies. I fancy, when the hon. member stated that something under $200,000 had been paid out of the Treasury, he included in that statement $15,600, which, if I recollect rightly, was paid in respect of a road which had already been ironed before the subsidy was granted, in order to furnish it with new rails; and therefore, in respect of new enterprises, a much smaller sum than $200,000, not more than $30,000 or $40,000, has yet been paid under these subsidies. As I was saying, it is important to know what the scheme of the Administration is with respect to aiding a road through foreign territory. It is also important to know, with respect to the plan brought forward last Session, as to the extension of the road through Maine by means of the subsidy granted. As I have said, it was with the view to making arrangements for the extension through Maine. What has been accomplished? Has the road been pushed through Maine? If so, what arrangements are now to be made with reference to that particular enterprise? On those points, on the question of alternative routes, which presented themselves to the hon. Ministers' mind, and which they must have had before them in considering what subsidy would be sufficient—because if they had relation to the route, they involved the question of mileage, and of the character of the work—on these and on other points to which I was referring before the House rose, I think we should have further information before the Resolution is adopted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I need not say how gratified I am to find that the policy propounded in this Resolution, and so frankly and fully stated to the House, has met with the unqualified approval of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not said a word about it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think when the hon. gentleman allowed the Resolutions to go into Committee without a single word, he gave the fullest and best assurance that he could give, that he had no objection to the policy so fully and frankly stated to the House. In addition to that it is extremely gratifying to me to know that the hon. gentleman is obliged to offer such weak and feeble criticisms of the position in which the question has been presented. On the great question contained in this Resolution, he hon. gentleman has not had a single word to say; on the principle, the largest feature of the public policy, and the largest appropriation of public money, the hon. gentleman has not said a single word. I think, having allowed the Resolution to pass into Committee without a single word, and having allowed these three grants to pass without a single observation, I am justified—I think the hon. gentleman will admit—in assuming that I have his entire confidence and support as regards so much of the Resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I can say is, that I have not discovered, on former occasions, that the hon. gentleman is wont to conceal his opinions; when he does not agree with the views of the Government, he is not in the habit of preventing the House from knowing it. I am glad, however, to be able to explain to the hon. gentleman that the discrepancy which he finds between the report of Mr. Schreiber and this Resolution has been occasioned by the fact that although a large number of the gentlemen sitting on both sides of this House arrived at the conclusion that the House would be warranted in appropriating $300,000 a year for twenty years, to accomplish so great an object—an object in which I entirely concur—and I have no hesitation in saying that this great and important object could not be obtained on easier or better terms than were stated in the memorial presented by a large body of gentlemen on both sides of the House, and the Government would, in my opinion, have been entirely warranted in making that appropriation.

But it is the duty of the Government not to provide outside and excessive means for accomplishing any object, however important. It is the duty of the Government to study and inform themselves by every possible means, not the largest, but the smallest appropriation of public money which will accomplish an object, however important. I am able to say to the hon gentleman, and I say it without hesitation, that I believe the means propounded in the Resolution, of $200,000 a year, for fifteen years, instead of $300,000 for twenty years, will be found quite sufficient to attain the very important object which is aimed at in the Resolution. And the Government having by careful enquiry, by communication with the ablest railway men in the country, by communication with gentlemen connected with the Province of Nova Scotia, the Province of New Brunswick, and the Province of Quebec, gentlemen who had the very best means of forming a judgment and arriving at a conclusion, we can safely calculate on accomplishing this important object without exceeding the amount proposed in the Resolution to which the hon. gentleman seems to take such grave exception. I am glad, however, to find that it is the smallness of the amount and not its largeness which has occasioned such an elaborate criticism. The hon. gentleman has had something to say with reference to the Short Line Railway Company. Well, Sir, that is quite foreign to the subject. The hon. gentleman knows, if he has taken the pains to read the Resolution, that it is not an appropriation to the Short Line Railway Company at all. It is provided in this Resolution that the Government shall have the power to make these arrangements in whole or in part, either for one section or the other, or with one company, covering the whole, or two companies, as the case may be found most convenient. It empowers the Government, within the limits of the Resolution, to make these arrangements with any Company that will give the Government solid and substantial and unqualified guarantees of their ability to carry the work to completien; and therefore, until the Short Line Railway Company is in a position to do that, they will not obtain any contract under the arrangement. The hon. gentleman has reminded me of the opinion I expressed last Session in regard to that Company; and it is an opinion which I have no reason to qualify at the present moment. I say that if that Company had been able to realize the expectations which were held out to them by the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of New Brunswick, there would have been no difficulty whatever in carrying the work promptly to completion. They entered into a contract for the construction of a portion of the work, fully relying, upon the understanding with the Government of Nova Scotia, that they were to obtain the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension on favourable terms; and they entered into it with the understanding, on the part of the New Brunswick Government, that they were to obtain a subsidy for the line between certain points. In fact, at the instance of that Company the New Brunswick Legislature changed the charter, changed the line, changed the appropriation, that both these objects failed, and that it was found that men who were prepared to pay out any amount of money, men who themselves did furnish a quarter of a million of money, as fast as required, to go on with the work, and that without having, down to this hour, received a dollar of subsidy from this Government—I say they could have obtained any amount required in order to carry on the work. But when it was found that the object they had in view had been defeated and frustrated, the Company came to the conclusion that it would not answer to go forward with a comparatively small work, and the construction company employed by them consequently were unable to carry on the work. The project broke down, not from its magnitude, not from the large amount required, but from its smallness, and from the fact that its proportions having dwindled down so much, they could not carry out the objects they had before them. The Company has been reorganized, and they will not only have to show, before making any arrangements with this Government, that they have ample means at their disposal, but they will have to give the most substantial guarantees of their ability to cover the entire cost. I trust that the observations I have made will be sufficient to meet the objections taken on that point, because they will show that we do not propose to be in the hands of any company, but to make arrangements with whoever is able to give evidence that they can promptly carry to completion any undertakings they may make. Now, with reference to the question of route, the hon. gentleman has stated that when the proposed appropriation was taken last year for the International Railway, for the purpose of laying that road with steel rails, a portion of the short line to St. John and Halifax—and I may say, to embrace the views of the hon. member for Charlotte, to St. Andrews—when I say that it was practically decided to furnish such means as would make that which was be one of the links of communication on the short line by a first-class road, by giving it steel rails, it was distinctly indicated, and was embraced in the law on the Statute Book, as the hon. gentleman knows, that it was with the view of obtaining a short line across the State of Maine. But if the hon. gentleman will read these Resolutions he will find that the proposal contained in them only binds the Government to this—to obtaining what is the shortest and best practicable route, after the report of competent engineers, to St. John, to Halifax, and to Sydney. So that the House will hold the Government responsible, under the obligation they assumed, that whatever route is selected, whatever route obtains the advantage and benefit of this subsidy, shall be a route that will be found to be the shortest and best practicable line within these points, and for the purpose of reaching those ports on the Atlantic coast, without any qualification whatever. I think, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the absence of such surveys and explorations and examinations as may be found necessary, would not wish to commit the Government to any particular line more definitely. There would be no object in adopting a course of that kind, because it would only be calculated to fetter the Government and frustrate the project they have undertaken, which is, purely and simple, the project of reaching these ports in our own country by the shortest and best practicable route which can be found, after careful examination.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot say that we have any further information than we had when the hon. gentleman rose. I may say to the hon gentleman, with reference to his prior remark that I obtained from other sources all the information which it was possible to obtain on the subject of the earlier two of these Resolutions, so that I did not ask him for it. I thought I might get something out of him, however, on the subject of this third Resolution, and I have not succeeded. I dare say there is more to tell about the first two; and if we were to hear all about them, no doubt he would have a long and interesting story to tell, as well as many others. But, after all, perhaps a time will come for the discussion of that subject. But on this Resolution, on which information is to be obtained, he has not given me an answer to any of the propositions I submitted for his consideration; and when he has not given us any information, I give my conjecture. I believe that the first offer was made by Mr. Stephen, or by someone else conected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, if not in his capacity as Presidont of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in his capacity as a member of the New Brunswick Syndicate. When we find an offer of that kind made, when we find the engineer referring to it in his report, and without any reason being given, recommending that the grant should be

given to one company for the whole of this work—when we find him reporting a plan which he does not say has been suggested to him by anybody, and when he refers to no document—I want to know on what plan it is proposed to divide the work. This is proposed for the Great Short Line—that we should have from the Pacific Coast, on the one hand, to St. John, Halifax, St. Andrews, Sydney or Louisburg; and the hon. gentleman proposes to cut it in two, and to give part to one company and part to another—at least the engineer proposes that, and the hon. gentleman accedes to it. This change was pointed out to the engineer, and the engineer adopted the proposed change. But he gives no reason for the change, and the Minister has given us no reason for the change from one line to two. Then he proposes a different distribution of $200,000 a year which is now to be voted; and the hon. gentleman, when asked for information, says: I have the assurance of gentlemen from the different Provinces who have considered this subject, and they are quite satisfied that this vote will be enough. Who are they? What is their data? He does not give us any data. He does not tell us anything on which we can form a possible conjecture. What proportion is this of the estimated cost? We are asked to deal with it purely on confidence, and the hon. gentleman himself felt that it was so loose that he must put in the condition that there is to be a report of competent engineers. Well, we have had reports of competent engineers before, and we have had results not the most advantageous from them. My opinion is, that it was the duty of the Minister to have formulated a plan, to have obtained information which would have enabled him to bring something intelligible before us. The hon. gentleman stated, in his first statement, then in his second, and now in his third, that his proposal to grant $140,000 a year is not based on the report of his engineer. On what it is based, we are not told. He says it will be enough. We are to take that on trust, and if it is not enough, I suppose there will be another application. The hon. gentleman says that I complain that it is too small. I do not complain that it is too small. I point out that it does not accord with proposals made by persons who presumably had calculated the cost; and I am entitled to enquire what his basis of calculation is; but I do not get the information. He does not tell me the cost of the missing link between Montreal and Moncton, what proportion of the cost this subsidy will be, or what the other resources will be? Nor has he explained why it is proposed to dissever this and make it an affair of two companies instead of one? Then the hon. gentleman says that the Short Line Company did not get the assistance from the Province of Nova Scotia and the Province of New Brunswick that was bargained for. Now, their own statement, in the petition that I have read, is, that owing to certain defects in the Act of Incorporation now about to be amended, and their failure to obtain certain and sufficient subsidies, the work on construction has been temporarily suspended. They do not say that anybody broke faith with them, or had declined to give them something that had been promised. Therefore, I must maintain that the Committee has not been supplied with that information which is necessary to enable it to judge fairly of the expediency of this proposal. We have not the slightest idea, even in a general sense, of the route that is intended to be proposed; we have not the slightest idea of the plan which is intended to be adopted. The hon. gentleman says it is not given to a company, and therefore it may be given to any company that answers the exigency. He has not even told us what corporations there are with corporate powers adequate to perform this business; he has not even laid before us the names of those companies with which it is possible for him to contract in the present state of things. We do not know what organizations have power to deal with the matter; we do not know what arrangements are possible, or even what arrangements may be made between now and next Session. And now, within a very few days of prorogation, we are called on, in this hurried manner, to dispose of a very important question, on what I maintain is wholly inadequate information.

Mr. McISAAC. The hon. Minister is mistaken, when he attributes the failure of the Short Line Company to a disappointment met at the hands of the Local Government. According to his own report, the contract for building the branch between Oxford and New Glasgow was signed on the 28th July, 1882. The Local Government came into office on the 3rd August, 1882; he cannot, therefore, maintain that on account of any disappointment by the Local Government, the failure occurred. He may say that the preceding Local Government disappointed the Company, but that cannot be the case either, because the Nova Scotia Syndicate was under an engagement with that Government to get the Eastern Extension, so that no matter what view we take of it, the present and the late Government are innocent as far as disappointing the Short Line Company in finishing their contract between Oxford and New Glasgow is concerned. I want to ask the hon. Minister if the subsidies already granted, which are included in the vote here, are the $256,000 voted last year to the Short Line Company and the $224,000 voted in 1882?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McISAAC. Does the Company forfeit or surrender the $256,000 voted last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may tell my hon. friend that I propose in the Bill to amend that portion of it which assigns that subsidy, especially to that Company, so as to leave our hands perfectly free.

Mr. McISAAC. Has the Company received any portion of the $224,000 voted in 1882, to build the Oxford Branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a dollar.

Mr. McISAAC. Can the hon. gentleman give me the information I asked earlier in the Session, as to whether the labourers and sub contractors are to be paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They have not been paid, to my knowledge, but I think they may expect payment soon. No arrangements will be made that will not cover their payment.

Mr. HOUDE. I propose, in amendment, to add after the words "the shortest and best practicable route," the words "on Canadian soil."

Amendment negatived; and paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 4,

For the construction of a line of Railway from Oxford Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Sydney or Louisburg, a subsidy not exceeding $30,000 per annum for 15 years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work, in addition to the subsidies previously granted, and also a lease or transfer to such company of the Eastern Extension Railway, from New Glasgow to Canso, with its present equipment.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman ought to give us some further explanations in reference to this also. As I pointed out awhile ago, the report of the engineer suggests a subsidy of $15,009 for fifteen years with the existing subsidies and with the Eastern Extension Railway, as what would be necessary to ensure the construction of this line of railway. What the hon. gentleman has proposed is $30,000 a year instead of the $60,000 which the Chief Engineer suggests; that is, as I have said, capitalizing it at 3 per cent., as I do, the $30,000 a year would be equal to $335,500 in cash, and therefore this is less by $335,000 than the view of the Chief Engineer as to what would be necessary. There is also important information as to the views

of others in this matter to be found in the papers on the Table. Several gentlemen, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Paint, have signed a memorandum in which they say:

"As it was found necessary to give the Pictou Branch which cost over $2,400,000—$600,000 in cash and 160,000 acres of Crown Lands—in order to induce a company to construct a railway from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso; and as the said Company and the Local Government of Nova Scotia successively sold their interest in the said Pictou Branch and Eastern Extension from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso for $1,200,000, which is only half the original cost of the Pictou Branch alone, we consider that a subvention, consisting of the Eastern Extension alone and $3,200 per mile, is totally inadequate for the construction of a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, in view of the facts: (1.) That the Pictou Branch pays each year about $60,000, as repeatedly estimated by both political parties in Nova Scotia, over running expenses; and (2) that the Eastern Extension actually earned $9,000 less than running expenses last year.

"A railway from New Glasgow to Louisburg would prove a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial, &c."

They point out:

"The short line from Montreal to New Glasgow would not have as much interest in extension eastward of New Glasgow as the Intercolonial from New Glasgow to Halifax."

And they point out:

"A larger subsidy would be required to induce the same Company to undertake the Cape Breton section, concurrently with other sections of the short line from Montreal to Louisburg.

"Any railway scheme, therefore, such as agreed upon by the Maritime members supporting the Government, having in view the shortest practical route between Montreal and St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax, and Louisburg, unless it provides that the Cape Breton section of that line shall be commenced, prosecuted and finished concurrently with the other sections of the short line, either by the same company or by the Dominion Government, will unfairly discriminate in favour of the unconstructed sections of the line west of New Glasgow, and render it more difficult to secure extension from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg after the short line will be finished to New Glasgow, than at Present."

I do not know whether these arguments had to do with the course of the hon. gentleman in proposing there should be a separation of the interests, and that the Short Line Company should be cut up into two short line companies, but it may be so. But in view of what I have here, in view also of the fact that the statement made by the hon. gentleman last Session has not been verified by events, in view of the fact that his engineer reported that an annual subsidy of twice the amount he is now proposing would be necessary in order to secure the construction of this line, in view of the fact that he is thus proposing to grant $335,000 less than the Chief Engineer considers necessary, the Committee is entitled to learn what the grounds are on which he expects this subsidy will be adequate to the construction of the line; and in order that the hon. gentleman may not fall innocently, of course, as usual, into a misapprehension of my meaning, I beg, in advance, to say I am not complaining of the smallness of the grant, but am merely pointing out to the hon. gentleman that his engineer indicates this grant is inadequate, and if he has other information to show Parliament that the grant is adequate, Parliament should be put into possession of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to be able to remove the difficulty suggested by the hon. gentleman. The Chief Engineer reported on a line from Moncton. The Resolution provided for a line from Oxford station, or sixty miles less than in the former case, the Intercolonial Railway being used between Moncton and Oxford, instead of the construction of a new line, involving some sixty miles additional, which accounts for the difference between the two amounts.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 5,

To the Quebec Central Railway Company, for a line of railway from Beauce Junction to the International Boundary Line, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in whole	$211,200 00

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman did not lay on the Table any papers at all connected with the Quebec Central Railway. I am consequently obliged to ask him to make an oral statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought I had laid a communication upon the Table, with reference to this. I think I laid it upon the Table this afternoon. I may say that I had an interview with the gentlemen representing that railway, and they stated that the subsidy such as I proposed, in addition to what they have from the Province of Quebec, would enable them promptly to take up and complete that connection, and this subsidy is proposed to cover sixty-six miles, from Beauce Junction or St. Joseph's, where the separation between the portion running to Montreal and the portion running to the international boundary would take place, to connect with the present International Railway, near the boundary of the State of Maine.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, the hon. gentleman is mistaken. The two papers he laid on the Table this afternoon do not comprise any statement with reference to this. Here we are dealing with a company, to which a grant is proposed to be given. The Committee will observe that this Resolution proposes that, where grants are not made to named companies, "the other subsidies shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established, to his satisfaction, their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively." Now, that is the proposition of the condition the Government thought it proper, when they asked Parliament to permit them to grant a subsidy without naming the company, to prescribe that the company must be such a one as should have satisfied the Governor in Council of its ability to construct and complete the railway. Now, we have a named company, with which we are dealing at this moment, and no doubt the rule is not more rigorous with reference to the unnamed than with reference to the named, and it must be presumed that the named Company has already complied with the condition which the unnamed companies are to comply with before they get grants or subsidies; that is, that the named Company has established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council its ability to construct and complete the railway referred to. If that has been established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, the evidence by which it was established ought to be laid before Parliament, in order that Parliament may be able to judge in the matter. The hon. gentleman has laid no evidence before us, has not even made a statement; we know not who are the corporators, we know not what the capital stock subscribed is, we know not what the capital stock paid up is, and we know not what is the financial basis of the Company. We have nothing whatever to indicate with reference to this Company its *bond fides*, about which I say nothing, for I know nothing; or its ability, about which I say nothing, for I know nothing, but upon which we certainly ought to have some evidence before we are asked to grant a subsidy to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that, while it is quite true that, where the Company is named, the subsidy is voted for that Company, but the Company cannot obtain a dollar of that subsidy until they make an agreement with the Government, and before they make the agreement they will require all the evidences of their ability to carry out the contract and to meet such obligations as are prescribed in that agreement; so that the fact of the Government being empowered to make an arrangement with that Company does not involve that any such arrangement will be made, because it would depend upon the Company being able to comply with the stipulations prescribed by the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, has it been thought premature, before bringing down these Resolutions, to enquire what the

financial bases of these companies are, has it been thought premature to enquire into what their scheme is, in order to ensure construction, whether they will be able to construct and complete the road with this subsidy? Am I to be told that this is a matter to be done afterwards, after we have passed the legislation and are prorogued, and that the Government has not thought fit to enter into any such enquiry beforehand and are not ready to make such a statement to the Committe now as to the *bonâ fides* of the Company, as to who are its stockholders, as to what they have subscribed and as to how the road is expected to be completed. Is that the case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that where the Government have put in the name of the Company they have such general information as leads them to the conclusion that the Company will be able to carry out the undertaking on the terms prescribed, but that does not bind them. They are entirely free until they have made the agreement, and are satisfied of the ability of the parties to comply with the engagements they have entered into, and until those parties have made such an agreement as will carry out what the Governor in Council may require.

Mr. HALL. Although this line, which it is proposed to aid, is not exactly in the section of country which I represent, I have a general knowledge of the status of the Quebec Central Railway Company, and as this is a point of interest at this moment, I may say that this is not a new or unknown Company. It was established twelve or thirteen years ago, for the purpose of constructing a railway between Sherbrooke and Quebec. That railway has been completed and running, 139 miles of it, for a number of years, entirely completed and equipped. Latterly, a section of road incorporated under the name of the Lévis and Kennebec Railway Company, a local road, got into financial difficulties, was brought to the sheriff's sale, and the Quebec Central became possessed of the road, as much of it as was in existence, and of its franchise. That Company was incorporated with the intention of building a road through the valley of the Chaudière river for local purposes, and the Quebec Central have taken that up for the purpose of completing it, and will, even without this aid, construct it as a colonization road; but it would be an important link in establishing the short line with the Lower Provinces, and in order that it might be improved and built of a character and construction to correspond with the through line, it is proposed that this additional aid should be given to it, and there is no doubt that, with that aid, the Company will be in a position to construct it and will construct it as a first-class road. I refer to these facts, with the view of establishing the position and competence of the Quebec Central Company, which is mentioned in this Resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, the statement of the hon. gentleman is very interesting, and I suppose it is news to the Minister of Railways as well as to myself, for it may be supposed that if he had possessed the information he would have vouchsafed it to the House. As we all knew, this is an existing Company, but with reference to this existing line of railway, the object, it appears, is to enable them to complete it in a superior style to what they would do if the subsidy were not given. They are about to complete it in an inferior style from their own resources, and the $3,200 a mile is to enable them to make it in first-class style. In the interval of time since these Resolutions were laid on the Table, I have not been able to acquire such information as I would have liked to acquire in reference to several of these links of railway, and can express no opinion whatever as to whether this is of that character, which under the hon. gentleman's elastic definition at present, of the conditions of Federal aid, render it desirable to grant this additional assistance. I should like to know the estimated cost of the construction of the line, as it was to be before this good fortune happened. I do not know if the Minister of Railways has any information on the estimated cost of the line or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman ought, I suppose, to give to the Government of Quebec some little credit for knowledge of these matters which are under their own observation, and I suppose he is aware, as I stated, that we had evidence that the Province of Quebec had given $6,000 a mile for eighty miles to this Company.

Mr. BLAKE. To this line now to be built?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not necessarily to this line, but to this Company, so that they are in a condition that will fairly warrant us in supposing that, with this additional aid, we could make that such a first-class road as it would need to be in order to become a portion of this short line of railway communication from Quebec to the Atlantic ports. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has stated the position of the Company, and I may say that the deputation of gentlemen connected with that road, as well as some other gentlemen with whom I have had long interviews, made communications which were personal, so that it is impossible for me to make them public.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. gentleman cannot give any idea of the estimated cost of this line?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it is at all necessary to go into it.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 6,

For the Extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, to the harbour of Quebec, in such manner as may be approved by the Governor in Council, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $960,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to alter that; by adding after the word "Montreal," the words "or some other point on the Canadian Pacific Railway." The object of the change is to avoid binding ourselves to St. Martin's Junction. The distance is defined; it does not affect the amount.

Mr. BLAKE. What are the possible alternative proposals?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are none, but we think it is better not to be tied to that particular point.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a very important matter, and I think the hon. gentleman might give us some idea of what alternative suggestions have been made to the Government as to the mode of completing this communication. Is it intended, for example, that this Resolution should be read so widely as to permit of the acquisition by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of what is commonly called the North Shore Railway, or is it intended to be restricted to the construction of a new line of railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is framed so as to enable the Government to procure an extension of this railway from its terminus to the harbour of Quebec. There is no specific mode pointed out, nor is it desirable that there should be. It leaves the question open for the adoption of the best line that can be secured.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is it not desirable to state the mode?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because another third, or fourth, or fifth mode may arise which may be preferred, and we wish to choose only the best line, the most proper terminus, and the best means of effecting the extension of the line from Montreal to Quebec—it may be by the acquisition of the North Shore road from the Grand Trunk Railway; it may be by the building of another line, in case of a failure to make that end.

Mr. AMYOT. I have no objection to the country granting money to building lines of railway going to Quebec, or to any other large city in the Dominion; but I do not see that this proposition in any way changes the ill-will of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company towards Quebec, which that Company has manifested from the beginning. We have seen by the late correspondence between a member of the Government and the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that the Company has decided never to go to Quebec. I notice that this amount of $960,000 is only one-half of the first amount that was to be given to the Government of the Province of Quebec, according to the principle laid down in the first paragraph; so, in order to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to reach Quebec, we take away from the Provincial Government the sum of $6,000 per mile, to which that Province is entitled, by what I may call the preamble of the resolution, as I take it for granted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not willing to go to Quebec. I observe that the paragraphs that we have already adopted, instead of forcing the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, sends it elsewhere through the United States, and I shall, on concurrence, ask that an amount of $960,000 be added to the first paragraph. I may say that the members of the Ministry will readily understand why I do that. They will remember certain previous conversations—I will not say agreement, but certain previous conversations—which took place, and which secured a certain action. At all events, without going further at this moment, I may say that I see no reason why, under the pretext of sending to Quebec a company that we sent elsewhere by the same Resolution, we should deprive the Province of Quebec of this sum of money. The Province of Quebec has built the railway which forms part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has been always understood that the Canadian Pacific Railway was to reach from ocean to ocean on Canadian soil, and it has been stated and reiterated from year to year, that Montreal and Quebec would benefit by the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have been told of steamboats that were to cross between Quebec and Lévis; we have changed the course of the Intercolonial Railway by the St. Charles Branch; we had brought the Grand Trunk Railway from Lévis to Rivière du Loup—all that to complete this great national route. But, now, Mr. Chairman, instead of doing that, we put aside three-fourths of the Province of Quebec and say, "You shall benefit no more from the Canadian Pacific Railway; we are going to send it elsewhere." To-day, under pretext of sending it to St. John or to other cities in the Maritime Provinces, we send it in the direction of Portland or Boston, or some other port in the United States, and there our commerce will consequently go. I think that before doing that we should, as far as possible, compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to remain in our own country, to benefit our own country, and to develop our cities at home instead of those of the United States. However, without going further into details, I repeat that I see no reason for giving that sum of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and taking it away from the Province of Quebec. The principle laid down is just, and we are entitled to it. The Province of Quebec has built the whole road from Quebec to Ottawa, and is just as much entitled to $12,000 a mile between Montreal and Quebec as it is between Montreal and Ottawa. We did not understand the first Resolution or we would have moved this amendment; but on concurrence we will move it.

Mr. HOUDE. Could not the Government provide, at the end of this paragraph and in the Bill which will be based on these Resolutions, that if the amount of $960,000 is not absorbed by the said subsidy, that is to say, if the Canadian Pacific Railway is not prolonged to Quebec, as is proposed, interest will be paid to the Government of the Province of Quebec in that case? I think this would be only just and right.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), I must say this; the hon. gentleman speaks as if the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not to be in the Province of Quebec. That extension is to be from Montreal to Quebec, and in the Province of Quebec, and for the benefit of the whole Dominion, but especially for the Province of Quebec. The intention is to make the harbour of Quebec the eastern terminus, in summer, of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This has been asked—the people and the press have asked it, and we have come down with these Resolutions to carry it out; that is to say, we propose to give $6,000 per mile in order that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific shall be in the harbour of Quebec. The hon. gentleman goes further and says: "I do not believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will go down to Quebec and make that its eastern terminus." Now, Mr. Speaker, we can judge of the disposition of the Company as well as of individuals by its words and by its writings. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by its President, has stated positively that the intention of the Company is to go to Quebec and make the harbour of Quebec its eastern terminus, and that Company is now negotiating for that purpose. That assurance has been given; papers have been laid on the Table to that effect. Besides, the Government have brought down these Resolutions, and if the hon. gentleman would wait until the whole measure was complete and the Bill laid before the House—because these are only Resolutions that must be introduced in Committee of the Whole and afterwards embraced in a Bill—he would find in the Bill the machinery by which this extension will take place. Certain powers will have to be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway to enable them to extend the railway from Montreal to Quebec, in order that they may build the line or purchase another line; and therefore the hon. gentleman should allow the measure to be completed and laid before the House, when he would be able to judge of the determination of the Government as well as of the Company, to build this line or purchase another line. The question asked by the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) is quite a different question. It does not arise now. We are convinced that this railway will be extended to Quebec; that is our desire; we show it by these Resolutions, and therefore we ask our friends and the House to help us in perfecting the measure, so as to bring the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec. There is no better proof of the determination of the Government than that furnished by these Resolutions. The hon. member for Bellechasse goes further and says: "The Province of Quebec is entitled to have $12,000 per mile for the railway." We are giving $12,000 per mile from Ottawa to Montreal to the Government of Quebec. Then, as regards the other $12,000 per mile, we give half to the Government of Quebec and half to the Province of Quebec, by extending the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Quebec. It is a promise we have made; it is the desire of the Province; and we have to consider, in this matter, two powers, authorities and sets of men: the Government of the Province of Quebec who have made their representations to us, and, on the other side, the representatives of the people in this House, as well as the representatives of the other Provinces who, I think, have something to say also in matters which belong even to the Province of Quebec, in the same way as we have something to say when measures are laid before the House relating to the other Provinces and in the interests of the whole Dominion. And, therefore, I think that the policy of the Government is one which should commend itself to the approval and fair consideration of this House, and I hope the hon. gentleman will give his support to this measure and especially to the Resolutions.

Mr. OUIMET. I am very glad to have heard the explanation of the Minister. He admits quite clearly that the principle on which these Resolutions is based is the right principle towards the Province of Quebec; that is to say, to give compensation to Quebec for the railway it built at an enormous cost, and in consequence of which its finances are now suffering very severely. The $12,000 per mile, the hon. gentleman says, are given from Ottawa to Montreal. He admits that the Province is entitled in the same way to the same indemnity for the line from Montreal to Quebec; but, for political purposes, to benefit the city of Quebec in particular, and to benefit the lower portion of the Province, the Government have thought it better to take part of the amount, in order to secure the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the harbour of the city of Quebec. I do not grudge the city of Quebec that indemnity which was due to the Province of Quebec. If it is necessary to carry out the original scheme of having the Canadian Pacific Railway through Canadian territory, to have that road linked with our great national highway, the Intercolonial, I think it is quite a proper way to so act, and the policy of the Government must be approved on this subject. But, on the other hand, I would have rather seen the whole amount given to the party to whom it is due, to whom it is admitted to be due—that is to say, the Province of Quebec—leaving to that Province afterwards, if it is in the interest of certain parts of it, to grant a portion of the money for the purpose of securing the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the city of Quebec—leaving, in fact, the Province itself to judge of the matter. I would certainly be more satisfied to see the whole amount given to the Province of Quebec; and when we are giving so many millions, I would have rather seen, and I suppose the whole people would have rather seen, that the Government's policy was the extension of the great Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec and from that port down to Rivière du Loup, and thence by the shortest line on Canadian territory to St. John. That would receive the approbation of all Canadian patriots. As to what has been suggested by the hon. member for Maskinongé, I think if the policy of the Government can be changed on that point, that is to give the whole subsidy to Quebec, it would be only fair that interest on the amount which is recognized to be due Quebec, until it is paid out for the purpose mentioned in this Resolution, that is to say, the securing of the extension to Quebec, should be paid to the Province of Quebec in the same manner as the rest of the subsidy until, as I stated before, the amount is paid out for the purposes mentioned in the Resolution. The Government should show them that it is not the intention to deprive the Province of Quebec of that amount, but it is only with a view of better benefiting the Province that they keep it, in order to ensure the extension of the railway. But on the other hand, until they see their way to secure that purpose they allow the Province of Quebec to enjoy the proceeds of that amount; and I think it is only a necessary conclusion by the Government, after what has been admitted by the Minister of Public Works, that they should allow interest on that sum to the Province of Quebec, until the money is paid out for the purposes mentioned in the Resolution. And I think that would be welcomed in the Province, and though some may complain, I am not disposed to complain. I think, as it has been asserted before, that Province had some right to expect that the whole sum would be paid to it, but the policy of the Government seems to have been modified in that sense, and I say—and I say it meaningly—that at least we ought not to be deprived entirely, and allow this $960,000 to lie in the public Treasury when it is admitted that it is the property of the Province of Quebec. I contend that the Province of Quebec should receive at least the interest, until the money is employed for the purposes mentioned in the Resolution.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Minister of Public Works stated in his reply to the hon. member for Bellechasse, that the scheme, as laid before the House, is strictly in accordance with the promise made. Will the hon. gentleman tell me when that promise was made? I am waiting for an answer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I asked when the promise mentioned by the hon. gentleman was made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman understood me to say that, he did not understand what I meant to say. I say we promised here that $12,000 should be given to the first section from Ottawa to Montreal, and that, as the hon. Minister of Railways has explained, that amount was given because that portion of the railway forms now part of the Canadian Pacific Railway—I need not repeat all that my hon. friend has said, but I was following what he stated—he showed that this was in consequence of the policy which had been adopted previously, for a similar portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the Canada Central had been subsidized in the same way by giving $12,000 for that road, that in this instance the North Shore from Ottawa to Montreal had been built by the Government at their own expense, and inasmuch as that portion of the line had been made a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, therefore we should treat that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the same way as the Canada Central, by giving it $12,000 per mile. We thought it a proper thing—and I was following that by saying that in accordance with the promise so made, the portion of the road from Montreal to Quebec should be treated in the following way. I did not enter into all the details, as the Minister of Railways had done so himself; that is to say: we were giving $6,000 per mile to the Quebec Government, not because the line was forming a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but because we knew the wants, the financial wants, of the Province of Quebec; we knew the great sacrifice that Province had been making to develop the country by building railways: that the Province had expended over $14,000,000 for these railways; that under those circumstances the $12,000 which we would have given to the Government of Quebec for the railway between Montreal and Quebec, had it formed part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the same way as the first portion from Ottawa to Montreal was forming part; that we would give one-half that amount to the Government of the Province of Quebec, and the other half would go in helping to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Quebec, and thus we would secure to the Province of Quebec not only the amount of money required for its wants, but also do what was asked of us on all sides—secure the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Quebec.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The answer of the hon. gentleman will not suffice. The hon. member for Bellechasse conveyed distinctly the information that the conditions on which some bargain or promise was made were not fulfilled—his language would bear no other construction—and the Minister of Public Works, in replying to him, maintained that the scheme brought down was consistent with the promise made. I ask when that promise was made, and to whom it was made, and I think we are entitled to a full reply, especially as the hon. gentleman's followers expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which the promise was fulfilled. I hope the hon. gentleman, with his usual candour, will give us a fair statement. I do not want a long argument—I understand the argument—but I want the reason of the promise which is said to have been made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am always disposed to be fair, and I am always fair, I think; and I want always to answer in a kind, and proper way, especially the hon. gentleman after the high position he occupied, and still occupies, in this House. I am sorry I cannot give him any other answer than the answer I gave him just now. I think that is the answer I had to give, and I am sorry that the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. AMYOT. As I understand that we will have no opportunity to deal with questions of money upon any stage of the Bill which will be founded on these Resolutions, I think this is the time to say what we want, and to move what we desire, about the amounts of money to be granted to the divers companies. The beginning of the Resolution says:

"To the Government of the Province of Quebec, in consideration of their having constructed the railway from Quebec to Ottawa, forming a connecting link between the Atlantic and Pacific *viâ* the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific Railway."

That is all very true:

"And being, as such, a work of national and not merely provincial utility—."

That is all true; we all admit that:

"a subsidy not exceeding $12,000 per mile for the portion between Montreal and Ottawa."

But I find that for the portion between Quebec and Montreal it is only $6,000 per mile. I do not understand why that difference. We say that the Government of the Province of Quebec has built a link of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for so building it that Government is entitled to $12,000 per mile. Well, if we give only $6,000 per mile from Montreal to Quebec, we say to the Government of the Province of Quebec: you are entitled to $12,000 per mile for having already built a road which forms part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but we will draw upon you again and we will ask you $6,000 more a mile to subsidize a new railway. We say to the Government of the Province of Quebec, you have done your share, you are entitled to $12,000, but we will take away $6,000. We help you because you are poor, and you are poor because you built the railway. Is it because the Province is poor that it gets $6,000 less per mile from Montreal to Quebec? We are now told, in the very clear explanation of the hon. Minister of Public Works, that this amount of $960,000 forms part of the cost of building the Pacific Railway from Quebec to Ottawa. So, it is directly told to the country at large that here is a Government that has built a link of the Pacific Railway, that has rendered itself poor by doing so. Though in spite of its poorness, we will go on and draw upon it to the extent of nearly a $1,000,000. That is the proposition. I think the country is rich enough to dispose of a million of money for that purpose; I do not grudge the $960,000 to the Pacific Railway Company to build a line that is not wanted immediately. Give that amount, if you like, to the Pacific Company; but I do not think they will go to Quebec; I do not think they want to go to Quebec; and under those circumstances we should not deprive the Government of Quebec of a sum that they are entitled to. The hon. Minister says a promise has been made. I presume it is a promise that is just; and that promise is another reason which I add to the reasons I give now. I do not go into the details of these promises; but I say, on the merits of the case, that the Province of Quebec is entitled to $12,000 a mile, just as the Province of Ontario was entitled to compensation for other similar roads; or else obtain the consent of that Government which is interested, and which is responsible to the electors, before you take away from it $6,000 a mile. We are building railways to bring immigration into the country, to give value to our lands, to increase our commerce; I am in favour of that; but do not lay at the bottom of that work an injustice—I shall not say a robbery exactly, but at least a legislative robbery. Quebec only wants justice; it wants to be treated as the other Provinces are treated. We want these Resolutions to be complete; we want the preamble to be the basis of the amount that will be voted. That is what I meant the first time I spoke. Now, in answer to the hon. Minister of Public Works, as to the good will of the Pacific Railway to go to Quebec, I have only to refer to the correspondence. I do not know whether or not it is before the House, but I find it in the Montreal *Gazette* of the 9th instant. Any one who reads between the lines can easily see what Mr. Stephen, in his letter, means, which he ends by saying:

"It is, of course, impossible to define the exact form or conditions which will characterize the arrangements for a summer terminus at Quebec, when finally made."

Mr. Chairman, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company know exactly where to pass among those mountains which have hardly ever been visited by man; they know exactly how to pass to the north of Lake Superior; they know what branches to buy here and there; they know where to go through the State of Maine, a country that has never been explored by them, so far as I know; but when it comes to the question of going from Montreal to Quebec, a place which, I believe, is known, it is impossible for them to understand anything, or to come to any conclusion. The correspondence published in the newspapers shows that they do not want to go to Quebec; but on the Minister of Public Works addressing a letter to Mr. Stephen, on the 14th instant, asking them to go there, Mr. Stephen, in answer, says: "It is impossible to say what we will do." That is his good will. I have no confidence in such good will, and that is one reason why I do not think the Province of Quebec should be despoiled of this $6,000 a mile, to which it is entitled.

Mr. VALIN. Will the hon. member for Bellechasse tell me why the Quebec Government did not secure the terminus of the Pacific Railway at Quebec at the same time that they secured it to go to Montreal? I understand that the Government now say that they give $6,000 per mile to the Government of Quebec for the road from Montreal to Quebec, and we are to grant $6,000 a mile in order to help the Pacific Railway to go to Quebec. Well, I say that is very just, and I am glad to see that the Government are willing to help the Province of Quebec. But, in the meantime, I would like the hon. member for Bellechasse to tell me how is it that the Quebec Government secured the Pacific road to go to Montreal? And how is it that they did not secure the terminus for the summer months at Quebec? I believe it is right and proper for the Government to reserve $6,000 a mile, in order to secure the terminus of the Pacific Railway at Quebec, or to give $12,000 per mile to the Government of Quebec, and let that Government fix the terminus at Quebec.

Mr. AMYOT. I will answer the hon. member for Montmorency. I am sorry that his numerous duties have prevented him from being here lately, or it would not be necessary for me to refresh his memory by referring to the correspondence which passed between the Government of Quebec and the members of the Syndicate of the North Shore Railway, by which he will find that if the terminus was not secured at Quebec it was because the Pacific Railway Company refused absolutely to buy the North Shore from Montreal to Quebec. If the Pacific Railway is no more to the interest of the country at large than it is to the Province of Quebec, I am afraid that it will be very little indeed—that it will be more to the interest of the members of the Company than it will be to the interest of the public.

Mr. BLAKE. I think my hon. friend from Bellechasse has placed the Government in a very awkward position by his denunciation of the Pacific Railway, and by the statement that they do not yet know the way to Quebec; because it is quite obvious that the Government are in the same box.

We have been told—and the statement is so important that the Minister of Railways abandoned the rudder for the moment, and put it in the hands of the experienced pilot who steers the ship of State, to give the answer, so that there might not be a "t" uncrossed or an "i" undotted—we are told that he does not know. It appears there is an embarrassment of riches—that there are four or five ways in which the Canadian Pacific Railway might go to Quebec if they choose. I did not hear of more than three ways. And really the difficulty the hon. gentleman for Bellechasse will see, is not that there is a difficulty of obtaining a way to get to Quebec, but there are so many ways of getting there that the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between them, with the utmost good will to settle the question, not tortured by any dissensions between the Company and the Government, or between one wing and the other wing of the Government itself, have been unable, in the interests of the country and the Province combined, to ascertain which of the many ways to Quebec is the way by which the Canadian Pacific Railway should reach that port. We are told not merely that the Resolution is to be enlarged by affording the utmost scope to the Goverment to take a choice of all the various paths open to reach Quebec, but that it is not expedient to tell us anything about any of the paths just now. We are to make a leap in the dark; we are not even to be told by the occupants of the Ministerial benches what the choices are which are before them, which have been engaging their attention, and upon which they have had conferences with the Pacific Railway Company, and with one another, without having yet been able to arrive at any conclusion. The hon. Minister of Public Works stated, as I understood him, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company expressed their determination to go to Quebec, that the Company spoke by its officers and spoke as an individual would, and then he alluded to correspondence laid on the Table. I read that correspondence personally, and I must say I did not draw from it the inference of the Company's intention to go to Quebec *coûte que coûte* which the hon. Minister of Public Works seems to draw from it. I rather think it partakes somewhat of that judicious vagueness with which the Ministerial propositions in general, and those on this subject in particular, are involved. I do not charge the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with any ill will to Quebec, as the hon. member for Bellechasse does; I suppose the Company has no good or ill will to any place, but simply considers what is good for its own commercial interests.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt it is considering the best bargain it may drive, and it has some capacities for driving pretty hard bargains, as we all know. I see the hon. Minister of Finance has laid on the Table a sweet little notice which is to appear in the Votes and Proceedings of to-day, and is to be discussed on Saturday, for a loan £2,000,000 to take up short loans and £3,000,000 to meet the demands of the Pacific Railway.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not to take up short loans.

Mr. BLAKE. A portion is—£2,000,000 sterling.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A very small portion.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, this is a very small portion. The hon. gentleman is so much accustomed to deal in millions——

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman must not misrepresent the facts of the case. The facts are, that but a small portion is to provide for short loans; the half of the £2,000,000 is already taken up and but a small portion of it is for short loans, and another portion what we have to pay to the Canadian Pacific Railway on account of the $12,000 per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. He has borrowed half before getting the authority of Parliament and the other half, the remainder, is for the Canadian Pacific Railway and those other enterprises mentioned here in which we see the sign and the mark, not of the beast, but of the Canadian Pacific Railway, very legibly demonstrated in various quarters. We know the capacity of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to drive a bargain, and I presume they are just considering whether it will pay them to go to Quebec and by which way they can make the best bargain. They have no good or ill will towards that or any other quarter, but are simply considering what is best for themselves, and we have equally to consider what is best for ourselves. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman might have given us a statement of what the four or five choices are, which he says the Government have to considerd, and upon which they have to decide, and I should like to know whether there are any other assurances or promises or statements made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with reference to creating a summer terminus at Quebec, except those laid on the Table? If there are, we ought to know them; if there are not, we can judge as well as the hon. Minister of Public Works, or any one else, what, reading between the lines, is the meaning of the communications we have on the subject.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 16,

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, for a line of railway from the Victoria Branch of the Midland Railway to the Village of Bancroft, in the Township of Dungannon, County of Hastings, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $160,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the ground upon which he thinks the subsidy will be adequate for the purpose?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With this assistance, they state they will be able to go on and finish the road.

Mr. BLAKE. All I can say is, that the paper I have here which is dated the 13th March, 1884, and is addressed to the hon. Minister, says:

"In doing this, we have already spent over $100,000, and we are now satisfied and prepared to go on and make further investments to an amount sufficient to complete fifty miles of the railway and erect two charcoal blast furnaces, provided:

"1. That the Dominion Government will give a bonus of $6,000 per mile, to apply on the fifty miles extending from the Victoria Branch of the Midland Railway to the Village of Bancroft, in the Township of Dungannon, County of Hastings.

"2. That the Province of Ontario will give sufficient amount of woodland per mile, applying on the same fifty miles, as will justify our erecting and operating two furnaces.

"We are prepared to proceed with the completion of the railway and the erection of the two furnaces, and to make such an investment of money as will ensure their successful operation, provided the grants are assured to us as asked."

This is signed by Mr. Charles T. Pusey. It does not appear to me from this that $3,200 a mile is enough; on the contrary, according to this, and it is the only statement we have before us, $6,000 a mile is required, besides a grant of woodland from the Province of Ontario, to an indefinite extent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the hon. gentleman is Minister of Railways as long I have been, he will know that parties do not always ask the smallest amount sufficient to build their roads, but the largest they think they can get; and when they find they cannot obtain more, they are prepared to make a smaller amount suffice. If I had placed on these Resolutions all the money asked by parties who have approached the Government in reference to railways, the sum would be considerably increased. What I did in this

case was this. Mr. Pusey was in town and I communicated with him, not directly but indirectly, and learned that if we would grant this amount, $3,200 a mile, the Company would be enabled to build the road.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not inviting the hon. gentleman to place on the paper all the amounts he is asked for. The hon. gentleman has said there are a very large number of applications which he has not granted, applications so large that he had not the opportunity to have them prepared and brought down, and I do not invite him to bring them down; but what I maintain is, that we are entitled to have some reasonable assurance that what we are asked to vote is going to accomplish the object for which it is voted, and when we find the only evidence forthcoming is a demand for $6,000 a mile, I am obliged to ask on what grounds he thinks $3,000 will suffice.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Mr. Pusey assured me that with the grant of $3,200 per mile he and his associates were prepared to build the road. The grant from the Local Government was not for the purpose of building the road but for constructing blast furnaces and providing the necessary wood to be used in those furnaces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To make charcoal.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). I do not rise for the purpose of opposing this grant, but to express my regret that the hon. Minister of Railways has not embracec in this Resolution a grant or subsidy to the extension of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, from its present northerly point of construction to the village of Bancroft, which has a junction with the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Road. The hon. the Minister of Customs, who is unfortunately unavoidably absent, when he had an understanding with Mr. Ritchie, who was the promoter of the Central Ontario Railway, that certain amendments should be added to the Bill asking for the charter for the extension of that railway, had an impression that these amendments would pass the House; and, had they done so, it would not have been necessary to have asked for any aid or assistance as a subsidy for this extension, because we would have had reciprocal powers for traffic in connection with the Midland system. I believe, were it not for this, and if the Minister of Customs were here, he would have probably got the consent of the Minister of Railways to have granted a subsidy to this extension that I now speak of. I believe that Mr. Ritchie is now willing to concede all that was asked by these amendments, that is, if he gets a bonus of some $6,000 a mile for twenty-three miles of his railway from Beaver Creek to Bancroft. We are aware that it was with the understanding that he was to build that road without asking any bonus whatever from this Parliament that he succeeded in getting his Bill through the House. It makes no difference to us whether we get it in the way of a grant to the Belleville and North Hastings extension or it is given to Mr. Ritchie, so long as the assistance is granted by the Government. We find, now, that the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company are receiving $3,200 a mile, or about $160,000, to assist them in constructing a railway into the richest part of the mining district of North Hastings; we also find that the Napanee and Tamworth Railway are receiving $3,200 a mile, or in the whole $70,400, for the purpose of extending their railway also into the mining region of North Hastings; and while Belleville has granted some $200,000 to the Midland and North Hastings Railways and the township of Madoc and county of Hastings have given almost as much, we find that we are, as it were, isolated and cut asunder altogether from the benefits and advantages which we should derive, as having the most convenient and expeditious route to market and the seaport. I agree with the importance of developing the material interests of the country, by extending our railway system as far as we can, and also granting subsidies to railways so far as we can afford to do so; and I also agree with what the hon. the Minister of Railways said this evening, that nobody now considers himself within the realms of civilization, who is living in a place of any importance whatever, unless he is somewhere in the vicinity, or is in proximity to some railway. I trust when the hon. Minister of Railways brings in his Bill based upon these Resolutions, we will have some assistance granted, at least, to this extension, and I hope at all events it will be, in my supporting these Resolutions, if not the understanding, at least the expectation, that the Minister of Railways will grant this assistance, or give us some assurance that a subsidy will be given for the portion of the extension asked for.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 17,

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction, for a line of railway from Aylmer to Pembroke, provided the Ottawa River is crossed within the county of Pontiac, at some point not east of Lapasse, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $272,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to ask to amend that by saying, from "Hull or Aylmer," after the word "from."

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state whether he has any information as to the probable cost of this line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a railway which, as I stated in my opening remarks, has been considered by the Government of the Province of Quebec worthy of a subsidy of $6,000 per mile, for the 85 miles from Aylmer or Hull to Pembroke, but that subsidy was not found sufficient to secure its construction. A contract was made but the company were not able to effect a sale of the bonds on the road, and hence they applied to this Government. I do not at this moment remember exactly what was asked, but I had various communications with my hon. friend, the representative of the county of Pontiac, who has pressed upon me the great importance of this road and the great advantage it would be to a very large section of country there to have it completed, and he has also quite satisfied me that, with the aid that is proposed in this Resolution, there would be no doubt of the road being promptly carried forward. The exact estimate for the cost per mile, I suppose, varies more or less, but as a rule from $12,000 to $20,000 and in some cases, where the work is more difficult, $25,000 a mile, I suppose, would be required, but I am told that with this subsidy, in addition to that given by the Province of Quebec, there is every reason to suppose the road will be promptly carried forward. In fact, I believe a company, and a very strong company, could be organized without making any addition to the subsidy here proposed to carry the road promptly to completion.

Mr. BLAKE. As far as I can hear, this is a very easy road to build, and it has received from the Government of the Province of Quebec $6,000 a mile, from the county of Pontiac, $100,000, and it has been fortunate enough to have made a contract for the construction of the road, in which the contractor has made default, and is to lose the work he has done, which is estimated at $70,000, which falls into the hands of the Company. It was also fortunate enough to have its preliminary survey made by the Province of Quebec. I have been told that an application was made some time ago, I think some time last summer, to the First Minister, by some gentlemen interested in this railway, for aid, and that he enquired of them how much they had put into the enterprise themselves, and that the answer was not satisfactory to the hon. gentleman. It turned out that the corporators had put very little

into the enterprise, a merely nominal sum, $200 or $300 a piece, or something of that kind; the whole expenditure was nominal, in railway parlance, and the First Minister pointed out to them that they could not expect public aid unless they showed sufficient faith in the Company to put something into it themselves. I am told also that some very strong men offered to take the enterprise off the hands of the present directorate, and to build the railway, paying up the claims of the defaulting contractor if they pleased. Some of the names were so strong as that those of Mr. Ross, of Quebec, and Mr. Maclaren, of Buckingham, were included among them. That was refused, the directors insisting upon receiving a pecuniary consideration for their interest as the price for their sale of the concession of the railway. You know something about it, Mr. Chairman. I believe you are one of the directors, and the Secretary of State, I believe, is another, and Mr. Church, of Montreal, and Mr. R. S. White, of Montreal, are in the directorate. I believe there are some eight or nine gentlemen who have the control of the stock of this Company, upon which a nominal sum has been paid, and who are, no doubt, making an excellently good thing out of the Dominion Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman looks, he will find this is not voted to the company at all. In certain cases these subsidies are voted in the company's name, in others it is left to be given to any company selected by the Government; and the hon. gentleman will see that in this case we do no ask Parliament to vote it to any company, but leave it entirely open, so that we may ascertain the lowest terms upon which it will be possible to secure the construction of that road, and we shall take very good care not to exceed that amount.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say whether there is another company than this incorporated for the construction of this line?

Mr. BRYSON. Last year, when the important Resolutions for granting railway subsidies were being considered, I congratulated the Minister of Railways and the Government on their liberal policy in giving the sum of $3,200 a tmile asa subsidy for certain railways. I then requested he hon Minister to take into consideration the very important branch in the county I have the honour to represent, the Pontiac Railway, and I am pleased now to be able to thank him for having remembered that railway in these Resolutions. I am satisfied this subsidy, along with the subsidy granted by the Quebec Government, of $6,000 a mile, will be adequate to secure the construction of this road; and I am satisfied that the large extent of country lying east and north of this railway will be greatly enhanced in value, and that its valuable mineral resources will contribute in no small degree to the revenue of the country. With reference to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, in regard to the company who offered to take up this enterprise, I would say that his information is not correct, I am not aware that at the meeting here the president or the directors of the company made any concession to any individual or party, or that they were prepared to accept any sum or sums for their charter. It has always been asserted to me and to many of my friends by the president and directors of this road, that they were not prepared to dispose of the charter but were determined to go on and build the road. It is true that about sixteen months ago operations were suspended on this road the contractor having gone to England to dispose of his bonds—as he was to be paid in bonds of the company for building this road—but he was unable to dispose of them and returned here, expecting to be able to form a construction company to build the road. As will be seen by the railway statistics, there is now about 4 miles of that road laid with rails, and about 23 miles under construction. It is the opinion of many men engaged in building railways that this subsidy of $3,200 a mile, along with the subsidy of $6,000 a mile granted by the Provincial Government, will enable the company, without difficulty, to go on and build the road. I think, Sir, that the desire which the Dominion Government has shown in subsidising this railway must be the best assurance to capitalists who are willing to put their money into this enterprise, that they are fully satisfied that it is in the best interests of the country that this subsidy has been granted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would ask the Minister of Railways when he abandoned what he has repeatedly announced lately to be his policy, of refusing a charter to competing lines. A few days ago he induced the Railway Committee to throw out a Bill giving power to construct a road on the other side of Lake Winnipeg, because another company had got a charter to build a road sixty miles distant. Now he grants Government aid to a line competing with another for existence. I cannot imagine that he has overlooked this. He must have changed his policy, if not, he should give some reason for the change in this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will answer the hon. gentleman and also the question of the hon. leader of the Opposition, as to whether there was another company chartered. I understand the position of the question to be this: A company has been chartered, and aid given by the Province of Quebec. They have made a contract for the construction of a portion of this road, or the whole of it; a large amount of money has been expended and a considerable portion of the road has been graded. Efforts were made to float the bonds which had been given to the contractors to secure the construction of the road, but those efforts failed, and the sub-contractors for the work done remain unpaid. A considerable portion of the work is done, but the fact that the contractors have not been able to go on and that the road has not advanced, is the best evidence that there was not sufficient means provided for the construction of the line. I am not now dealing with the question as to whether this road should be built or not. Parliament has chartered it already, the Province of Quebec has given a subsidy, a considerable amount of work has been performed, and the Government have come to the conclusion that, under these circumstances, one road being in the Province of Ontario and the other in the Province of Quebec, they being separated by a river, they are not in a position exactly of competing lines. The illustration the hon. gentleman has drawn from the Hudson Bay Railway is the best evidence of how weak he considers his argument in the present case, as in the case of the Hudson Bay Railway the only possible chance of getting a railway constructed at all, or of obtaining capital for the purpose, is the assurance that there would be no competition. This subsidy is not granted to any company; it is granted for the road; it is a declaration made by Parliament that they consider the road of sufficient importance to entitle it to this amount of money. If the present company are not in a position to go on vigorously with the road—I say more, if they are not prepared to secure payment to the persons who have put their money and labour into the work—I for one would not listen for a moment to the proposition of giving that company this subsidy. They have got, in the first place, to establish their ability, with this subsidy, to complete the work; and they have got, in the next place, to cover the claims that have already been made for doing work, on the strength of which they obtained the subsidy. If they are not prepared to do that, and better arrangements can be made with other parties, it is quite competent for the Legislature, at a future Session, to charter another company, and thus secure the construction of the road on the best possible terms.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman says he thinks that perhaps this company may be able to do it. This

company is the one that has the $6,000 a mile from the Province of Quebec, and it is the company that has applied to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, awhile ago, in making his statement, pointed to the fact of that subsidy from Quebec as a reason for being sure of the ability of this company to construct the line; and to say that he proposes, if necessary, to legislate here to charter another company to construct the line without a subsidy from Quebec, is to say something which, I think, is rather rash. With reference to the question of financial ability of the company there can be no question. The position I took was a different one. I pointed out, that, from the information I had acquired, this company had a very soft thing, and it was made softer by this subsidy.

Mr. BRYSON. I do not know whether I quite understood the Minister of Railways in his remarks with respect to another company. The hon. gentleman stated that this subsidy was for the Pontiac Junction Railway, not for any particular company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is to the road.

Mr. BRYSON. Do I understand that, in the event of the present company being unable to go on and complete the road, the Government will be in a position to give a charter to another company; and, if such company should put up a sufficient amount of paid-up stock to insure the building of the road, will the Government grant another charter to that company over the same route?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government have no power to grant a charter; that can only be done by Parliament. The Government can, however, arrange with parties to support their application for a charter in Parliament. In such an event as that referred to, the Government would no doubt support the granting of another charter to a different company.

Mr. HOUDE. Has the Government been made aware of the fact that people who have worked on this line have not been paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not only been made aware of it, but I am prepared to say that I would not be a party to any arrangement with any company which would not secure payment for its workpeople, to those whose labour goes into the work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the hon. gentleman wishes this Resolution to be effective, a change must be made. The Ottawa River cannot be crossed in the county of Pontiac.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will strike out the words "within the county of Pontiac."

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

On paragraph 18,

To the Gatineau Railway Company, for a line of railway from Kazuabazua to Le Desert, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $160,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. What is the hon. Minister's information as to this subsidy being adequate to ensure the carrying out of this work.

Mr. WRIGHT. I may inform the hon. gentleman that a company was formed to carry out the construction of this railway. We obtained a grant of 6,000 acres per mile from the Quebec Government; and, as the hon. gentleman is aware, last Session the Dominion Government granted a subsidy of $3,200 per mile for 50 miles, from Hull station to Kazuabazua, up the Gatineau. A difficulty occurred with respect of obtaining the necessary amount of capital, on account of the short length of the line, and it was suggested —and this was our proposal originally—to carry the line from Kazuabazua to Le Desert, 40 miles further. The prospects of the company are reasonably good. We know tha difficulties are liable to occur in regard to all railway compa nies. We have had the Canadian Pacific Railway Company here this Session, and the Gatineau Valley Company may have difficulties as well; but there is every prospect of the road being completed. I may state to the House that the line will pass for 100 miles through a country well settled and inhabited by—as my constituents all are—a most intelligent and exceedingly industrious body of people. I may further state for the information of the House, that 100 miles due north there is an immense tract of exceedingly good land on which Canadian people could find happy homes. The products of the country are excellent. The wheat crop is a very fine one, and the cereals would be a credit to any portion of Canada. Under the circumstances, I think the House can very well afford to grant the additional subsidy, because it will be the means of opening up a vast extent of country in our immediate vicinity.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has a little misapprehended my question, as, indeed, the Minister of Railways has done more than once. My question was as to whether the proposed additional subsidy would accomplish the object desired? I expected an answer from the Minister of Railways, but the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright) interrupted, and I will now have his evidence in the case. The Minister of Railways, when I have brought forward the written information which he has laid on the Table, has pointed out to me that it would not do for him to give all the aid that was asked; that, if he were to pursue such a course, Parliament would be called on to grant a very much larger sum than the several millions which we are voting away this evening. But all persons are not alike, and all persons do not ask more than is necessary, and of those modest men who ask only what is right and necessary, the hon. member for Ottawa county, who has just spoken, is a distinguished example; and if I am able to prove, on the authority of the hon. gentleman, that it was only within a few days he found the subsidy was not adequate, I will be bound to ask for more specific information as to the ground on which the Minister expects a different result. The House will have observed that the hon. member was cautious in his observations; that he compared great things with small; that he pointed out a precedent which they would probably follow next Session, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had got a large subsidy, and cut and came again this Session. In a letter addressed to the Minister of Railways, at a very recent date, over the respectable signature of Alonzo Wright, that gentleman said:

"The undersigned, on behalf of the Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway would respectfully submit the following:

"4. That your petitioners had asked in their original application for $6,000 per mile.

"They would further submit:

"1. That it is found impossible to induce capitalists to guarantee money to build the road throughout, unless the bonus is specifically named and granted for the entire line.

"2. That capitalists argue, and very reasonably, that they might build fifty miles of the railroad and find a difficulty in securing further aid, the result being that the line would end at no particular point of junction with the great trade centres north and east of the Desert.

"3. That the engineering difficulties have shown that the portion of the first 50 miles will be the hardest possible to construct, and cost at least one-third more than the upper half.

"4. That the railroad has been commenced, and 5 miles graded, and extensive surveys (involving a large expenditure) made during the past summer and fall.

"5. That it is most important the work be continued, so that a connection is established between the north and the Ontario system of railways; and your petitioners fear that, unless the Dominion assists more liberally, this enterprise will be indefinitely postponed.

"6. That your petitioners would suggest that the Government grant $6,000 per mile towards the entire line; or,

"7. Failing this, that they grant for the first 50 miles the sum of $5,000 per mile, thus enabling the promoters of the enterprise to tide over the difficult work and accomplish the floating of their bonds.

"8. Or the company would be in a position to float bonds, and can float them if the Government of Canada will change the bonus or

subsidy into a fixed guarantee for a given number of years, the subsidies being used as a guarantee of interest on the bonds of the company for a term of ten years.

(Signed) "CHARLES G. BATE, Mayor of Ottawa.
"ALONZO WRIGHT."

That was not all. There is a second communication to the hon. gentleman, as follows:—

"To the Hon. Sir CHARLES TUPPER, K.C.M.G.:

"SIR,—The Government having through you as Minister of Railways announced as part of their policy aid for railways that were in the interests of Canada, and having since carried out their policy, by granting subsidies to several lines of railways, among others the Gatineau Railway, to the extent of $3,200 per mile for 50 miles, from Hull station of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the subscribers would respectfully represent that the granting of an additional subsidy of $6,200 for 50 miles from the Kazubazua, where the 50 miles already subsidized terminates, would be in the public interests, for the following reasons."

Then he gives a description of the hon. gentleman's constituents, which we have heard from him already, and which perhaps the House will spare my repeating. It also adds, in the terse and epigrammatic language of the hon. gentleman, that it would "also add another Province to the Dominion." It points out certain local claims, and then you find the name, the respected name, to which I have just referred, at the head of this second letter. So that twice we have repeated the signature, not of a railway contractor or a railway solicitor, who asks twice as much as he expects, but we have the statement of my hon. friend that $6,000 a mile is wanted to do the business. Now, what I would like to know from the hon. gentleman is, does he think it will be done for $3,200?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am pleased with the statement of the hon. gentleman, and I hope the Government will consider this proposition, and will be disposed to grant an additional subsidy to our road. The document which he read is undoubtedly authentic. We did think that that great tract of country, which had contributed so much to the revenues of the Dominion in timber dues, and had received so little in return, might have received an additional subsidy. We submitted that claim to the Government, but in view of the exigencies of the case, in view of the numerous applications which were being presented, they found they could only give us the exceedingly small sum of $3,200. I hope that under the circumstances we will be able to build the railway; we will, at any rate, do the best we can, and if the Government, at no distant period, feel able and willing to supplement the present subsidy, aided by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and, I have no doubt, by the entire feeling of the House, I hope they will grant us an additional sum. I submit to the Minister of Railways the proposition that he might give us $6,000 per mile from Hull to the River Desert, which would greatly improve our prospect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry that we are not able to increase the vote after it is once brought down, otherwise I would be disposed to yield to the solicitations of the leader of the Opposition. I am glad to find that the principal objection he finds in the Resolution is that the amounts are too small. I will bear that fact in mind, and perhaps I will have more confidence on future occasions in preparing these matters for the consideration of the House. I had a good deal of discussion with the hon. gentleman who represents the county of Ottawa, and who takes so deep an interest in this particular road, and with the gentlemen who have been actively engaged to raise the capital, and I came to the conclusion that it would absolutely give them a better and more substantial foundation to secure the capital required for the construction of the road, if we expended this amount on the 100 miles, and really touched and opened up this magnificent tract of country to which the hon. gentleman has referred, than if we gave $6,000 for the first 50 miles. In addition to that, as I have explained, there was the reluctance the Government had to depart from the general principle that they have applied to all these roads. But if there is any case which has been brought before the Government in which we feel disposed and warranted in considering the question of giving a larger amount than the usual sum, it would be the case of this very road to which I have referred.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot permit the hon. gentleman to recur to the misapprehension, the innocent misapprehension, of my remarks, without once again pointing out the unfortunate fallacy which seems to beset him. I have not complained of the smallness of the amounts. The hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) at an early period in the discussion, told the hon. gentleman that the reason why so small an amount of the many millions was asked, was because the grants were illusory, and he knew it. Now, I am not a supporter of the Government, and I am disposed to use more moderate language than that; but I think I am entitled to point out to him that the difficulty one has in reconciling, from the papers before us, the proposition that there has been an investigation into these matters which would lead the House to believe that there is a practical business basis on which the grants may be expected to be adequate to construct the roads. I will tell him why—I will tell him one reason, irrespective of others: It is because we know very well that this is only the thin end of the wedge, and if we are told next Session that these grants are too small, that we must give more to complete the roads, it will be a case of, half begun is nearly done, and we will have the work to go on. I want to see the end, if I can, towards the beginning, and I want therefore to understand what the principles are and what the information is, on which the hon. gentleman proceeded in each of these cases. Now, then, the hon. gentleman has made one remark, so extraordinary, that I feel bound to comment on it. He says he really believed that he was giving the company a more solid basis for success, in dividing the same amount of money over 100 miles, as if he had given them the opportunity of spending the money as they think would be best, on the most difficult 50 miles. He was not giving them any more money, or enabling them in any other way to construct the 100 miles of railway, but he gives the same amount of money, but pledges that it shall be divided over the 100 miles instead of giving it in the way which they think would best accomplish their object; and still he thinks that this was a better basis of credit than the other. I do not say that he was wrong to prescribe that this $3,200 should be expended over the whole way, but I fancy, as far as the basis of credit of the company is concerned, it would not be hurt by its being known that if the company desired the subsidy might be spent on the first fifty miles.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would suggest to the Minister of Railways that with his parliamentary skill and knowledge, he might see his way to increasing this amount, and giving us $6,000 from Hull to Desert. I am quite sure that the House would sustain him in doing so.

Mr. HOUDE. As the leader of the Opposition has congratulated himself upon being more moderate in his language than I am in mine, I would say that I am glad of it, because I believe in moderation, although it happens to me sometimes, as to others, to be a little too quick-tempered. Perhaps I was so this afternoon; but in all frankness I must say that I did not take the argument of the hon. Minister of Railways as being very complimentary to the intelligence of the House, when he was telling us: Well, do not be afraid to vote so much money; we have already voted a large sum, but we did not expend much of it. Well, perhaps, I enterpreted that remark too severely. If I did I shall be sorry, and I will confess frankly that I have been wrong. But I was feeling pretty strongly against the basis of the policy which seems to underlie these Resolutions, with regard to the local railways. I do not regret that the Government propose to spend so

much money, so much as I regret that they propose to spend it in this particular way. I should have very much preferred that the Government would have chosen a smaller number of railways, of most importance, and subsidized them to a larger amount, and ensured thereby their early construction, in order to develop large tracts of country where a great part of our population can be placed, and contribute to the strength and prosperity and greatness of the country. When I examine the list of the railways which it is proposed to subsidize, I remark that there are some very important ones, as for instance, the railway in which the hon. member for Ottawa county takes so great an interest, and also the Montreal and Occidental Railway. But there are other railways of so little importance relatively, which induced the Government to subsidize them, that any railway company in the country will feel entitled to apply here for a subsidy. I do not pretend to say that the Government are subsidizing useless railways; all railways are more or less useful; but if we open the door to so many applications from railways, which will not add a single soul to the population of the country, I say that the Government will find it impossible to give efficacious aid to railways that would open up large tracts of country, such as the Ottawa and the Gatineau valleys, and other large valleys in the Province of Quebec, as well as in other Provinces. My opinion is that it should be the object of this Parliament to encourage the development of those regions in preference to subsidizing railways between cities and towns and villages which are already provided with railways—even with several railways, in some instances. It is useless for us to try to conceal from ourselves the fact that our people want to have opened more regions for colonization in the Old Provinces. We are making great efforts, and spending vast sums of money to settle the North-West, while if I am not mistaken, it is just as important to people the old Provinces, and to keep our own population, who are accustomed to our climate, our laws, and our usages, and who are more Canadian than the people in the North-West will be for years. I think it is important to take this view of the subject, and to prevent our population from going to the United States. I do not like to say anything disparaging to my country; but there are truths which it is more injurious to conceal than to admit; and I must admit that our population is constantly leaving our country, especially the rural population, at least in the Province of Quebec; and why? Because the valley of the St. Lawrence is already inhabited. People have to go far into the forest, and beyond mountains, into districts which have no facilities of communication; and they cannot have adequate facilities except by railways. And if we do not give them those facilities, they will continue to leave us as they are doing now. That is the idea I had when I said that the grants voted in past Sessions, and proposed to be voted this Session, are illusory. I did not mean to be offensive; if my expression was so, I beg to withdraw it, and to ask the pardon of the House for having used it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two lines of policy under discussion just now—first, that adopted by the Government as shown by these Resolutions, and the policy suggested by my hon. friend, who has spoken with his usual clearness. His policy is that we should take fewer lines, longer and more important lines, and grant them a larger amount of subsidy. Well, that has its merits. These large and important lines, if they are largely subsidized, will of course be of great benefit to the section of country in which they are built; but there are two objections to that. In the first place, I think that policy would not be acceptable to this House. This House is composed of representatives from the different Provinces, and there would be great reluctance among the representatives from a Province far away from some of these main lines, to voting for a charge to be put upon their constituents, in order to assist lines far away from them, and giving them not the most remote advantage. And there is this other objection—that if you grant large subsidies, you prevent the people, the capitalists, and the municipalities interested, from helping themselves. These two objections, I think, stand greatly in the way of the policy proposed by my hon. friend—first, that a few large and important lines, running in particular parts of the country, would not receive the general support required to carry out that policy; and, in the next place, it would cause the parties interested in promoting these lines to throw themselves altogether on the public purse, instead of trying to help themselves. The present policy has been already explained by my hon. colleague. There are very many tracts in the country which would be very much aided and developed by reasonable assistance. The people say: We would like to have a railway, but we cannot start it; we have not capital enough; we cannot interest capitalists in our line; our municipalities are not rich enough to commence these lines, and therefore we must do without them. So that, if a tract of country is really eligible for a railway, which is likely to be ultimately a commercial success, the Government are encouraging the people by giving them a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, and if there is anything in the scheme, the people will undertake it. They will go to the municipalities along the line of railway, get the stock lists up, and start a real basis to work upon. Thus, without overburdening the Dominion Treasury, you will have a number of really good schemes, having some real merits in themselves, started. As my hon. friend has said, that is a good test whether a railway scheme has any real merit. Parliament grants a subsidy of $3,200 a mile for a particular line. If it has any real merit, the road will be established; and if it has no merit, it must, to be built, throw itself upon the public treasury altogether, and then it will never be built. In all previous subsidies, a provision has been made—and it will be repeated in this scheme—that the road subsidized must be commenced in two years and finished in four years; and if it has any real merits, after this Parliament has voted for it $3,200 per mile, the parties and the portion of the country interested in the road will put their hands in their pockets and build it. At the end of the two years, if they have taken no steps to commence the road, that will be proof positive that it is not a meritorious scheme. The Treasury will not have lost the money and that money will be ready to give to another portion of the country and to another scheme which is really meritorious.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I cannot help saying that I feel disappointed to see that the sum of $6,000 has not been appropriated by the Government, instead of $3,200, for the Gatineau road, and that the same thing has not been done in favour of the Montreal and Occidental Railway, which is to start from St. Jérome, to reach the same terminus at the Desert, above the Gatineau River. Last year this same vote of $3,200 was granted for these two lines on a distance of fifty miles. Well, Mr. Speaker, one year has gone by since, and nothing has been done; still the promoters of these two undertakings, who take such a deep interest in the development of the Gatineau district and of the great valley of the Ottawa, have used every effort, have taken every step to induce capitalists to come to their aid, and to build these two railways. The hon. Minister of Railways has told us this afternoon, that out of the $3,000,000 voted last year and the year before, there had been expended—if I am not mistaken—only $200,000. This fact is ample proof that the appropriations voted up to this day are inadequate to the purposes for which they have been granted; and if there is a case in which there should be an exception to the policy just propounded by the leader of Government, it seems

to me, that it is the case of the Gatineau Railway, and of the Montreal and Occidental Railway, for both of these railways are to go through new territories, which could not, by any means, be compared to districts which have long been settled. The vast territories which extend far back on the other side of the Laurentians may be compared, in a measure, to our North-West country, for which we have already made such heavy sacrifices. The aid of municipalities is spoken of; but the history of the past is there to show that it is impossible to expect a great deal of help from municipalities, especially when these municipalities are poor, when but yesterday they were still unorganized, when but yesterday several of the villages, several of the townships, several of the counties which lie in rear of the Laurentian range, were nothing more than a group of shanties, were nothing more than the forest, nothing but a vast wilderness. In spite of the good will of the first settlers, who went there to improve this fine portion of our country, it is impossible to expect that these settlers, who can hardly make a living, will vote thousands of dollars, will saddle themselves with heavy taxes, in order to build railways. In the course of the debate on the Pacific question, a great deal has been said about the importance of building railway branches in the North-West Territories. Well, the Montreal and Occidental Railway and the Gatineau Railway have just as much importance for the Ottawa valley as the branch railways which have already been built, or which will be built, at a more or less distant date, in the North-West. These two lines, the Montreal and Occidental and the Gatineau Railway, are two important tributaries of the great line of the Canadian Pacific, and will do much towards ensuring its prosperity. Mr. Speaker, I attach the highest importance to the two undertakings mentioned in these Resolutions, and I am a great deal of the opinion of my hon. friend the member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), who has just spoken. Instead of dividing our strength, instead of scattering our resources on too great a number of railways, we should rather concentrate our means of action on our main lines, on lines which would favour the development of both trade and colonization, and on this point I am sorry to say I can not entirely agree with the leader of the Government, although it is very seldom my opinions differ from his own. Since the last seven or eight years, about twenty parishes have been established in rear of the Laurentian range. I have had occasion to visit that part of the country, in company with Rev. Mr. Labelle, of whom the hon. Minister of Railways has this afternoon made such a just and well deserved eulogium, and I was struck by the richness of its soil; I was struck by its progress, by its development, by the hardihood and manly endurance of its settlers, who only some few years ago, some few months ago even, had left the old parishes of Lower Canada, and who had already made comfortable homes for themselves in the midst of the forest. Since the last seven or eight years, at least 10,000 persons have settled in that great wilderness, and if Parliament only did that which we have a right to expect from it; if instead of granting a subsidy of $3,200 which, in my humble opinion, is entirely insufficient for the requirements of these two undertakings, if, instead of that, they should grant at least $6,000, as has been asked by the directors and promoters of these two undertakings, we might trust that, in a few years from now, a great country, interspersed by railways, would be opened to colonization. Mr. Speaker, a measure which would result in the increase of the population would be a measure essentially beneficial to the Government, essentially in the interest of the revenue of the Dominion; for the Dominion Government, the Federal Treasury, is about the only one interested, financially, in the development of the population. Every person which is added to the number of the population of Canada represents a tax payer, and the best means of increasing the population, both in the west and in the old Provinces of the east, is to do all in our power to give them railways, which will be the most powerful and influential agents to ensure the development of our population, and the comfort and prosperity of our country. I know that, frequently, letters have come to us from Canadians who had left the country to expatriate themselves on the other side of the frontier, and who, although living far away from their native land, had not forgotten their country and felt a strong desire to come back. They were anxious to give Canada the benefit of their labour and of the savings they have made abroad; they asked that these fertile lands should be put at their disposal, and should be put in communication with the large centres of trade by means of railways, by means of colonization roads. Well, Mr. Speaker, instead of facilitating this movement we have been obliged, in many cases, to stop it in a measure, because in the northern townships, where the poor French Canadians who had emigrated to the United States were desirous of settling, we had no surveyed land to give them, no land where there are colonization roads, much less railways. It is useless to conceal the fact that every year a large immigration goes to the United States. It is not so large as has been pretended by our friends opposite, but still it does exist, and one of the main causes of that emigration is the want of roads in that vast country, which extends north of the St. Lawrence and of the Ottawa, in the places where the French race is partly agglomerated. The want of roads is the main cause of the emigration of our race to the United States. I say that if we intend to do something for the French race in this country—for it is hardly possible to expect a large French immigration—if we wish to bring back here a great number of the thousands of French Canadians who have been obliged to expatriate themselves beyond the frontier, the best means for the Parliament and the country to adopt is to build railways in that great valley of the Ottawa and in that of the Saguenay, which, I am happy to say, for the district of Quebec, is soon to have its railway. The Gatineau road, and the Montreal and Occidental road have, for us inhabitants of the Ottawa valley, just the same importance as the Lake St. John Railway has for our fellow-citizens of the Quebec region. I repeat it, Mr. Speaker, if we wish to adopt efficient means to bring back here a large number of our countrymen who have gone to the United States, let us throw a network of railways over these vast territories, which will enable our people to live there and make money, and will add to the comfort, prosperity and greatness of our country.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 19,

To the Napanee and Tamworth Railway Company, for a line of railway from Tamworth to Bogart and Bridgewater, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....$70,400 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for eighteen miles from Bogart to Tamworth, four miles from Bogart to Bridgewater, where it will connect with the Toronto and Ottawa.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the sufficiency of the subsidy, the petition says:

"On account of the roughness of some parts of the country between Tamworth and the Ontario and Quebec Railway and the Central Ontario Railway, it will cost more per mile to build a railway there than from Napanee to Tamworth.

"For the twenty-eight miles already assisted, the further sum of $1,800 per mile and for the additional mileage, including sidings, spurs, and extending to the Napanee river in the town of Napanee, say four miles, the sum of $5,000 per mile, and for the branch from Tamworth to the Ontario and Quebec Railway and the Central Ontario Railway the sum of $3,000 per mile."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have refused to give them any further aid on the twenty-eight miles already subsidized. We said, if you build that, you will obtain the subsidy that is voted for it, and then as you complete each ten miles of this distance of twenty-two miles, to Bridgewater, you will receive the same sum. The subsidy has been practically found sufficient to build the portion already subsidized, and the same thing will happen in this case.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman takes it for granted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will go further; I have a private note from the president of the road, stating that with this subsidy he would be able to go on with the road.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 20,

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from Lake Simon to Le Desert, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $160,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to amend this by striking out the words "from Lake Simon" and substituting the words "from the end of the line subsidized last Session." This makes no alteration, except to correct an inaccurate description.

Mr. BLAKE. How far does the present subsidy carry the railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Fifty miles; this will carry it 100.

Mr. BLAKE. There are no papers laid on the Table with reference to this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I dare say the hon. gentleman may have seen a communication on this subject. I received a deputation of a large number of gentlemen, headed by Father Labelle, who stated the difficulty pretty much in the same terms as were used with regard to the Gatineau Railway. He stated they found the distance too short, and they asked for $6,000 a mile. I am told the difficulties will be much greater in the early portions of the road than in any other, and if so those portions will receive rather more per mile than $3,200. They will receive the subsidy in proportion to the whole work to be done. I hope, with the assistance this road will obtain from the Province of Quebec, which has given $4,000 per mile for 18 miles, it will be pushed through to completion. The Province of Quebec has given $4,000 a mile for 18 miles, $2,500 a mile for 12 miles, and 4,000 acres a mile for 35 miles. With these combined subsidies they will be able to make some considerable progress.

Mr. BLAKE. What have they done?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They have not commenced. They found they could not organize with the 50 miles. The distance was too short.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman will find it impossible to apply the clause in the latter part of the Resolution for the purpose he requires.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps so.

Mr. BLAKE. He cannot take the $3,200 a mile and apply it to any other part of the work. He can only allocate it to the 50 miles which is to be subsidized according to the value of the work done. He cannot take it for the earlier 50 miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; it must be within the 50 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But suppose the first 25 miles is very much more difficult than the second 25 miles, hastily looking upon it, I was inclined to think that out of the subsidy for the first 50 miles you might give a larger proportion if the value of the work done is greater in proportion to the whole.

Mr. BLAKE. My recollection of the provision in the subidies in previous years is, that the $3,200 a mile is to be paid as 10-mile sections are completed, and that there is no elasticity. If so, it will lie there. When he reaches the second 50 miles, he may apply that on the new sections, in the same way as he has decided in regard to the new sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

On paragraph 21,

To the MiramichiValley Railway Company, for a line of railway, from Fredericton to the Miramichi River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole (instead of the subsidy proposed in 1883) $128,00 00

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, I have no personal knowledge about this matter, but I have received—and I communicated with the hon. gentleman on the receipt, and found he was in receipt of the same class of communication, as I suppose other hon. members of this House have received—communications on this subject. It appears to me there has been a somewhat inaccurate description of the subsidy to be now given as being "instead of the subsidy proposed in 1883," because really it is the other end of the Intercolonial that was in view in 1883.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It takes the place of the other.

Mr. BLAKE. I am aware of that. The obvious intention is that the work the hon. gentleman is about to construct as a Government work at the other end shall take the place of, as far as the public interest is concerned, the work which was intended to be subsidized last year. That is the principle effect of the transaction, as the hon. gentleman has said, and being so, it is material that I should ask from the hon. gentleman an explanation with reference to the facts, as communicated to me and no doubt to him. These are the statements by telegram:

"Northern and Western Company has purchased 6,000 tons of rails in England, and made other expensive preparations to at once build first thirty-two miles Miramichi Valley Railway, commencing at Intercolonial, under their contract with Local Government, and in expectation of existing Dominion subsidy, Ottawa Government now proposes to wipe out that subsidy and spend $140,000 for fifteen miles of road which will run generally parallel to and in places not more than a mile from company's proposed road. It is deliberate waste of public money to please small coterie party hacks in Newcastle and persecute Chatham and three-quarters county. Justice demands that subsidy provision of last Session should stand and Government abandon its proposition to build Indiantown and Derby branch. The proposition to build Government branch to Indiantown presents aspect of attempt to crush enterprising men of county who have already invested over $80,000, with intention to practically build what Government proposes now to undertake."

I have also received a communication, which I believe has been duplicated to other hon. gentlemen. It is in these terms:

"18th May last at telegraphic request of a number citizens this county Dominion Government resolution relating subsidy Miramichi Valley Railway was changed by Government so as to apply to junction with Intercolonial on either side Miramichi River."

The hon. gentleman will remember that we had some discussion across the floor about that, and it was so stated that the change the Government made last Session was calculated to make the matter more elastic and make a provision by which the railway could be built on either side of the river:

"Encouraged thereby, Northern and Western Railway Company was organised, survey made on both sides of the river, plans and profiles made, contract entered into under Local Subsidy Act with Provincial

Government, 6,000 tons of steel rails purchased, and necessary local legislation was secured last month so as to enable company to proceed forthwith construction which it has made advance preparation to do. So superior are advantages of route by south side to junction with Intercolonial two miles only from river, that three-quarters of actual rate ayers of county petitioned Local Legislature in favour of securing it and succeeded. If existing Dominion subsidy between Intercolonial and Dunphy village is withdrawn, will be great breach of faith with people of county and Northern and Western Company, who are satisfied with that subsidy of $102,400 for first 52 miles road from Intercolonial up river, which they will build forthwith, while proposed branch under Resolutions for to-day, from Derby to Indiantown, will run only 15 miles of the distance on opposite side of river, and cost $140,000. We ask as matter of justice to people and company, and for all interests involved, that paragraph of Resolutions relating to branch to Indiantown be withdrawn, so that company may go on with construction of whole line, which withdrawal of last year's subsidy will jeopardize."

That is signed by Mr. Muirhead, the Senator, by Mr. Tweedie, by Mr. T. F. Gillespie, M. P. P., President Executive Council, and by a number of other persons, making sixty-two names, and they add that there are 857 others. Of course, I merely make myself the vehicle upon this question of laying these statements before the Committee. The very late hour at which the hon. gentleman brought down the Resolutions, the very early period at which he presses them upon the attention of the Committee, and the short time which remains before prorogation, render it impossible for any hon. gentleman to make those enquiries he would desire to make before bringing these points before the House at all, but it is only just that I should place these statements before the Committee, and should ask the hon. gentleman to make such explanations as are to be made for what does seem at first sight to be a very extraordinary course; when we find, as stated here, that a considerable investment of money has taken place, large preparations have been made, 6,000 tons of iron has been bought, and arrangements have been entered into, that a subsidy granted should be withdrawn and that other arrangements should be made, irrespective of the question of policy. I think that there are two important questions involved; one is the question of good faith and the other the question of policy, and on both, I think, the circumstances demand a tolerably full explanation from the Minister, and I see my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will assist and will become, if not the principal, the second in those explanations—I dare say the principal.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman is quite right, perhaps, in saying, that if I will not be the second, I may possibily be the first, in the explanations in regard to this matter. I can assure my hon. friend that the information which he has given is nothing new. I hold in my hand a copy of a similar telegram, signed by the same persons—857. It is a wonder that it is not 2,857, or 3,857. I have done nothing but open telegrams for the last twenty-four hours. I have them here by the dozen—not on one side only, as my hon. friend has, but on both sides, and if my hon. friend and this House are at all curious to hear them, it will afford me the greatest pleasure to read them.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Dispense.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why, Sir, there is but one thing outside the wish of the Committee to cause me to dispense with the reading of these telegrams. I hold in this hand the telegram my hon. friend has got, with just one line of variation, which I will read for the benefit of my Conservative friends. I do not know whether my hon. friend, out of delicacy——

Mr. BLAKE. I read the whole.

Mr. MITCHELL. But they put this in:

"We ask, as a matter of justice to the people and for the interests involved, that the paragraph in the Resolution relating to the Indiantown branch be withdrawn, and that the company may go on with the construction of the whole line."

Then they go on to say:

"On the south side will answer all purposes, and will run parallel with the proposed branch in several places, not a mile distant. If this is done it will kill the Conservative party in this county outright."

Now, Sir, I think my hon. friends have taken a queer vehicle for presenting to the House their case, if they desired to avoid killing the Conservative party outright. My hon. friend has quoted the telegram from Mr. Smith, referring to the respectable people who signed these telegrams and the people who opposed this change in the line. Now, I have nothing to say against the respectability of the people who signed his telegram; they are respectable men, but they are respectable on the other side of the question, too, and I will just read one telegram in proof of what I say. I will read a telegram from the Hon. Allen A. Davidson, legislative councillor for the county:

"Best thanks for your noble stand for railway through Derby. Has gained you many friends. I was in Chatham to-day. The selfish grab combination is reprobated even there."

Here is another telegram:

"Thanks for services. Only adds another evidence of your ability and great public usefulness."

Mr. Chairman, this is a true telegram:

"Our people are rejoiced. On behalf of them we tender you hearty congratulations and a 'Cead Mille Failthe' on your return to us."

And it is signed by a long list of names. Now, I will place the respectability of these men alongside the respectability of those who signed the telegram of my hon. friend. My hon. friend has made a statement, based upon information which he has received, which may or may not be true.

Mr. BLAKE. I made no statement, I read the information.

Mr. MITCHELL. He made some statements in addition to the information. I find no fault with him. Mr. D. G. Smith, who furnished that information to my hon. friend, is the gentleman who conducts the newspaper organ of the Liberal party in that county, a man who has never ceased to villify the Government of the day, and represents the party who have persistently attacked the policy which this Government have honoured the country by adopting. What have these men done in relation to this matter? I hold in my hand a document I have written in reply to this telegram I received, which contains some twenty-five pages of replies. I do not want to take these people by surprise, and so while I answered their telegram by letter, I also stated that I would not consent to withdraw the Resolution, but I was willing to enable them to present their case here. If my hon. friend wants me to read the letter I will do so. I applied last year, in the month of February, to the Railway Department, for the purpose of seeing whether I could not get some aid to the Miramichi Valley Railway. I had not the honour to be a member of this House in the previous Session, when Mr. Snowball was the member and supported my hon. friends opposite. During the Session before last, a principle was introduced into this country of subsidizing private roads from the general revenue of the Dominion. At the time it was looked upon with some surprise. I must confess that to my own mind it was a policy that admitted of a great deal of discussion, whether it was wise or not; certainly it has opened a great door for applications for assistance, and it has given a great impotus to the developement of the country. But, Sir, when that door was opened, and when the people of the county wisely selected me to represent their interests, and when I find the echoes that come from all sides of this House to that sentiment, I know I have not only got right and justice on my side, but I have got the feelings, as I will have the votes of the people who elected me to this House. I applied to the Government last year, and I found a pretty tough customer to deal with in the Minister of Railways. When I approached him, I pointed out the necessity of opening up this portion of the country, and mak-

ing a connection between the North Shore and Fredericton; and I asked that some means be taken to grant a subsidy to that road. I was met by two objections from the hon. gentleman. He said: "Government have not yet adopted the policy of granting subsidies to roads of a private character, but if you choose to put in your application, there are some others of the same character coming up, and they will all be considered together." I endeavoured to press upon him the necessity of giving aid to this road as a feeder to the Intercolonial, when I was met by another objection of a serious character. "Why," said he, "Mr. Mitchell, if we build this, the effect will be that, instead of feeding the Intercolonial Railway, it will take trade away from it." I felt at once the force of the objection; I put in my application, but I saw that the people of the county did not expect I would get the subsidy, and then I thought it would be desirable to meet the second objection, and I asked him to build either 10, 25, 48 or 60 miles of branch, just as I could persuade him. I then pointed out that there would be no connection with the St. John river, and therefore it would be a feeder to the Intercolonial. The answer I got was that the Government could not build it as a branch, but would grant it a subsidy. Up to the time I made the application, no party in the county had asked me to obtain a subsidy for them, but individuals, throughout the upper river parishes of Ludlow, Blissfield, Blackville, Derby, Nelson, South Esk and North Esk, had urged on me to obtain it; but on my own responsibility, as their representative, and taking an interest in the matter, I made application based on the fact that other roads had received support in previous Sessions and that our road had been passed over. The president of the Miramichi Valley Road or the Northern and North Western, as it is now called, came to Ottawa in March. In discussing with him, Mr. R. R. Call, about the matter, he told me he was going to make application for a subsidy; and I told him I had done so. He made out an application and I took it round the House and got three fourths of the members to sign it; I afterwards submitted it to the Minister of Railways and we had a lengthy discussion on the subject. When I found, some days ago, that subsidies were proposed to be granted, I found the Minister of Railways had not forgotten one who has always admired his pluck and ability and the courage with which he has dealt with great questions. I found he had remembered the county of Northumberland, and had inserted in the list of subsidies one for 25 miles of this road. This was not quite satisfactory, as some other projects had got a great deal more aid, and by means of argument I induced him to give a subsidy for 32 miles, so as to extend the road to a point named. Up to that time Mr. Snowball and Mr. Muirhead, the gentlemen who represent the telegrams which the hon. gentleman opposite has read, never hinted at such a thing as making an application. I asked Mr. Muirhead to go to the Senate and get a few names, which he did. None of them made any motion in regard to it. The motion was made by myself, on behalf of the people of the parishes, not on behalf of the town of Newcastle nor Chatham or other towns in the county. As far as Newcastle or Chatham are concerned, important and influential as they are both, they are not the most important factors in this matter. My duty is to the people for whom I secured that subsidy, who cannot present their views in telegrams and written documents, so readily as the townspeople, but they are, nevertheless, the people for whom the subsidy was obtained, and I made up my mind that I would do the best I could to open up their parishes. The moment I obtained the subsidy, telegrams were sent to the Minister of Railways and others, in regard to the matter, which was not very flattering to me, considering the fair treatment I had always given my opponents. I did not then adopt a dog-in-the-manger policy; but I said I was willing to leave the matter to be settled by the people themselves, and for ten months I never interfered, although asked by both sides to meet their views, one on behalf of Newcastle and the other on behalf of Chatham. I determined, however, to let them fight it out. I have no particular sympathy with either of the towns as regards this railway. My feeling is with the people of the parishes, for whom this railway subsidy was obtained and who will be benefited thereby; those are the people in whom I am interested, not in interests connected with either the one town or the other. I know it is very difficult for a man to take such a position in a county. I am well aware that these are important towns and the inhabitants have influence, not only in the towns themselves but in outside districts; but I knew what it was my duty to do, and I did it. When the subsidy was given, Mr. Call, as representing the Northern and North-Western, wanted the subsidy for building a line from Derby up the river to Dunphys. Mr. Snowball, Mr. Muirhead and Mr. Gibson, of Fredericton, formed a new corporation and got a new company organized, with a view to obtain control of the money and build the road. The result was, that these companies got into the Court of Chancery and other litigation; and I made up my mind that it would be a very long time before the people of the parishes, to whom I have referred, would obtain the railway if they were to depend on companies which got into the courts and continued fighting over a carcase which they had done nothing to acquire. That was the position in which I found the matter. I came up to Ottawa, still prepared to see what I could do towards securing an amicable settlement, and I found the fight was still going on. In my absence, Mr. Tweedie, representing the Chatham people, had come up and, as I understood, sought to obtain control of the subsidy. He did not succeed, and the Government, in my absence, refused to deal with the matter. When I arrived in Ottawa I presented my case to the Government; I said, there is but one way to deal with this matter, and that is to build fifteen miles of the road, which portion will prove a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial; and if the Government would build the road, I said, it would put an end to all the difficulty. I thought the Government would do that, but they put the subsidy to the other end of the line and agreed to build the line themselves. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite find fault. They say we have 6,000 tons of steel rails. I will not say I doubt the statement; but if they have those rails they have forty miles of line subsidized with so much per mile at the other end to put the rails on, and no great hardship is done. When they talk about work done, I must say there has not been the first step taken, outside of litigation and the organization of the rival companies, towards going on with the work, and the matter stands where it did. In conclusion, I would say that this is a matter of vast importance to the people of my county. I stand here as an advocate, not of the rich and wealthy of the towns, but of the poorer farmers and lumbermen of the parishes; those are the people for whom I speak, and I ask the Committee to support the Resolution of the Government, in order that we secure a railway which I doubt we will ever obtain except in that way.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman is not quite right in respect to this matter. The people who have formed the Northern and North-Western Company are by this Act deprived of the opportunity of building the road. The Minister of Railways, in introducing his Resolution, said, it had the support of the members of the county. The hon. gentleman is not quite right in that statement, because there are four members for the county.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Having received a telegram from two members, I thought there were but two.

Mr. WELDON. There are four; two reside in Newcastle and two on the Chatham side. I desire to say a word with respect to the history of this matter. In 1872 a company

called the Northern and North-Western was incorporated to build a line from the town of Chatham. That Act was kept alive, but nothing was done under it until last July. In 1882, a vote for local aid was granted to the road, and in consequence of the disputes which followed, it was to be carried to another point. Originally, the first grant was made to another parish on the south side of the Miramichi river, and was in consequence of the Act of incorporation. In 1882, the subsidy was granted to the parish of South Esk which, I think, is on the north side of the river. Nothing was done up to 1883, when a grant was made to the company. In July the company was organized, or an attempt was made to organize it by parties in Newcastle, but they got into court, and the judgment of the court was that the company was organized. The question came up in the Local Legislature this winter, and in accordance with the Act of incorporation, and by an overwhelming vote of, I think, 25 to 8, it was decided that the subsidy was altered, the contention being that the original corporation was sustained by this vote. What will be the result of the present proposition? It will be that another road will be built parallel to this road, and as stated by the hon. member for East York, it is a direct contravention of the policy of the Minister of Railways to build competing lines of railways alongside of each other. He is now actually going to build these two roads in competition, though I believe the claim of the inhabitants of the southern portion of the county is as much entitled to consideration as those on the north, as the farmers and the lumbermen there are as poor as those on the other side of the river. The telegram which has been forwarded to the hon. member for West Durham and myself is signed, I believe, by a large number of gentlemen supporting the present Government, among them being Mr. Muirhead, Mr. Gillespie, one of the members of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, and also a supporter of my hon. friend, and a number of others. But this is not a question of party politics. The matter was decided in good faith and by a large majority in the Legislature, and after having entered into a contract and gone to a great deal of expense, for I find by this telegram that the rails have actually been purchased, it seems to me that they would now have a just ground of complaint if that subsidy were withdrawn, and the Government should undertake to build a branch line parallel with the other road and competing with it, thus destroying the usefulness of both roads. It seems to me that these parties have a right to be heard; they have a right to complain that the subsidy upon which they reorganized the company and entered into engagements with the Local Government should now be withdrawn, and that the Government should grant $140,000 for a line of fifteen miles, when they undertook to build for the $102,000, which was granted last year, a road thirty-two miles in length.

Mr. MITCHELL. I omitted to state to the House that the subsidy granted last year was supplementary to the Local Government subsidy, and that the Act of the Local Government in granting that subsidy was to bring that railway to the parish of South Esk, which is on the north side of the river. I do not wish to introduce politics into this question, but we know that a change of Government took place; and the hon. gentleman must know that the men who are taking this course are those who oppose my hon. friend, Mr. Temple, and supported his opponent, Mr. Gregory, doing all they could to defeat the one and to secure the return of the other. Now, with regard to the unfairness of this matter, I may say that last year it was the misfortune of the Conservatives of New Brunswick to have a change of Government, and when this Government came in, without giving any opportunity of competition, they entered into a contract with Mr. Snowball, Mr. Gibson, and Mr. Muirhead, to build it on the north side of the river, in accordance with the Subsidy Act. That is what they did, and they did not strike a blow, and they did not put a shovel in the earth, and I do not believe—notwithstanding these telegrams—that they bought 6,000 tons of rails. They have a subsidy upon 40 miles on the other end of the line, so I do not think there is any great hardship. When the Government came in which is hostile to the present Government, they altered the subsidy and transferred it to the south side of the river. These are facts which the hon. gentleman cannot dispute, and if he does dispute them, I know that there is an hon. gentleman in my eye who is prepared to corroborate what I state.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I do not wish to enter into the dispute between these two parties, one of whom contends that the north side of the river is the better place for the railway, and the other that the south side is, not knowing which would be preferable to a majority of the people. But it may be well to state that the act of the Local Legislature, needed in 1882 was passed, and the line that was subsidized was this:

"A line of railway from the city of Fredericton or the parish of St. Mary's, in the county of York, passing through the counties of York and Northumberland, to some point on the Intercolonial Railway, either in the parish of Derby or the parish of South Esk, in the said county of Northumberland, and thence, if advisable, to Beaubear's Point, so called."

Now, I want to draw the attention of the Committee to this fact—that these words bring the terminus of railway between the two rivers, which is contrary to the statement in these telegrams. That was the law adopted by the Legislature of New Brunswick in 1882. Then, I believe, two companies were incorporated, one of which obtained authority to build a line starting from the town of Chatham, having no subsidy; the other starting from this subsidy. Then there arose a rivalry between the two companies; and what amount of litigation there was, or what the result was, I am not prepared to state.

Mr. WELDON. The court decided that there was only one company—that which was organized by Mr. Gibson and Mr. Muirhead.

Mr. LANDRY. I am willing to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, that the company organized by Mr. Gibson, which is the same company that bought these rails and entered into these arrangements, was the company recognized by law. What did that company do? Last summer, while this subsidy Act was in operation, which provided that the line should go between the two branches of the Miramichi, they entered into a contract for the purpose of building that road; and what sort of a contract did they enter into? I think I can safely assert that the contract was in accordance with the terms of this subsidy, and provided that the road was to go between the two branches of the river and not to the south side, contrary to what they represent now in these telegrams. If that was their contract, why should they make a contract for 6,000 tons of rails for a railway in another place. I know that, within the last month, the Local Government obtained a vote from the Legislature, authorizing them, if they thought proper, to change the terminus to the south side of the river.

Mr. WELDON. The original Act, passed in 1872, provided that the road should go to the town of Chatham; and the question arose in the last Session of the Legislature whether the Act of Incorporation or the terminus should be changed. That was the contest in the lower House at Fredericton, and by a vote of 25 to 8 the House decided that they would not alter the Act of Incorporation, but altered the terminus.

Mr. LANDRY. I have not seen the Act of this Session, as it has not yet been printed; but my opinion is, that all that Legislature did was to make it optional as to whether

the Local Government should apply the subsidy to the road going between the two branches of the river, or to a road going to the south side. The hon. gentleman speaks of their getting a majority of 25 to 8. How did they get that majority? Why, because they said: We do not intend to change the terminus. It may be best to go between the two branches of the river, but surely, the Government said, you will give us the privilege of making it optional where to apply the money. But what I want to show is, that the Act of the Local Government was to make the company build the road between the two branches of the river. I think it was only right that I should explain this to the Committee, in order that they might understand the true nature of the contract entered into.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to say one word more, by way of explanation. The hon. gentleman has spoken of a division that took place in the Legislature of New Brunswick. I will speak of a division which took place in the county council in January last, when this question was rife before the people. In the county council, with twenty-six members present, representing every division in the county, when the question came up where the line should be, a decision was given in favour of the north side, by a vote of 19 to 7.

Mr. WELDON. The Local Legislature are supposed to understand what is the best policy to be adopted for the two counties, far better than the county council, and after discussion, and after hearing everybody interested, the Legislature decided in favour of the contention of those who sent this telegram.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to enter into this local question, though I must say I think rather harsh justice, if not injustice, has been done to this company. I desire to know if there is such a company as the Miramichi Valley Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is labouring under an entire misapprehension as to the relations of this company to the Government, when he talks about injustice. They have not the shadow of a ground of complaint, when it was distinctly provided by the Statute that the location of the road should be approved by the Governor in Council, and that an agreement for the construction of the road should be made in such specifications as we should require; and yet, down to this moment, they have never approached the Government, and have never asked to make an agreement that would entitle them to the subsidy. So that they have no claim to speak of injustice, or to raise the question of good or bad faith at all. In the next place, they have no ground of complaint, if they purchased the rails, when we are subsidizing the same road to a greater extent than before. And if they are prepared to make such an agreement as the Government will make with them, to entitle them to this subsidy, all they have to do is to send their rails there and lay them. I am sorry that this controversy has arisen; but after the statement made by my hon. friend, it is quite obvious that they are the parties who are changing the line from the place where it was to be built, according to the contract made with the Local Government, and for which the subsidy was originally intended. I think the Resolution is a good one. We have given a larger subsidy for a longer portion of the same railway, and we propose at the same time to construct a branch of the Intercolonial Railway that will meet the wants and requirements of the other end of the line.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. I do not know what the company did or did not do; but I presume they had still time to do what was necessary to be done, on application to this Government; yet, without a moment's notice, the Government alter this arrangement, which seems to me to be a course which is not defensible. I remain of that opinion. I do not apprehend that the hon. gentleman is correct either, in his other view that this arrangement, as a whole, is equally advantageous, and for this reason. Besides the hon. gentleman is doing much more than transferring the subsidy. He is proposing to construct, at the public expense, a railway at the end of the line originally subsidized and running parallel to it and which obviously must very seriously interfere with the commercial prospects of the line as a whole line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the contrary, it will help it very much, because we are bringing the Intercolonial Railway that much nearer to it.

Mr. BLAKE. That is assuming they will only construct a portion of the enterprise; that is assuming they do not go to neither Chatham or Newcastle, but to a point where the hon. gentleman will strike his branch from the Intercolonial Railway. What I rose, however, to ask was, what is the Miramichi Valley Railway Company? There is no such corporation.

Mr. MITCHELL. The road was always called the Miramichi Valley Railway Company, until it was altered to the Northern and North-Western Railway Company, and it is still generally known by the former name. My hon. friend has stated this will be a rival road, running parallel to the other road, but not a foot of that other road has been built, and this is subsidized to run on the line of which the subsidy granted to the other end is part.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to know that the road is called the Northern and North-Western.

Mr. WELDON. The subsidy last year was to the Northern and North-Western Railway Company.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. member for York, on whose application the subsidy was granted, has given a wrong name, that can be easily corrected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to amend that resolution by substituting "Northern and North-Western Railway Company" for the "Miramichi Valley Railway Company."

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

On paragraph 22,

To the Erie and Huron Railway Company, for a line of railway from Wallaceburgh to Sarnia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	$96,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman reason to believe this grant will be adequate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 23,

To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Cornwall to Perth, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	$262,400 00

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will make a similar statement as to this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know that this subsidy will be sufficient, but it is all we felt authorized to grant.

Mr. BLAKE. The president asks for $6,000 a mile; did he assure the hon. gentleman that the road could be built for $3,200?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; he said it was experimental.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be called speculative.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, it is experimental.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 7,

To the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for a line of railway from Mississippi to Renfrew, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... $48,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt this will accomplish the object.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 8,

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for that portion of their railway between St. Jerome and New Glasgow, in the county of Terrebonne, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $32,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. There is no paper before the House with reference to this subsidy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; there is no paper, but I believe there is no doubt that will accomplish the object.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is there not any paper? I am sure the Secretary of State could write a paper; his business is to write papers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He tells me that it was a very useful line to build, and this would accomplish it.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman take his word, without anything to bring down to Parliament?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. colleague had to leave the House, or he would be able to give the desired information.

Mr. BLAKE. I was under the impression he had run away and shirked the question.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 9,

For a line of railway and bridge between the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and St. Martin's Junction, connecting the Jacques Cartier Union Railway with the North Shore Railway proper, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole..... $200,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. We do not know what proportion of the whole cost of this is being paid by the country, and what by the company. Another thing, and one which I feel very strongly, is this: it seems, from the papers here, and from what information I have been able to gather of the conflict of the rival roads, as if a reasonable conduct on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have rendered this vote unnecessary, and from the hon. gentleman's own statement made here this afternon, in which he stated he hoped they would not be able to use the grant, if it be the case that reasonable conduct on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with reference to the facilities required, would save to the country an expenditure of $200,000, it was the right and the duty of the Government to have imposed, as a condition, on that company, when we were granting them a loan of $30,000,000, and are to-night granting very large sums further in their interest, as a condition of these grants and benefits, the performance of reasonable conduct on their part.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not decide that the Canadian Pacific Railway were alone to blame. I believe that if these two companies had exercised the mutual consideration, good-will, and forbearance, they ought to exercise, the difficulty would have been avoided; but I am not a lawyer, I am not able to decide this question, which is a question of legal rights. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway took the ground that it was not possible for the other company to run their trains over this particular short piece of the line without involving danger in the carrying on the traffic, but they said to them, if you will arrange to construct an independent line, so as not to be made permanently dependent upon this, we will allow you to have what you want—the running powers; we will carry your freight now at a nominal rate over this piece of line, but we will not allow you to run over it with your engines; as a permanent arrangement we consider it fraught with danger to life and property," but if they would agree and make arrangements for the construction of a short piece of railway within any reasonable time, they were willing to allow them all they asked. So I am not prepared to say it was the unreasonable conduct of one party or the other; probably both were at fault, but while these companies are fighting it out and contesting their rights, their extreme legal rights, we should be in a position to solve the difficulty and cut the gordian knot, by preventing the obstruction to the trade and traffic of a large portion of Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. I maintain this. There are two different questions. There is the question of strict legal right, whatever it may be. The Grand Trunk Railway Company, as I understand, raise certain contentions as to their rights, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company raise certain contentions as to theirs. I maintain that a company, which is involving us in such enormous subventions this Session, ought not to raise strict legal rights to the detriment of the community at large, and at the cost of a tax of $200,000 more on us to cut the gordian knot. I do not say which is to blame. I dare say the Minister is right, that both are to blame. What I want is that the company on whom we may well impose conditions, we should impose conditions on, and then, if the Grand Trunk Railway Company is not reasonable, they must take the consequences. But the hon. gentleman says we had not any power to impose conditions on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On either of these companies. I said we had not power to deal with this particular question at issue.

Mr. BLAKE. I say the hon. gentleman could take power to deal with this question, so far as it affects the Canadian Pacific Railway, and could arrange with them that they shall do that which is determined to be reasonable, as a condition of the great grants we are giving them, and so save this further expenditure we are asked to make.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope it will not require to be spent.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister should make them do what is reasonable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We hope to do that.

Mr. BLAKE. He has not taken power to force them to do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are not quite independent.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say there is a mutual dependence.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

On paragraph 10,

For a line of Railway from St. Louis to Richibucto, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... $22,400 00

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman satisfied that this will accomplish the object.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I believe there is no doubt about that.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe there is some reason to hope that in this case the hon. gentleman will not be troubled:

"We may here state that, whilst other branches subsidized by your Government still continue to annoy your Department with various deputations to settle their intestine difficulties, we can assure you that we will be satisfied with the subsidy requested, and pledge ourselves that we will not further trouble you in future in the matter."

That really is a splendid thing, then they say:

"The electorate of Kent county, which has, in the choice made of its representative, shown its sympathy for the present Administration in electing a man whose political tendencies were not equivocal, will be gratified should there be reciprocity on the part of the Government. Hoping that, with additional railway facilities Kent county may have the pleasure and honour to greet oftener the presence of dignitaries from this honourable and respectable body, and in all confidence leave the question in your responsible hands, being assured that, as true statesmen and experienced politicians, you will grant bread and not stones to your deputed petitioners."

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 11,

For a line of railway from Hopewell to Alma, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... $51,200.00

Mr. BLAKE. I could not make out very well, from the paper brought down, what this was for. The statement which is laid upon the Table says: "Whereas a railway known as the Harvey Branch Railway."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not it.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the only statement that has reference to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the wrong paper then. There were two applications, and in sending these papers down they have been obliged to copy them in great haste, and they have put in the application for the three mile extension, which was refused, on the ground that it was practically built.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what appeared to me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was refused and the other granted. The sixteen miles, no portion of which is built, was to complete the extension of the Albert Railway from Hopewell to Alma.

Mr. BLAKE. What assurance has the hon. gentleman that this will be used?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not quite certain that it will secure the construction of it, but there is a local subsidy of $3,000 from the Government of New Brunswick.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 12,

For a line of railway from St. Andrews to Lachute, in the county of Argenteuil, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... $22,400 00

Mr. BLAKE. I see the stock subscribed is about $25,000 and the Local Government granted a land subsidy of 4,000 acres. Has the hon. gentleman satisfied himself as to its being adequate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I did so.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 13,

For a line of railway from the Grand Piles, on the River St. Maurice, to Lake des Isles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... $217,600 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to strike out "des Isles," and put in "Lake Edward."

Mr. BLAKE. The only paper I have on this subject brought before the House is a letter signed by the hon. member, I presume, of the district (Mr. Montplaisir), in which he says that he has the honour to transmit a map, a plan, showing the route of the road, and he dares to hope the Government will do right and meet the just demands in giving $3,200 a mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say there are twenty-seven miles already built to the Piles, and I am instructed that if this subsidy is granted, parties are ready to sign a contract for the completion of the road, in connection with the Lake St. John Railway. Twenty-seven miles from the St. Lawrence, running in this direction towards Lake Edward, are already built. There is a company already organized.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 14,

For a line of railway from Annapolis to Digby, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... $64,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. There can be no question as to how this is to be done. It says for a line of railway from Annapolis to Digby, but it must be either to the Western Counties Railway or to the Nova Scotia Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I propose to do is to aid the Western Counties Railway, or the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, or the Government of Nova Scotia, provided they will make the necessary arrangements. It will be open for them to make arrangements with any parties or to make a combination of the whole.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the policy of the Government will be to give it to whoever that corporation may be that represents the other interests.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This will complete the two interests. The Western Counties interest is one interest, and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway is another interest. They are connected at Digby. I leave it open, because the Government of Nova Scotia have aided both these companies, especially the Western Counties Railway. Of course, they are all desirous of having this connection completed, but I ask the vote with a view to aid either company, or the Government, or the whole thing combined.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be necessary to consider the question of who has the corporate power to build the link. I think this Western Counties Company must have the power; therefore, the hon. gentleman could not grant the subsidy to the Windsor and Annapolis, because it has not the capacity to build the link.

Mr. VAIL. My hon. friend knows that the Local Government has power now to take over the whole road if it chooses to do so. In the event of their doing so, and a new company being formed, would this subsidy be given to such company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly; any company building the link will obtain the subsidy.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 15,

For a branch line of the Central Railway, from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, between Sussex and St. John, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... $128,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the meaning of these words "branch line of the Central Railway" means the Central Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; it is called the Central Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended it shall be an independent company, under guise of a branch, or that it shall be given to the Central Railway Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All we propose to do at present is to take power to aid a company in the construction of this branch from the Central Railway to the Intercolonial Railway. The Central Railway runs from Fredericton to Salisbury, thirteen miles from Moncton, and this branch intersects it forty miles from Fredericton. There is a subsidy covering that line; therefore it will apply to a line from Fredericton to the Intercolonial Railway, *viâ* this branch. It will apply for forty miles, and this will cover the district from that Central Railway down to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. KING. I do not think the Resolution properly describes the road; this line, I think, could not properly be called a branch of the Central Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will see that the terms are wide enough to cover the case.

Mr. KING. I hardly think they are.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are these words not embraced in the term, "between Sussex and St. John's?"

Mr. KING. That is true, but still I think this is part of the Central Railway, and not a branch of the Central Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Why not strike out the word "branch?"

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well, we will strike out the word "branch."

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

On paragraph 24,

For the extension of the line of railway from Caraquet to Shippigan, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $76,800 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to amend this Resolution so that it shall read "to the Caraquet Railway Company, for the extension of the railway from Caraquet to Shippigan harbour" which makes a distance of sixty miles. A company has already been organized for the construction of the work, and this is to enable them to cover the entire distance from the Intercolonial Railway to Shippigan harbour.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

On paragraph 25,

For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapediac eastward towards Paspebiac, in the Province of Quebec, a sum not exceeding in the whole $300,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to amend that by putting in the words, after Paspebiac, "twenty miles."

Mr. BLAKE. This vote demands some explanation. This and the succeeding vote seem to be based on a different policy. The hon. gentleman says twenty miles; that would be about $15,000 a mile. Now, has the hon. gentleman no data which he can give to the House for this vote?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; we have examined the line.

Mr. BLAKE. My recollection is, that the statement of the petitioners on the former occasion with reference to the proposed subsidy was, that it was an expensive line to build. Here I find a request on their part to grant $6,000 a mile from Metapediac to Paspebiac, 100 miles; that upon this demand, $3,250 had been voted; that capitalists were spoken to, but they thought it insufficient; that since the last Parliament the whole right of way has been acquired by a company, the whole line has been finally located, and all preliminary works have been completed. The company is alleged to have actually acquired the right of way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will have the advantage of the right of way and location.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that as the company has a large subsidy, they would be able to build a longer line than the Government would be able to build for the same sum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the right of way acquired for this road was not handed over by the company, we would not construct a mile of it; in fact, we would not do so unless the entire right of way and every facility in connection with the surveys, &c., was handed over.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman think it would be more economical and of greater good to the public to expend $15,000 per mile in order to obtain twenty miles, rather than give an additional subsidy to the company, which would enable it, with a large land grant, to construct a longer line, as that proposed is 100 miles in length. The rest, I suppose, is to come afterwards.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not necessarily.

Mr. BLAKE. But probably. A departure from the ordinary principle is being adopted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We came to the conclusion that a feeder to the Intercolonial should be there, and we were prepared to ask the House to give an amount for its construction. We have, therefore, decided to build a branch of 20 miles rather than ask for a larger sum.

Mr. BLAKE. Two and a-half times as much road could be obtained by granting a subsidy as by the Government proceeding to build the road. No reason has been given for a departure from the principle of granting a subsidy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. $3,200 a mile is not sufficient to procure the construction of the road, with the aid the company already has.

Mr. BLAKE. If $3,000 per mile will not secure the road, it does not follow that we should pay $15,000 per mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The road will belong to us.

Mr. BLAKE. We will not make any money out of our investment. If we are able to clear ourselves, that is all we are working for. If the hon. gentleman will show me it is of greater use to build twenty miles at $15,000 per mile than to procure the construction of fifty miles for the same sum, I will be satisfied.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see the hon. gentleman's point. This branch will, however, go into the heart of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not given an answer to my question. We propose to expend $300,000 in building a line to Paspebiac. The question is how the greatest good can be obtained from the investment of that money. There are two proposals. The Minister of Railways proposes that we should build twenty miles, at $15,000 per mile. The proposal of the company is that, if the Dominion Government will give them the $300,000, they will build fifty miles. I maintain that it is better for the country that the fifty miles should be built, and that it would be quite as well for the country if the company would work the railway after it was built.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first 20 miles is the heaviest portion of the line, and by building it as a branch of the Intercolonial, a fair chance will be given to the company to construct the balance of the line afterwards. The company have a subsidy of $3,200 per mile from this Government and 10,000 acres of land from the Local Government, and the right of way, which has not been bought, but has been given by the municipalities; and as the Dominion Government would build the heaviest portion of the line, the company would afterwards be able to get along.

Mr. BLAKE. If the heaviest portion cost $15,000 per mile, the average of cost will be a low one. From the statement now made, it seems that $3,200 per mile subsidy is to remain for 80 miles out of the 100, and that the company is to build that portion. So the proposal is, that we are to spend $300,000 to build 20 miles, and then we are to give $3,200 per mile for the remaining 80 miles, which will be $256,000. So that no less than $556,000 will be given altogether.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that the Intercolonial Railway by constructing these 20 miles of railway will be in a very much better position to operate the line than any company could be. Suppose the Government build these 20 miles, much of the expense connected with operating them and the cost of rolling stock would be saved.

Mr. BLAKE. But what I pointed out was, that they could build fifty with this subsidy, according to their own statement.

Paragraph agreed to.

On paragraph 26,

For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Derby Station to Indiantown, fourteen miles, a sum not exceeding in the whole... $140,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Is there an estimate from which you have formed a conclusion that it can be built for this money?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; we have the surveys and we are satisfied it can be done.

Mr. BLAKE. Upon what principle is it that the hon. gentleman has departed here from the rule, with reference to the other Resolutions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The subsidy has been for a year on the Statute Book, and nothing has been done. The Government have not even been approached by the company, with a view to making an arrangement. There is a very large and valuable timber district, and I believe it will be a very profitable branch, and will bring a great deal of traffic to the Intercolonial, and will also be of value in developing that portion of the country. We thought it better to provide for the construction of that branch than to allow the matter to stand longer.

Mr. WELDON. I have understood that letters have been sent to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been no application to make an agreement or anything of the kind.

Mr. WELDON. Is it on the same condition, that the land for the right of way shall be given free?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not say that.

Resolution to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:35 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 12th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LONDON LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. BEATY moved that the second section of Rule 65 be suspended, as respects Bill (No. 139) respecting the London Life Insurance Company, and that the said Bill be placed upon the Orders of this day for consideration in Committee of the Whole forthwith after routine, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before proceeding with the ordinary business, I wish to bring to the notice of the House a matter which I conceive affects the reputation and character of this House, and perhaps I may best do it by reading a letter which I have addressed to the Minister of Railways in these words:—

"OTTAWA, 12th April, 1884.

"MY DEAR SIR CHARLES:—I regret that I should again trouble you on the subject of the Bill entitled 'An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada' in which an alteration has been inserted in the Committee of the Senate at the instance of Mr. John Bell which completely alters the declared policy of the Commons, and I believe also the wish of the Senate in relation to the disposal of the money as provided for in sub-section C of section 5 of said Bill.

"You will recollect that both before the Railway Committee and in the House of Commons the subject of the disposition of the money was fully discussed and the will of that branch of Parliament fully declared, that after the redemption of the securities mentioned in sub-sections A and B of said 5th section, sub-section C provided how the balance of the money should be appropriated, and the order thereof, viz.:

"First upon putting down a double track between Montreal and Toronto, then on such portion of the railways as the Directors may from time to time determine with all necessary works, machinery and appliances connected therewith, and also to the purchase of necessary additional rolling stock, and lastly to the other general purposes of the Company. In that shape the Bill was sent to the Senate, and was amended by striking out the words 'the necessary' on the 38th and 39th lines of the second page of said Bill, and the words 'lastly to the' and also the word 'the' on the 39th line of said page.

"The effect of these alterations as I read them, in place of leaving as the Committee desired the disposition of the balance of the money as they directed—first, to double track the road between Montreal and Toronto, and lastly, to the general purposes of the road have placed entirely at the disposal of the directors the order of the disposition of that money, and they may use the money for any general purposes of the road by buying up railways in the United States or Canada, and are not compelled to spend any money in double tracking should the funds be otherwise absorbed. My attention was called to this remarkable change by the publication in the Montreal *Herald* of sub-section C as it originally stood, and the same clause as it came back from the Senate amended and subsequently passed by the House under the impression that the changes of the Bill were merely verbal ones and did not affect the import or effect thereof—a copy of which article I herewith enclose for your information.

"The Bill as amended was assented to by the House on its meeting after recess at eight o'clock, and I happened to be out at the moment, or I should have made enquiries and looked into the effect of the changes, but immediately on my return within a few minutes after I entered I learned that the Bill had passed with several amendments, and I went to the Clerk to ascertain what they were. I could not see the Bill as it had been sent away, but the Clerk assured me they were mere verbal ones, and did not alter the effect of the Bill. I also asked His Honour the Speaker, who made the same statement to me. I then went to yourself and you repeated the same thing, and it was not until a short time after until I heard from outside sources that the Grand Trunk Railway people alleged that the changes in the Bill were of that important character that it gave them all they wanted in regard to the disposition of the money, that my suspicions were aroused, and I went to the Clerk and obtained from him a certified copy of the Bill as amended and passed.

"I then went to the Chairman of the Railway Committee of the Senate, the Hon. Mr. Dickey, in order to ascertain from him whether it was the intention of the Senate Committee and the Senate to alter in so material

particular the character of the Bill. He assured me that it was not, that the Committee had approved of what had taken place in the Commons, and especially of that portion of the Bill which required that the first application of the surplus moneys should be expended in double tracking the road between Montreal and Toronto, and until his attention was called to it by myself he was not aware that any alteration had been made except verbal ones, but now saw that the disposition of the money was placed entirely in the hands of the Company, and he went with me at once to the Law Clerk who produced the original Bill and also the amended Bill and who statee, as Mr. Dickey confirmed, that there was little if any discussion on the merits of the Bill, but that Mr. Bell, the Grand Trunk Railway solicitor, stated that he would like a couple of words struck off, viz.: 'the necessary' before the words 'additional rolling stock' on the 39th line; as he stated that the effect of these words would be to limit the powers of the Company to the expenditure of money only on rolling stock on the second track and it might be necessary to put rolling stock on the other track, and the Company desired power to do it if they saw fit, as it would improve the general character of the rolling stock on the road the amendment was unobjectionable.

"This proposition so self apparent to be in the public interest, the Law Clerk was directed to make, which he did, and while doing so Mr. Bell suggested that the words 'lastly to the' on the same line and the second 'the' on the same line were surplusage and should be struck out as not affecting the sense of the Bill, which was done without discussion or comment and without the Committee being at all aware that there was any material alteration made by such change in the Bill, and that it was not their intention to make any such alteration as to the disposition of the money as stated in the Commons Bill. Important changes in a country's legislation should not be dealt with in this manner, and as it is clear that upon a matter on which the Committee expressed so decided an opinion, and so definitely expressed their policy, and after the manner in which the changes were effected in the Senate Committee as explained by the Chairman and Law Clerk thereof, it is beyond a doubt that Parliament has been misled into sanctioning important changes in the Bill under misconception of the effect thereof if not under direct misrepresentation by the parties interested in such Bill.

"I have made to you a simple statement of the facts of the case as they have been developed to me by careful enquiry, and I have called your attention to them in order that the Government may institute enquiries for the purpose of ascertaining if the statements of the facts are correct, and as the responsibility of guarding the honour, directing the legislation and protecting the rights of Parliament rests after Parliament itself, more especially with the Government of the day, I trust, should you find my statements to be true that you will at once introduce a short Bill repealing sub-section C as it now stands and restoring the sub-section as it was when sent to to the Senate.

"Should the Senate then desire to alter it, with a full knowledge of the facts of the case, of course no one would have a right to complain; but such an important change should not have been made on a misapprehension of the facts and evidently without the knowledge either of the Committee of the Senate or the Senate itself

"You are aware that when the Bill first came before the Railway Committee the effect thereof was outrageously misrepresented by the representative of the Grand Trunk at that Committee, a misrepresentation which he had to confess to at a subsequent meeting of the Committee, and it would be a scandal on Parliament if by misrepresentations which have been clearly made in another quarter the interest of the country should be sacrificed and the will of Parliament set at defiance.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) "P. MITCHELL.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER, &c., &c.,

"Minister of Railways and Canals, Ottawa."

I have brought this matter before the House because I think it is one in which the honour of Parliament and the credit of the country is involved. After such a full and able discussion as was given to the Bill in the Railway Committee and before this House, it appears that the security provided has been got rid of, namely, first, to double track the road between Toronto and Montreal; second, to provide the necessary rolling stock; and, lastly, for the other general purposes of the road. The word "lastly" was struck out under colour of its being a mere formal amendment; and the Bill thus changed was sent down to this House. I was not in the House when the Bill came down, and I entered the Chamber a few minutes after the Bill had been disposed of. On looking up *Hansard* I find that nothing appears in regard to it, and the Bill must have been disposed of before the shorthand writer got to the table, as I find that Senate amendments to Bills are noticed in other portions of *Hansard*. I have now done my duty in this matter. I have called the attention of the House to the fact that an important feature of our legislation and the declared policy of the House in regard to one of the most important Bills of this Session has been deliberately altered by some means or other. I make no charge and I make no insinuation against anyone; but I have stated the fact, and I feel that it is the duty of the House to deal with the matter and thus protect its own honour and the interests of the country as it may seem fit. In my opinion the Government should indicate what they are prepared to do. If the facts, as I have stated them, are true—and I challenge enquiry—and the Government should find out if they are true, it is the duty of the House to deal with this matter so as to prevent the recurrence of such a scandal, and, at all events, see that the express will of this House is enforced, and not quietly set aside by chicaneary, or any such means, as have been used in this case to deceive the Committee of the Senate and this House. Does anyone doubt that if the House had been aware that such an important change had been introduced into the Bill, it would have been allowed to pass without comment or remark? By striking out the word "lastly," the disposal of the whole money is placed in the hands of the Grand Trunk directors, and the country has no security for the double tracking of the road. That, I take it, is in direct violation of the expressed opinion of this House. Is this House, when such means have been resorted to as are described in this letter, to sit quietly down and allow such a proceeding to go without remark or any effort being made to remedy it? I trust it will not be so, and that the Government will tell the House that they will make enquiry into the matter, and if they find that the statement I have made is true, they will introduce a Bill to remedy the defect and prevent those persons so acting from securing the advantages they sought, and depriving the country of the rights ensured to them by the original Bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I find reported in a daily paper that a member of the Administration, in another place, made these observations:

"I was merely going on to say that Mr. Blake began his Ministerial life by making the wreck of one whom he induced to betray his leader, his stepping-stone to office. He did not then descend to bidding for worthless characters as McKim, but boldly bid for a minister, and caught him, and rewarded him out of the public treasury with a salary of $6,000 and a seat upon the Bench, which he degraded by placing such a man on it."

I am not aware whether the report is accurate, but I beg to say the statement is false.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. HAGGART. In regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the statement made that the expressed will of this House and the Railway Committee has been set at naught by the statement being made that the Senate amendments were unimportant and did not affect the character of the Bill, I beg to say that I did not know whether the amendments altered the Bill or not; but if the statement made by the hon. member is correct, it seems extraordinary that such an occurrence should take place without any comment being made on it—that the whole character of the Bill, the expressed will of the House and of the Committee, should be altered on the third reading, on the plea that the amendments were unimportant and did not alter the character of the Bill. If the statement is correct, some attention should be paid to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If I understand the alteration made, it was made in the other House, not here; and when it came here I had no recollection of any person making a statement about it. It may have been done—I was present at the time—but I did not hear anyone making a statement

Mr. HAGGART. If the alteration is an important one then it is required by the rules of the House that the Bill

should be sent back to the Standing Committee, but if the alteration is only a verbal one, it is so stated by the Speaker or the Clerk, and on that understanding, it does not go to the Committee. But the House have a right to know whether the alteration is an important one or not, and if it is important enough to alter the whole character of the Bill, and the House has been led to understand that the amendment is a verbal one, and not important, and it has been led on that statement to pass the measure, surely there should be some remedy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not understand that it is the duty of either the Speaker or the Clerk to make any statement to the House with regard to a Private Bill. A Private Bill is sent from this House to the Senate. The Senate deals with it making such amendments as they in their wisdom think proper. The Bills come back here, and the parties, those who as representatives of the people in this House, should be in their places, and if they are not in their places, and take an interest in the Bill, they should get some person else to take notice of it, and call attention to the alterations, if any are made. It would be intolerable that the Government, or any person should be held responsible for amendments made in the Senate, to any Bills which may come down from that House. My attention was called to the amendments and I did not consider them important, nor do I now consider them important. The hon. gentleman, as we all know, takes an extreme view in regard to everything connected with the Grand Trunk Railway, I will not say he is too ready, but I think the keen interest he feels in regard to that question induces him to take a very extreme view in regard to everything connected with it. I gave great attention to the Bill in Committee, and when it was passing through the House, and considering it a very important measure, I hastily glanced over the amendments made by the Senate, as I do in regard to any Bill of an important character to which my attention has been turned, and I did not consider the alterations made were of an important character, or that they would at all interfere with the objects Parliament had in carrying that legislation through the House. And notwithstanding the long letter which the hon. gentleman has been good enough to address to me, and still more kindly, to read to me in the House, so that I should hear it as well as see it, I am convinced that no injury has been inflicted on the country, or that any damage will result from it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to make one or two observations in reply to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Railways. In the first place he made reference to the fact that it is the duty of hon. gentlemen to be in their places. I wish to say that I was in my place that evening, just as early as I was on any evening for the ten or twelve days before, or seven or eight days after. I was in about the usual time, and I found that the Bill had just gone through. I went to make enquiries, and was told that the changes were merely verbal—the Minister of Railways told me so himself—and that they did not affect the sense of the Bill. Now, I have taken the opinion of a number of legal gentlemen, and they tell me the amendment alters the whole character of the Bill. That is my own conclusion, too, and if that be the fact, I say it is the duty of the Government to look into the question and see whether the policy which was decided upon by this House should be over-ridden in the way I have stated. I can understand Your Honour allowing that or any other Bill to pass, if attention is not called to it. The rule of the House is :

"When any Private Bill is returned from the Senate with amendments the same not being merely verbal or unimportant, such amendments are previous to the second reading, referred to the Standing Committee, to which such Bill was originally referred."

And, Sir, it is the duty of the gentleman in charge of the Bill to state to Your Honour, whether or not there is any material change, and if there is a material change it should be referred to the Committee. Now, Sir, that was not done in the present case; and the fact that it passed at all is not even noticed in *Hansard*, showing how quickly it was pushed through; and, I think, taking the whole of the circumstances into account, there is an element of peculiarity about it—I will use moderate words—which calls for remark. It occurred in the Senate upon what I believe to be a misrepresentation of the facts, a statement which I can make good by the Chairman of the Committee on Railways, as well as the Law Clerk, who is responsible for the alterations. I invite the attention of the Government to these matters, and I ask them to make enquiry and see if I have stated the facts; and ascertain if the change alters the character of the Bill, and if it does, I ask them if that was the will of Parliament? If these are the facts—and I defy them to be contradicted—I ask if they are going to sit down upon it? It is not for me to take charge of the honour of the House, or to guard its Private Bill legislation, but I have simply done my duty in calling attention to the matter. And as the Minister of Railways has publicly indicated that I have taken an extreme view with regard to Grand Trunk legislation, I think the series of allegations made by their solicitor, the gross misrepresentations which he made before that Committee, and which he had to take back, and the facts that were developed in connection with that legislation, show that the representatives of that Company require careful attention. I have done my duty in the matter, and I place the responsibility of it on the Government of the day, whose duty it is to guard the honour of the House and look into this matter; and if they find that the facts are as I have stated, they have to assume the responsibility of seeing whether the will of the House shall be defeated by a side wind got up in this way.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It is certainly the practice whenever amendments come from the Senate to a Private Bill of this character, for the gentleman taking charge of the Bill, and who moves concurrence in the amendments, to pledge his word to the House that they are verbal and not important, and if they are otherwise the rule is perfectly explicit that they require to be referred to the proper Committee. I have myself often been asked by the leader of the Opposition, on occasions when concurrence is moved, what the nature of the amendments made by the Senate is; and it does seem to me that whoever moved the Bill, pledges his word to the House that the amendments and alterations are verbal and unimportant. I should be glad to be able to agree with the opinion the Minister of Railways has expressed, that these amendments are verbal and unimportant, but I have read the original clause, and the clause as amended, and I confess I must agree with the hon. gentleman for Northumberland that the alteration made is of a most material character. It leaves it in the discretion of the directors of the company to apply the funds dealt with by this clause, either for the general purposes of the company, or in double tracking the road, as they think proper. That certainly was not the intention of the House. If the statements in the letter read to this House are correct, that certainly was not the intention of the Senate, and that amendment has been made inadvertently, and what seems to me to be very like a misapprehension. If that is the case I think the matter is so important that it should be dealt with in some way, and if the House or the Senate did not intend to legislate in the way in which as the Bill now stands it has legislated, some steps should be taken to put the matter in the position in which Parliament intended it should stand.

Mr. BLAKE. I think this whole discussion is of a peculiar character, and I may say that I have long thought that our practice with reference to Senate amendments to Private Bills was very loose and liable to lead to accidents.

We find for instance to day that the Minister of Railways declares in his opinion this amendment is unimportant, while the hon. member for Victoria and the hon. member for Northumberland declare it to be of great importance. Well, I think it is a fact that a substantial alteration in the powers of the company has been made. I have not been able this Session to pay that attention in Private Bill matters I gave in former Sessions, but I was here on the evening when the Bill went through, and, speaking from memory, I have no recollection of any enquiry being made, or any statement made in return, with regard to the character of the amendments. My own opinion is that it passed without any remark being made by any person. I am rather inclined to agree with the hon. member for North Victoria that if an hon. member has an amendment which he knows to be an important one in the Bill he has in charge, it is the understood practice of the House that it should be mentioned to us; but I say we ought to take warning from this. I have long felt that the present practice would lead to difficulties. The question is whether we ought to allow it to be decided by an hon. member in charge of a Bill or by the House at large whether an amendment is important or not. I think, where it is merely verbal, we may take the opinion of the hon. member; but if it goes beyond that, and the question be whether it is more or less important, my opinion is that either the Clerk at the Table or some one else should read the amendment, so that the House could form a judgment upon it as to whether it is important or unimportant, and then the responsibility would rest upon the House of deciding whether it should be referred back or adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I was just about to enter my dissent to the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Railways that it is not the duty of the Government to supervise private legislation. There is a certain kind of private legislation to which my remark does not apply; but it does apply to the present measure. This Bill was introduced as being in the public interest, and it is one of a class of Bills which I think the Government are bound to see is in the public interest. That duty, I think, has been neglected in this case.

Mr. McCARTHY. I just rise for the purpose of pointing out that, as I understand it, this Bill has not been substantially altered, although I agree with the hon. member for West Durham that the power is changed. The Bill, as passed by this House, directed that the money should be applied, first to building a double track between Montreal and Toronto, second, to building double tracks elsewhere; and third, to the general purposes of the company. The Bill as passed by the Senate provides that the track between Montreal and Toronto shall be built first, and then, instead of building double tracks anywhere else, which I suppose was not contemplated, that the money should be expended for other purposes in the discretion of the company, so that I do not think that there has been a substantial change, though there is a difference in power between the Bill as it passed this House, and as it has been returned from the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL. If my hon. friend looks at the Bill, he will find that the word "lastly," which defined that the directors should only devote the money to the general purposes of the road after the double-tracking, is struck out; so that, with that word "lastly" struck out, the directors are at liberty to spend the money first in the general interest of the road, and secondly, upon the double track between Montreal and Toronto. That, I think, my hon. friend fails to catch.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that our practice has been too lax, and more care and supervision must be exercised by the House in future. Of course we are obliged to take the statement of an hon. member in charge of a Bill when he says that an alteration is merely verbal; but if it be more than verbal, as the hon. gentleman truly says, it is not for the hon. member in charge of the Bill to decide whether it is important or unimportant. If the alteration is merely verbal, such as a change in the grammatical construction, or the substitution of one word for another which is synonymous, without altering the sense, we may accept the statement of the hon. member in charge of the Bill; but if it be anything further than that, I think the responsibility should be thrown, not upon the hon. member but upon the House to decide whether it is important or unimportant. With regard to Government supervision over private legislation, I am quite sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways did not at all intend to speak in the sense suggested by my hon. friend opposite. Over the general current of private legislation of course the Government cannot be expected to take charge; but legislation which is technically private, but in every sense concerning the general interest of the public, the Government of course exercises supervision. With reference to the amendment in the Bill, it occurs to me that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is correct. Here is the clause:

"And the remainder of the said consolidated debenture stock by this Act authorized to be created and issued, and any sums remaining out of the sums mentioned in the preceding paragraphs after the said existing charges and debenture stock mentioned therein have been purchased or exchanged for consolidated debenture stock, shall be applied to the putting down of a double track or second line of rails, first upon the portion of the line between Montreal and Toronto, and then upon such portions of the Company's railways as the directors may from time to time determine, with all necessary work, machinery and appliances connected therewith, and also to the purchase of the necessary additional rolling stock, and lastly to the other the general purposes of the Company."

The word "lastly" being struck out. From a cursory examination, one would say that these purposes should be carried in the order in which they are stated. Perhaps on reading the clause a second time——

Mr. BLAKE. I think if you will read it a third time you will find it means what the hon. member for North Victoria says it means.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) The clause is doubtful without this word; there was no doubt with the word "lastly" in; and I do not think we ought to allow the doubt to remain. I have again carefully looked at the clause, having heard what the right hon. leader of the Government and the hon. member for Simcoe have said, and have no doubt whatever that the omission of this word "lastly" alters the sense of the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two sets of purposes stated, the one stated specifically and the other generally; and in dealing with these purposes, the order in which the power is to be used is stated, viz.: It is to be applied to double the track, but they could not double any part before the piece between Montreal and Toronto, and then the general purposes are provided for; and as between these two, there is no order of time or proportion, as far as I can judge, one attaches more importance to the change in the wording by leaving out "lastly."

Mr. GIROUARD. A doubt is created which did not exist before.

Mr. McCARTHY. I still think there is not really any doubt about the matter. It says that the money shall be applied to the putting down the double track or second line of rails upon that portion of the line between Montreal and Toronto and then with regard to the residue, the residue is to be applied for general purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. You begin with the double track first between Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. McCARTHY. A certain sum to be realized from these debentures, they wish to be used in putting down a double track.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We might consider the two purposes and leave the distribution of powers as to putting down the second line of rails. "The remainder of the consolidated debenture stock shall be applied to the putting down of a second or a double line of railway and also to the purchase of the necessary additional rolling stock and the general purposes of the Company." It must be applied to these three purposes, but does not say in what proportion.

Mr. BLAKE. Supposing the money was sufficient or supposed to be sufficient for all, it might be given to the rolling stock.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is evident to the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway, when he got this changed for some purport. We know how he voted against it in Committee and how he had to submit to the Committee. If it is not important why should he obtain that change in the Senate? It has been obtained to enable them to do what they like with the money, and that is what they have the power to do by means of this alteration, notwithstanding the opinion of the right hon. First Minister and the hon. member for Simcoe. I took the opinion of many legal gentlemen, and almost all of them agree with the opinion I have stated, and it is for that reason I brought the matter before the House. There must be grave doubt when the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. members for North Victoria and Jacques Cartier express their opinion in the same sense, and I do not see why we should leave a Bill involving millions of dollars with this doubt. The Government should provide a remedy. The hon. gentleman may say it is not a Government measure, but he took a great deal of interest in that Bill when it was passing through the Committee and the House, and it is a *quasi* public Bill affecting the interests of the Government of the country and it is the duty of the Government to say what course they will take with relation to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. In consequence of these observations in regard to the practice of Parliament, in future all amendments to Bills coming from the Senate must go on the paper, and the amendments will not be taken into consideration immediately after the Message has been announced from the Chair. It has been the practice, when the amendments made by the Senate were not of importance, to take them into consideration at once, but the practice in future will be that they go on the paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister what he intends to do in relation to this Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already said we will take it into consideration.

LONDON LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. BEATY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 139) amending the Act incorporating the London Life Insurance Company.

Mr. BLAKE. As this Bill comes before us under rather exceptional circumstances and hon. members have not had the opportunity of reading it, I would ask the hon. gentleman to depart from the usual practice and give us a brief statement of its objects.

Mr. BEATY. The leading object of the Bill is to authorize the London Life Insurance Company, incorporated under the laws of Ontario in 1874, to increase their capital stock from $250,000 to $1,000,000, the shareholders being ready to take up that amount of stock. It has happened, however, unfortunately for the company's progress, that a part of the company's capital was impaired, amounting to some $15,000 out of the $33,000 which was paid up, and the shareholders wish to place the company on a stronger footing than before. They have deposited in Ontario $75,000 as security under the laws of Ontario, and they now wish in addition to increase the capital stock and to extend the operations of the company throughout the whole of Canada. These are the two leading objects of the Bill. The details, in other respects, simply concur with the laws of the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE. Was there a reference to the Committee to ascertain the financial condition of the company, and whether it has been verified that there remains unimpaired of the capital paid up stock the difference between $15,000 and $33,000?

Mr. BEATY. No, there was no reference to a Sub-Committee. There is no doubt that that is the only loss or impairment of the capital.

Mr. BLAKE. The Committee on Banking and Commerce was satisfied of that, on evidence?

Mr. BEATY. Yes, it was satisfied of that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Superintendent of Insurance was before the Committee, and he had the latest report of transactions of this Association as rendered to the Legislature of Ontario, and that was consistent with the general statement made by the promoter of the Bill. There was no absolute investigation into it, but from the statement made by the Superintendent of Insurance, there appears to be no reason to doubt that the statement made is correct. The Bill, as it came before us, contained some extraordinary provisions, and one extraordinary provision remains in it, that is the one allowing the company to insure preference shares. I do not like that. It is a provision that ought to be carefully considered, at any rate. Another section provided that sections 5 to 12 of the Act which they had from the Ontario Legislature should constitute part of the present Act. The Committee resolved to print these clauses *in extenso*, and have them printed with the Bill as forming part of it as independent sections. The Bill as it stands is not more than half of the original Bill, and I do think it should be printed before we are asked to consider it. I do not wish to prevent the progress of the Bill, but it is utterly impossible to consider it carefully in its present shape; and, as the attention given to it in the Committee was necessarily cursory, it is of the more importance to have it printed before it is passed.

Mr. BEATY. Those added clauses were clauses from the General Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE. From the Ontario General Act.

Mr. BEATY. And they are clauses well understood.

Mr. BLAKE. One does not wish to interfere with the progress of necessary legislation, but we must see that it is correct. It seems there was some investigation, though not as satisfactory as I would have liked, into the question of the impairment of the capital. I would ask the mover whether the Bill, as amended by the Committee, proposes to arrange for that impairment of capital. Heretofore, when a corporation has come to us for legislation—a bank or an insurance company—which declared that its capital was impaired, we have said, "We must find out what the extent of your real remaining capital is; we give you a new mint mark by giving you an amended Act, and we must not allow the public to be deceived by stating that so much is your real capital in cash if the real capital be less;" so we have made the legislation show on the face of it what we thought the real capital was. Banks have come to us to reduce their capital stock; we have not been satisfied with their statements of what their stock was. Either the Consolidated or the Royal Canadian came to us for legislation by which the amount stated by the company

themselves was largely reduced by the Committee, and was found to be altogether illusory, even so. The examination was not adequate; still it did some good. I say we ought, if we grant a charter or an amendment of a charter to a company here, to declare what its real capital is, and we ought not to emit it with $33,500 paid up if in fact nearly half of that has been lost capital. Still less ought we to do that when it is proposed that we should take hold of a company which has heretofore been a local company. Of course, we have done that several times, and there is no objection to it when a company desires to enlarge its operations; but we ought to be very careful, when we give an enlarged and Dominion character to a corporation, to see that the charter is in accordance with the genuine status of the company, and, if that has been reduced by $15,000 it ought to be stated here, and provision ought to be made for the restoration of that impaired capital, unless the Committee think the amount is otherwise adequate to carry on the operations of the company.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Committee struck out the section altogether which declares the amount of the capital paid up. The section now only provides the extent to which the capital is to be subscribed, and the existing capital is to form part of the new capital to be created.

Mr. HALL. This seems to be a different case from the reduction of bank capital to which the member for West Durham has referred. Banks often ask for a charter to recognize the impairment of their capital and enable them to start anew. This company did not come here with that view. It was a local company, and desired to enlarge its sphere of action. It was only incidental to that that this impairment of capital came out. We were informed in the Committee on Banking and Commerce that the matter had been examined by the Superintendent of Insurance to see that the capital was sufficient for the company to go on with, and all we thought necessary in the Committee was that the necessary provisions were secured to give the company the power they asked under a Dominion Act. The clause in reference to the amount of capital was struck out, and the only provision contained is as to the deferred capital, and the view was shared by the whole Committee that it was in the interest of the public, which, of course, we had principally in view, that provision should be made to enable preferred capital to be subscribed. The Superintendent of Insurance was satisfied that the company, as it at present existed, was authorized to go on, and that, if we furnished power to provide additional capital, even if it were in the nature of preferred stock, it would be in the interest of the public.

Mr. BEATY. The object of the promoters of this Bill is that the preferred stock should be taken at a premium by the present shareholders. Though that is not in the Bill, that is the expectation, and the amount of premium will be added to make up the impaired capital so far as it goes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The statement of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) is quite correct. Instead of wiping off the impaired portion of the capital, they say to their present shareholders, we give you the added capital at 4 per cent., thus replacing the amount of the impaired capital. Before the Bill was submitted to the House, I had an opportunity of seeing the Inspector of Insurance for the Dominion, and he highly recommended this course as being in the interest of the policy-holders and in no way likely to affect them prejudicially. I felt therefore that the interest of the public was protected in that respect. Our Inspector of Insurance also inspected the affairs of that company, and I presume, as he was present at the meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee, that he would have taken exception to it in any respect that he might have discovered, after making that investigation, that the legislation was not in the interest of the public. He made a report which I have not with me at present, but it speaks of that impairment, and, having his statement that their mode of making good that impairment would be satisfactory to him, I have no doubt it will be satisfactory to the policy-holders, because he stands largely as their representative when legislation of that kind is proposed.

Mr. BEATY. I should have added that there is a section providing that this Bill shall not take effect until it is adopted at a general meeting of the shareholders.

Mr. MACKENZIE. By a vote of three-fourths in number and amount.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the explanations given remove the objections as far as I am concerned.

Motion agreed to; and Bill considered in Committee, and reported.

Mr. BEATY moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood the third reading was to be taken on Monday.

Mr. BEATY. I was anxious to have the first reading in the Senate on Monday.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There will be no trouble with the Senate, I think.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend must remember this is a Private Bill. No doubt there are many important Public Bills with which there will be no difficulty in the Senate, but there might be with a Private Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Very well, I have no objection.

Bill read the third time and passed.

THE HARBOUR OF QUEBEC.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, on Monday next, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That in order to assist the Quebec Harbour Commissioners in the improvement of the Harbour of Quebec, it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to advance to them a sum or sums not exceeding in the whole $300,000 to enable them to complete their Tidal Dock, the advance hereby issued to be in addition to the sum of $1,200,000 authorized by 36 Vic., cap. 61, and the further sum of $250,000, authorized by Act 43 Vic., cap. 17, the advance authorized by this resolution to bear interest at 4 per cent. per annum, and to be made on the same terms and conditions as the previous advance above named.

Motion agreed to.

THE LEVIS GRAVING DOCK.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, on Monday next, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to advance a further sum or sums not exceeding in the whole $150,000 to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners toward the completion of the Levis Graving Dock, bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, in addition to, and on the like terms as to Sinking Fund, as the sum of $500,000, authorized to be advanced by 38 Vic, cap. 56, and the further sum of $100,000, authorized to be advanced by 46 Vic., cap. 40.

Motion agreed to.

REDEMPTION OF LOANS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, on Monday next, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise by way of loan such sum of money not exceeding two million pounds sterling, as may be required to redeem by one issue, under the existing arrangement, with the Financial Agents of the Government in England, the small loans maturing within the ten years next following the first day of January, 1882, or to make good to the Consolidated Revenue Fund such sums as may have been paid out of it, for redeeming any such small loans which may have matured since the day last named; and also such

further sums not exceeding in the whole three million pounds sterling as may be required to meet the charges paid on the Consolidated Revenue Fund by Acts passed in the present or any previous Session relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or for granting subsidies for or in consideration of the construction of certain railways; or to provide for the prosecution of certain public works; The said loans to be raised in accordance with the provisions of the Act 35 Vic., cap. 6, as amended by 38 Vic., cap. 4, but at a rate of interest not exceeding 4 per cent. per annum, and the moneys so raised to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole (page 1511) on Resolution respecting Subsidies to certain Railway Companies be received.

Motion agreed to; and Resolution read the first time.

On motion for second reading.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought this would be the most convenient time for the general discussion of these resolutions, because the case is one in which the application of the principles and policy of the Government as indicated in the Resolutions depends very largely on the facts and circumstances with reference to each particular line of railway proposed to be aided; and the further information which is expected to be obtained, and which to some extent was obtained in the Committee, seemed to be material in order that the House might be in as good a condition as possible to apply these principles of action or the policy to which I have referred to particular cases. Now the resolutions before us are, of course, extremly important. They are important in view of the very great pecuniary interests involved; they are important in view of the multiplicity of different interests involved; they are important, some of them, in view of the principles involved; and they are important in respect of the consequences which they will probably entail upon Canada. I think it doubly to be regretted that it is at this very late hour of the Session, and with the very short interval for deliberation which we are to have, that we should be called upon to deal with Resolutions possessing all these elements, and possessing the additional element that in many respects they deal with enterprises about which it is impossible that the members of this House could have acquired that information which is necessary to an intelligent assent to, or dissent from, the views of the Administration as to granting the aid or otherwise; and, as I said on a former occasion, these considerations apply much more potently now, because we are members of a Confederation involving a very large area of territory divided into many Provinces; and although those of us who pay attention to these matters may have some general knowledge of what are the wants and needs and geographical location and other interests which are involved in our Provincial railway system, whether as completed or as proposed, it cannot be expected that we should have the same familiarity with, and the same capacity for forming a judgment from pre-acquired information, upon the plans proposed to us with reference to the other Provinces. I maintain there has been no excuse whatever given to us for the delay upon this occasion. With respect to many of these proposed grants, they are continuations of the policy of Parliament, and with respect to others there was ample opportunity to have reached a conclusion as to what the Government should propose to Parliament much earlier in the Session, to have formulated the proposals much earlier and given the House that means of enquiring, of deliberating and of forming a sound judgment which we ought to have had. The proposals involve an appropriation of some where about $8,500,000 in cash, calculating interest upon the annuities at the rate of 4 per cent., which is the rate at which we borrow money, besides the cession of a road by an Act to be assented to, on the same day as that on which the policy of this Parliament receives the assent of the Crown. These joint appropriations will amount to between $9,000,000 and $10,000,000. Nor is it pretended on this occasion that this policy is to be carried out by means of the surplus. Time was, when that was the glowing statement. Time was, when it was stated that this was a means of disembarrassing the Government respecting its surplus. I recollect when the hon. member for Ottawa county last Session, or the Session before, said that one of the reasons which probably induced the Administration to grant such appropriations was, that it was a means of extricating the Minister of Finance from the embarrassment in which he found himself as to the disposition of the surplus; but the Minister of Railways differed from that hon. member, and said these appropriations were not expenditures out of the surplus; that he recollected an instance in Nova Scotia when the Government expended $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 on railways, and so far from the Dominion Government disembarrassing itself with regard to its surplus we made a good investment. The hon. Minister pointed out that the result of the policy would be not to trench on the surplus but to leave it unimpaired; that it would be an investment of the same business-like character as the hon. gentleman was making in regard to another enterprise for which we are borrowing $20,000,000 odd at 4 per cent. to lend it at 5 per cent., thus making a net profit out of the transaction of not less that $22,500. But upon this occasion, Ministers do not make this proposal. Before this order was called, the hon. Minister of Finance had taken the preliminary step to borrow a large sum in order to implement obligations to be created under the Canadian Pacific Loan Act and this measure. It is, therefore, not out of the surplus or in spite of the surplus, according as we take the observations of the hon. member for Ottawa county or the observations of the Minister of Railways, but by mortgaging the future resources of the country, that we are now expected to carry out the present policy of the Government. I think in view of the general prospects of the country at large, and in view particularly of the other railway proposition made by the Government during this Session, and in view of those prospects which open out from the proposals now before us, we may well pause, take breathing time and endeavour to consider for a moment, where the present proposal is about to lead us. The proposition we have before us *en bloc* is one divisible, as it seems to me, into three heads; and I frankly acknowledge that of these three heads, two have been to some extent disposed of as to the principle, apart from their application to the particular object in hand, by the decision of the last Parliament in its last Session and of this Parliament in its first Session. I say there are three lights in which one may consider this proposition. First, as Federal aid to railways of general advantage to Canada, within the meaning of that phrase as it exists in our constitution, and as interpreted up to a comparatively late date; those railways, which properly speaking, fall within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada exclusively because they were either international or inter-provincial, or, although they were geographically altogether within the limits of one Province, yet from some particular circumstances they were of such a character as might lead them to be properly described as of general advantage to Canada. Of course there is a sense in which every railway that can be proposed, is of advantage to Canada. So is a high road, cross road, a country road, every house, every factory, every man—they all more or less in one way or other conduce to the safety, strength and prosperity of the State. But it is not in that broad sense that the words are used in our constitution. The words which apply to railways are used in a restrictive sense. They are exceptional. They acknowledge the possibility that a particular road, though lying

within the limits of one Province, may be declared to be of general advantage, and in that case this Parliament should obtain jurisdiction over it. But they never were intended to convey the view, and until a very recent day the view was never contended for, that all railways might be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, or at least all railways which touch, intersect, or go near any leading line of railway. But then, as I have said, the first proposition is, Federal aid to railways which come within even my comparatively limited construction of these words, —the words, "general advantage to Canada." The second is aid to build local railways; and as to these, of course, there is a question of degree. You may find it very difficult to decide where the line is to be drawn between railways which are truly for the general advantage of Canada, and railways which may be properly excluded from that category. We have had just now an illustration of the difficulty of deciding whether an amendment is important or unimportant; and so here you have very great difficulty in deciding this question as to railways, in which local patriotism—no doubt that local patriotism which induces members for the county or locality to take a very strong view as to the importance and magnitude of the interests of that particular county—may unconsciously of course, but none the less potently, sway their judgment as to whether a particular road is for the general advantage of Canada or falls fairly within the category of local railways. But even with respect to local railways, although confessedly such by both sides of the House, the principle of granting aid to them has not been, unless it is done by these resolutions, conceded. The third point which I hold to be an entirely new one in point of principle and which is to be sanctioned now for the first time, is, that aid should be extended in respect of past local railway expenditure—in respect of railway expenditure in a locality in which a railway has already been constructed. Now, as I have said, the question we have to deal with is one, as to the first two points, largely of degree. It was not difficult to foresee that it was to come; in fact it was obvious from the year 1882, in which year we entered upon this policy. In that year the hon. Minister of Railways in propounding the policy was disposed to cast as far as he could some veil over. In opening the discussion, when he came to defend and expound the application of the policy he found it necessary, with reference to roads of an important character, and compared to some of those which it is now proposed to aid, transcendent, to point out their Federal character as distinguished from the local Provincial roads. When he came to deal with the railway from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, he said:

"At first sight this may appear to be somewhat of the character of a local Provincial railway, but there are features connected with that work that take it out of that category, and place it on a broader and more substantial basis that will commend it to the approval of this House and the country."

He proceeds to state those features. I read this to show that with reference to an enterprise confessedly so important as the Lake St. John Railway, the hon. gentleman found it necessary to say that at first sight even that railway assumed rather the aspect of a local Provincial railway, and therefore not one to be aided by him, but he went on to show that the first view of the case was not one which could be sustained, in his opinion, and to give the reason why. Then I ventured in reply, to say this:

"I will only say just now that the subject the hon. gentlemen proposes is one of the very greatest importance, as being, however he may disguise it, very largely a proposal that the Dominion Parliament shall grant aid to local or provincial enterprises. It is of the greatest importance, both as regards the enterprises which it is supposed to assist, and the principle of the rate of aid which it is proposed to apply, and the money assistance which it proposes to extend, and above and beyond all, in the precedent which it proposes to create."

Mr. BLAKE.

Then, Sir, we got a little further, and in the following year, when the hon. gentleman proposed his railway aid policy, there was some further discussion upon that subject, which is interesting. Having brought forward a much more extensive policy, I used this language with reference to it:

"There is one sense in which I have no right to be surprised at any of the proposals which the hon. gentleman might bring down in this direction. I told him last year, when he brought down his proposals, that it was impossible to deny, with respect to some of them, at any rate, under whatever cloud of words they might be submitted, that he was, in point of fact, aiding provincial and local works, and that the door was but opened, and he would find it difficult, if not impossible, to close it. He has found it perhaps difficult or impossible to open it as wide as he would have desired; others may have attempted to close it, but found it too late; but it is open wide enough to admit the various subsidies which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House."

Then, Sir, in replying to me, the hon. gentleman said this, speaking of myself:

"The hon. gentleman said that it was opening a very wide door; but I think that he has already learned from the sentiments of some of the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, who have on this occasion given an independent expression to their sentiments on this question, that some of these hon. gentlemen would be prepared to open the door a little wider. The most cursory examination of this question is sufficient to satisfy the House that it is absolutely necessary that we should look at these measures proposed for the development of our country from a somewhat different standpoint to that from which we have been accustomed to look at them. The hon. member for Middlesex especially takes exception to interference with provincial legislation. I am under the impression that the Provincial Legislatures will be very much obliged to us for coming, with our great resources, to aid of the country in its developement, let it be in one Province or the other. So far as its being regarded as an interference, the great sentiment of the country will be, that when the public works of this description are shown to be essentially necessary for the development of the country they should receive the careful consideration of the Federal Government and the Federal Parliament."

Then the hon. gentleman proceeds to say that the resources of the various Provinces are come to an end:

"I am sorry to say that there are very few Provinces that are in a position, however anxious, to give that aid and support to the development of the country it is desirable they should give, on account of the condition of their resources; and I believe they will only be too grateful to find that there is a disposition, when works are of general importance to the whole country, to give their careful consideration and assistance when practicable."

Then, Sir, those results to which the hon. gentleman adverted have received a great expansion this Session, in which it is perfectly clear, from the hon. gentleman's own statement, clear from even a cursory perusal of the Resolutions, clear from a very limited enquiry into the subject, that as to many of the proposed enterprises, they come properly within the name of local railways, and cannot be deemed to be more than of provincial importance, though I quite concede, as I have expressly stated heretofore, in this and former Sessions, that the general advantage of this country is, in the other sense to which I have referred, enhanced by the construction of railways. Now, we have come to the full-blown application of the principle that local railways, and strictly local railways, are to be assisted by this Parliament, and that is the progress we have made in the first Session from the first adoption of that policy. Speaking generally of the whole proposals, it is to be observed that during the debate upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Loan Bill the rumour spread that a large additional expenditure would be proposed, under the statement that it belonged more or less immediately to that scheme; and I proposed that we should have before us, at one view, and before being called upon to decide on any one of the parts, the whole plan of the Administration with reference to Pacific Railway expenditure; that we should not be called upon to vote a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway and that portion of the policy, and to the British Columbia settlement, and that portion of the policy, separately; but that we should know what the plans of the Government are, which they were about to bring down to this House, as a part of the trans-continental railway policy

—that we should have all that before us before being called upon to decide on any one. But that proposition was negatived. The wisdom of the House was opposed to my proposal. They decided to proceed piecemeal. They determined upon arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway without being aware, at any rate, as a House, however much individuals may have been aware, of what the remaining portions of the policy of the Administration were, and that portion was carried out. Now, so far as can be seen, in addition, the British Columbia settlement involves something which, I am afraid, before the hon. gentleman gets through with it, will approach $1,000,000—$750,000 for the advance for the railway, and between $100,000 and $200,000, according to his present estimate, for the dock. I am afraid we cannot hope to get these quite within his figures, and so I say it is more than probable that the figures will amount to something close upon a million. Then, on this transaction there is directly or indirectly, in connection with the scheme of a trans-continental railway, including the aid in respect of railway construction by the Province of Quebec, the aid towards new railway construction, if necessary, between Quebec and Montreal, the aid towards the Short Line Company and other incidentals, about $7,000,000 which will be granted, including the Eastern Extension, if you rate that at the cost at which we acquire it. I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman says that we ought not to rate it at that cost; but if you do so, there is something like $7,000,000 in addition to the $1,000,000 for British Columbia, making $8,000,000 for the trans-continental railway, irrespective altogether of the loan to the Company and the guarantee, involving liabilities of $30,000,000 more. All these liabilities of one kind or another approximate to close on $38,000,000, which have been assumed by the Legislation of the present Session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does the hon. gentleman say that we pay for the Eastern Extension?

Mr. BLAKE. $1,200,000 in cash.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. That embraces the 50 miles of railway between Truro and Pictou.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not speaking of the Pictou Branch as part of the Eastern Extension. I am aware that the hon. gentleman does not agree with my figures. He says that we purchased the Pictou Branch, which is a profitable enterprise, and therefore we are paying less than the sum I have mentioned for the Eastern Extension. It is impossible for me to obtain information on the subject. I know he agreed to pay what the Government of Nova Scotia paid to the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company. I think it is $1,200,000 at least, and added to that, something for rolling stock, which has to go over for the moment. Not being able to divine this amount, I shall assume that the price of the Eastern Extension to us is what he pays—$1,200,000 or $1,300,000. Thus, we get the sum of $7,000,000. If you say that the Eastern Extension is only costing $600,000——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. According to the statement of the hon. gentleman, the Eastern Extension costs us nothing. The hon. gentleman stated, when that measure was passed, you expect that the road you get back from Truro to Pictou will give you enough to warrant you in taking the other, which is of no value. He knew that we were paying $1,200,000 for the 50 miles from Truro to Pictou, which would give us a net profit, and which we could only get back in that way, and he stated that that included the cost of the Eastern Extension, which we took only to secure that which was valuable.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the hon. gentleman's own statement, which he gave me in answer to my questions. I asked him if I understood his views to be so and so, and he said, yes. I was anxious to acquire from the hon. gentleman information as to the grounds on which he brought this proposition before the House, and I re-stated it, so as to ascertain what his views were. I had no information. I have accepted what I read the other day, in which the hon. members from Cape Breton stated the cost as I have given it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman wishes to state this matter in a way to mislead the House——

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For he charges against this subsidy the 80 miles of railway which were acquired, not by this Government paying $1,200,000 for it, but in connection with the 50 miles from Truro to Pictou, and states it as costing $1,200,000. Although we have the fact before us that the entire object of the Government was to obtain the 50 miles from Truro to Pictou, which had cost $2,000,000, and which the Government got for $1,200,000, and this Eastern Extension in addition, knowing that we had acquired by that expenditure what was the only paying portion of the Intercolonial Railway, the hon. gentleman misleads the House if he charges this $1,200,000 as for the portion, which was the price of the whole line.

Mr. BLAKE. When I made the statement, I said that it was on the assumption that the $1,200,000 was paid for the eastern branch. I added that the hon. gentleman disputed that, though I understood that it was partly paid for the Pictou Branch, and I say that I cannot allocate the money to the different portions of the line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And therefore you will put the whole amount on the Eastern Extension.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I think the hon. gentlemen is unreasonable. I gave to the House the information on which I based my calculation that the $1,200,000 was to go for this portion. If the hon. gentleman tells us now that the Eastern Extension is worth nothing, I wonder why he is giving it away to a railway company, and what he expects the railway company to do with it. What addition will it be to the resources of the company that is to build a railway to Louisburg to get a piece of railway that the hon. gentleman says is worth absolutely nothing at all. If it is worth something, we paid something for it; it was included in our bargain; I do not know how much the hon. gentleman estimates it to be worth, therefore I charge this $1,200,000 to it. I leave the hon. gentleman to solve that matter further.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but will he allow me to suggest that it may be worth nothing at all to us, and I did not, in the calculation which I laid before the House, say that it was worth anything. I said that the value we received was in connection with that portion which we desired to obtain and retain. But the House can see that, while it would be worth nothing in its present position to us, yet, as a portion of the short line between Montreal and Sydney, it might become of the greatest possible value to the parties engaging to construct that line.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we have an article that may be worth nothing to us just now, but may be of great value to others who want it, I presume that our capacity to sell it for a price is the measure of its value. The hon. gentleman, when he leaves for England and wants to sell his house in Ottawa, does not say that it is worth nothing because he cannot live in it, but that it is worth what he can get for it. So, to those who are going to build the Short Line Railway, the Eastern Extension is valuable and, therefore, it ought to be worth something to us. It is a

little difficult, in making a statement such as I am making, that one should have so many interruptions——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BLAKE. Not that I profess to be discomposed by them, but they of course a little interrupt my argument. Now, that you have got here these grants, these obligations amounting, in all, to about $38,000,000, it matters comparatively little at what price we estimate the Eastern Extension, for take it at the highest, it only amounts to $1,000,000 or a little over, out of $38,000,000. I do not propose to go into the details of all these new schemes at this moment, or, at any rate, I do not propose to go into them at great length. In my opinion, though, there again I occupy a different standpoint from the hon. genteman. We are paying dearly to-day for the fault of the route chosen for the Intercolonial Railway. We are called upon to expend large sums of money in order, if possible, to accomplish the great interprovincial objects which were to be served by the construction of that line of communication. I know all about the military argument, and knowing all about it, I have never been able to valuo it as a strong argument My opinion has always been that the great difficulty which exists in the consolidation of these Provinces, in the consolidation of the interests of Confederation, in the association of all things that go to make a nation is distance, and that to shorten distance between their different ports is the most important political object which we could have had in view; and, therefore, that to adopt about the most circuitous route upon the map as the means of making a great interprovincial line of communication, was sacrificing, to the fancy and phantasm of a possible invasion, that material prosperity, that building up our country as a nation, that moral prosperity and strength which would accrue to a nation by its nearer and closer association — sacrificing those things which would make us one and really strong, to the fancy that, some day or other, we might want to send troops by railway. As I have said, we are now called upon to recognize that, at any rate, as far as the arts of peace are concerned, the Intercolonial has not answered its purpose. I do not say it has been useless; far from it. I am quite free to admit that it has developed a traffic far greater than I, for my part, expected it would; I am free to admit that it has done more good than I expected it would, and I rejoice to know it; but I say that we are now recognizing, in the most formal manner, that it has failed to accomplish its real, its main purpose, which was, not to protect us in case of war, but to benefit us during a time of peace and to give as real and as close a connection with one another as geography allowed. The hon. gentlemen has acknowledged this; he stated it a Session or two ago, and he repeated, in his speech the other day, that he was obliged to give up as beaten in the effort to promote a through trade by Halifax.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not altogether failed. We have a through trade now.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course there is a through trade; I believe there was a half cargo of wheat and three half cargoes of peas went through the elevator. It is a through trade, of course, to that extent. The hon. gentleman remembers when Beau Brummel was asked if he ever ate vegetables, he said:—"Yes, I once ate a pea." So, to pretty much the same extent, comparatively, the hon. gentleman has a through trade. We all know the elevator is doing nothing; we all know that they cannot get the grain brought down there, and what is proposed to us to-day is to spend more money in order that we may find some other means by which, if possible, we may get the trade to our own port and in that effort we are building a line to compete with our own; we are to give large subventions to a railway which is to compete with our own; and whatever may be done in the way of a through trade by the Intercolonial now, whatever magnificent account the hon. gentleman himself may be able to give—and no one that I know of can make more of slender material—I should not be surprised, if we had not got down to "hard pan" on this question of the grain trade, that he would have talked of it as flourishing, or at least promising—I say whatever may be done to-day, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman expects, with his short line, to compete successfully for the through trade to Halifax. Of course he does not, because it would be ruinous—whatever may be the present results of the work on the Intercolonial—it would be absolutely ruinous to engage in competition with a line, the advantages of which he has pointed out are so enormous. And our subsidizing this short line, depends upon the very proposition which is, of course, destructive to the through trade by the Intercolonial; that that which the hon. gentleman found it impossible to do by the Intercolonial there is a chance of our doing by this line, viz., competing with the Atlantic ports not in our territory. If that can be done by this line, there is an end to the Intercolonial through trade. If we are to do that, according to reports, as far as I can judge—as well as we are permitted to conjecture, for conjecture is all that is allowed to us at present—we are doing that by actually paying our own money to build a railway through the State of Maine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. Go through the State of Maine! Canadians to travel through the State of Maine! Does the hon. gentleman suppose that any hon. member of this House, on either side, after this line has been finished, will venture to attend this Parliament by means of the short line? Does he suppose we will allow the dust of Maine to adhere to the soles of our boots when we come up here? I, cannot be. We must go around by the good, old, reliable roundabout route that we are accustomed to, and in respect to which we are accustomed to the hon gentleman's management. Now, I do say that this is a wonderful change. I am not myself horrified at it; the hon. gentleman knows that quite well, because I have never perceived the same reluctance to use the shorter way to get from one part of the country to the other on the part of really sensible people. I do not perceive that the nationality which the hon. gentleman is constantly throwing up in the faces of us, in the Opposition, as being a nationality that always seeks their country's benefit, will even do what ambassadors used to do in the old days, now happily passed away, since the hon. gentleman has accepted the position of High Commissioner, go abroad to tell lies for their country. I have not observed, living in a section of country which happens to possess the shortest line of communication between two parts of the great Republic, that even the most enthusiastic citizen of the United States objected to pass through the western peninsula of Ontario when he could, in a more convenient, expeditious, and in a cheaper manner, get from one part to another part of his country in that way. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cite the instance of that community as an instance which perhaps may protect me against the charge of want of patriotism in having, even earlier than the hon. gentleman came to the conclusion that it was not wrong to take the shortest road. Nor have I failed to express that view because there was a time when I was accused of something like treason because I suggested that it would be a good temporary arrangement for us to take advantage of the Sault line in order to make communication between our east and our west. When I suggested that plan, which had struck

the hon. gentleman himself before, which he had been rather inclined to at one time, I was told it was traitorous on my part to make the suggestion. Subsequently, it is true, as scenes changed, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway announced that they were about to build either a branch or the main line to the Sault, I was told it was a capital thing for the country that there should be that connection; but there was a short spasm, or a short frenzy of patriotism, when I was accused of these traitorous designs, because I had made those suggestions. But, of course, this matter is to be disposed of, now that we are in the region of hard fact, upon the basis of hard fact. I told my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), the other day, when he was accusing the Canadian Pacific Railway of possessing an ill-feeling towards the city in which he takes so deep an interest, that I thought he was doing that corporation an injustice. I think now with reference to this question, as I thought then, with reference to that city, that it is possessed by the idea of getting as much as it can from us, and of using all the concessions that we will give to it, to its own commercial advantage; and whatever is for its best, commercially speaking, it will do, so far as we allow it to do it. That is my opinion, which is based upon such slight observation on human nature as I have been able to make during fifty years, and I do not believe that human nature is very different, when it is formed into a corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway, from that which we find pursuing its avocations in life, not under the guise of a corporation. Now, my own impression is, that it will be found that this scheme is of doubtful advantage, in the aspect in which it is mainly brought before us. I think that we see, from the statements that the Canadian Pacific Railway itself has made, from the statements that Mr. Stephen made at Portland, last fall, or the fall before, very clearly what, after a full consideration of the whole question, that corporation believes to be its commercial terminus. I cannot conceive that the statements which he then made were made without having fully considered the whole subject, and having come to a conclusion as to where his transatlantic ocean trade should go, and we know that he talked of Portland—and Boston has also been hinted at—as the winter port, and of Montreal as the summer port. It is true that I have seen the letters which the hon. the Minister of Public Works laid upon the Table, and we, of course, know that various events, various exciting events have been transpiring this Session, and it is quite possible that, in the course of those negotiations and discussions, affecting largely the material interests of the corporation in other respects, respects in which they had to look to the assistance and good-will of men highly placed, of men who compose Governments, and of men who can retain or subvert Governments, it is quite possible I say that hopes may have been held out; but I must say that, upon the whole, as far as the published letters of the corporators are concerned, I see no pledge, for my part, which would lead me to the conclusion that there is any other view present to the minds of the Company, even to-day, than the view which was stated by Mr. Stephen, at Portland, last fall. Now, if we can, by any plans of ours secure an equally advantageous port in Canada, I have no doubt they will adopt it; if we can secure a more advantageous port, of course they will adopt it; but, unless we can secure as good a port in all the respects which go to make up an ocean port—and I need not say that these involve many considerations; they do not involve simply consideration of mileage, they do not involve simply considerations of harbourage; they invole certain other considerations, with reference to ocean freight, which are important—I say, if we can get that, then we may get the trade there; but without that, unless we pass an Act of Parliament to prevent them going abroad, we shall find the trade go where it will go to the best commercial advantage of the Company that controls it. You find, however, other reasons, no doubt, why they should favour these lines. Mr. Stephen is largely interested, as is well known, as he himself has said in the letter which I think the hon. member for Halifax read to the House a little while ago, he, and I believe certain other members of the Company are interested in New Brunswick lines, and it is very natural that they should desire to make communication with those lines, and very probably, making communication with them, it will be to their individual interest, and they will use their influence, as far as they have it with the Company, to throw traffic upon those lines, so far as the great objects of the Company can consist with that course; and, therefore, I think there is reason why we may hope that more will be done, and that a smaller demand will be made upon the public purse than we might otherwise hope for in this connection. But I wish to say that my strongest feeling, with reference to a short line between the Provinces, doubtful as I am of what may be done in the way of a through trade, is that to which I adverted a little while ago. I have always thought, and I repeat, that I consider it of high political consequence that we should get as near to one another as possible; and for our own local trade, for our commercial intercommunication, our business intercommunication, as well as our social intercourse, it is of considerable consequence that we should have a line which will bring us as near together as may be; and on general grounds I am, in railway construction, for the shortest line between the objective points. Of course, we know that in railway construction the shortest line is not always the line which counts the least number of miles. We know that grades and curves are equivalent to mileage, and that a level road, with many miles more of extent, may be really, for all practical purposes, of time and of cost and of convenience, as short or shorter than a road with sharp grades and sharp curves, whose miles number less. But we are called here to deal with the question in a fresh aspect. It is not merely to sanction expenditure on the construction of railways within our own bounds, which are, probably, to perform their function of a continuous short line of railway by means of a link through a foreign country, but we are called upon to expend our own money in the construction of a railway through a foreign country. This subsidy is in part for the construction through Maine, or may be, if that turns out to be the shortest practicable route; and, of course, I need not say that that raises a different question. The question is this: there are always two objects to be considered, the primary and the secondary. The primary object here is to obtain a feasible line of communication between different parts of the Dominion; the secondary object, which is not to be overlooked, and which is an important adjunct of the primary object, is that we know that we are giving considerable local advantages which also benefit the country at large, while we are stimulating railway construction through any part of our own country; therefore, if we can combine these two we accomplish a double good. In my opinion, the second is entirely subordinate to the first in a case of this kind—I do not hesitate to say so, but I do not disregard the second, for all that. I think, for instance, that if the balance were nearly equal, it ought to be turned in favour of the railway which, besides accomplishing all, or almost all, that the other would accomplish, would add to that advantage, that our money was spent in the development of our own country. I think that is a circumstance which we cannot put out of the account. I think we must consider that we are doing a great good in that; at the same time, I repeat that I would not sacrifice the primary to the secondary object. I must see that the primary object is susceptible of practical attainment, but if I find that it is possible to attain it by the conjunction of the second, if there

is any doubt in my mind, the doubt is solved when I find that I can join the first and second. Now, Sir, I cannot discuss the details of the hon. gentleman's plan. As I have said, it is a very important plan. It involves the expenditure of a very large sum of money. The grant to this portion, the short line, the piece between Montreal and Moncton, is $170,000 a year for fifteen years, equal, calculating interest at the rate at which the Dominion pays interest, and which is the proper basis of calculation, to something over $1,890,000 in hard cash. Therefore, the cash we are going to expend is very considerable. The policy is also a very important question, because I am quite sure that those who are, according to the hon. gentleman's view, more patriotic than myself, would be disposed to add the patriotic consideration, and to say that they would rather under go a certain amount of inconvenvience, a little more detention to travel through our dearly beloved country, than to cut across a foreign one; and, therefore, from those who have so pointedly, and for so many years, hoisted the flag, waved it in the air, flung it in our faces on this and analagous subjects, I anticipate a very large share of approbation towards the more moderate and, as I flatter myself, the more practical and sensible view of the case, which I am just now presenting. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes that he shall settle this. He proposes that we shall give him authority to decide what this line shall be. He says: "I do not know where it is. I have not acquired sufficient information to enable me to form a judgment. I have been thinking of it for a long time; I have looked at it a great deal; I have talked to a good many people, and yet I am entirely in the dark. I propose," he says, "that it shall be by the shortest, the best and the most practicable line"—I forget the exact words, —"between two points, after report by competent engineers." Well, we have had reports of competent engineers before; we have had reports of competent engineers with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway; we have had reports of competent engineers with reference to the Intercolonial Railway; we had results which were not gratifying to various Parliaments, as due to the reports of competent engineers. I highly approve of the report of a competent engineer; I think it is an admirable thing, but I think it ought to be laid before Parliament, with all the information, with all the knowledge, and with the decision of the Administration, and that the people's representatives should take it upon themselves to decide and to fix the route. Let the investigation take place. Let competent engineers report to the hon. gentleman as long as he pleases and as often as he pleases, and when the matter is ripe for decision let his plans be submitted to the people's representatives, with all the comparative advantages and disadvantages of the different routes, and let us, for ourselves, freely decide which route is, upon the whole, that which is in the best interests of the country. I believe, as I believe with reference to the Intercolonial Railway, that we ought to have a voice in the selection of the route. I believe that it is not a fit thing to be left to the sole and uncontrolled discretion of Ministers. It is quite true that if they go wrong we may turn them out, but that won't change the route of the railway; and it is more important that we should have the right to fix the route of the railway than that we should be able to turn out the hon. gentlemen afterwards. Now, as to another point—the hon. gentleman's plan—no information was vouchsafed to us, and I feel myself inclined to think that at the first blush, at any rate, it is objectionable. I refer to that which proposes, under guise of a short line between Montreal and the ports of Halifax and St. John, that the work should be accomplished by giving a subsidy to one company to build any uncompleted links between Montreal and Moncton, then to go over a portion of the Intercolonial Railway, and then deal with another company with reference, at any rate, to one of the termini which are to be served by the completed links—I refer to the terminus of Louisburg or Sydney. I say I should have been better pleased if the hon. gentleman had pointed out to us why it is that he proposes the divided instead of the unified system for this short line of railway; why it is that he proposes that it shall be in three pieces —at least three, because there are links in the westernly part of which we do not know that they are to be under the control of the company—at least three, one under control of the Dominion, and one each under control of two different companies; but I do not know whether he intends to provide arrangements which shall secure that unity of action which is essential to a through line, as the hon. gentleman himself has stated, when he told us that it would never do for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to have stopped at Callander, and to have used other lines of railway as its means of communication with the Atlantic; that it was essential to its success that it should be under one management until it reached its terminus—that it should indeed be one line of railway. If it was necessary, in order that the Canadian Pacific Railway might do this, it must be equally essential with reference to the through business to be done at St. John, Halifax or Louisburg; and therefore I think, as at present devised, the hon. gentleman's scheme has elements of weakness. I observe that the great unknown who made the personal proposal to the hon. gentleman, proposed for the completed line, and the offer which has been accepted, or the plan which had been adopted, is not that one. As to the financial question, it is, of course, limited. Our concern at the moment is limited to this: first, what is it proposed to cost us; and secondly, is the proposed cost reasonable and likely to accomplish the result. We know what the cost to us will be as now proposed, but we have not had any practical information whatever as to the grounds of the hon. gentleman's expectation that that proposed cost will really accomplish the object. We have, therefore, no means of saying that we are really doing anything more in this respect than making, what it has been said we have made in other cases, an illusory grant. Now, Sir, without longer, at the present time, engaging in the discussion of that part of these Resolutions which deals more or less with matters of real interprovincial concern, I wish to refer for a moment to the local railway part of the scheme. As to these roads, of course they are of different classes. They are of different classes even in this set of Resolutions. I fully recognize that there is a very material difference in point, not merely of intrinsic merit, in a local sense, but also in the interest that Canada has, as a whole, between the different roads, in these railway Resolutions. But, as I have said with respect to them, taken as a whole, and including all, even the thin pretence with which, on the first occasion, the hon. gentleman veiled his arguments of Canadian, as distinguished from Provincial interests, is now abandoned; and the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), when he pointed out his theory of the Federal idea, was answered by the First Minister himself, who took that question in hand, and who stated to us that there was an obstacle in the way of its accomplishment. He pointed out two or three reasons; but it was like the case of the Irishman and the sailor—there was one reason which overbore all others, and that was it could not be done. And why could it not be done? Because the members would not vote for it. He said the country is a large one, and the members represent various localities, and (I am not quoting his words, but I am giving the spirit of his remarks) they must have some sop or solatium, and they would not support a large measure for really an important purpose. That was the hon. gentleman's proposition. I regret that he should have said so. My belief is, that if the hon. gentleman had appealed to the

patriotism of this Parliament, had drawn his line as he might have drawn it, at enterprises which were clearly on the safe side, the Federal side, the Canadian side, and had said this is what we propose to you, this is in the public interest, as we conceive it, this is the true limit of our jurisdiction, there would have been an effective response to such an appeal made by that hon. gentleman. But he did not choose to make that appeal; he preferred to adopt the other policy, that of granting aid to railways, no matter how small, how short, how purely local their interests may be. And so I told him that this was the almost inevitable consequence of the expectations he held out, of the line he adopted when he began this policy. And we know not where it is to end. We see the portentous growth of it, the proportions it has assumed. I remember the first speech on this subject delivered by the hon. Minister of Railways, when he mentioned that numerous enterprises had been pressed on him for aid by the hon. member for Ottawa and other hon. gentlemen, and he said he could not see his way to aid them. Then, next Session, they were all down in the list for aid for 50 miles each. These are all again down in the list for other 50 miles, and numerous others have been added. And yet we know not the end because when the hon. gentleman placed a large quantity of papers on the Table, he told us that there was an immense number of papers connected with proposals which had not been favourably considered, and that they were so long he could not possibly get them copied and brought down. We have only the papers connected with those enterprises which have been favourably considered so far; we have not any idea of those which are reserved for further consideration, for further pressure, for the anti-election period; for then it is we may expect the full fruition of this policy. I say the policy of the hon. gentlemen is a degrading and demoralizing policy, and that the ground on which he supported it is one to which I think he might have induced this House, with the influence he has over the majority, to have declared itself superior. It is objectionable on other grounds. It is an assumption of provincial functions, and it is centralization in its most dangerous, because in a material way, and in its most inviting form. I see the Finance Minister and the First Minister laugh. We all know about it. When the late member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) declared last year that the grant of railway aid was an interference with the Provinces, the Minister of Railways stated that the provincial revenues were exhausted, and he thought the Provincial Legislatures and the Government would be obliged to the Dominion Parliament for the aid granted. This is not the only case in which suggestions of the same dangerous character have been brought forward. We have had a suggestion that the administration of justice, which belongs to the Provinces, should be paid for by the Central Government; and if that course were adopted, it would of course follow that those functionaries whom the Central Government pay should also be appointed by them, that that administration which they pay for they should also control. And so, I will not say by slow, but by rapid degrees, the hon. gentleman, instead of invading provincial rights, may buy them from the Provinces one by one—he may acquire them under the guise of being a benefactor. Such is far from being the principle on which the Confederation of Canada was framed; it is far from being the principle on which the Confederation of Canada can last. If it be the fact that the Provincial Governments and Legislatures, after an experience of seventeen years, are not in a position, financially, to discharge those functions which belong to them, the whole subject ought to be reconsidered. If, in consequence of their impecuniosity, they are unable effectually to discharge their own functions, you may do one of two things. You may say, we propose to alter the Constitution, so that the central Government shall take this, that and the other, and so relieve you both of your importance, dignity, power and provincial autonomy, and of expense at the same time; or you may propose a new adjustment of the financial question, which will enable you efficiently to continue the discharge of those functions which for seventeen years you have been discharging. But the proposal of the hon. gentleman is neither of those propositions; it is a proposal, I do not say the word offensively, under the guise of a bribe. The hon. gentleman says the Provincial Governments will be very much obliged to us if we give railway aid here and there, but this is a proposal calculated to sap the independence of the Local Legislatures and Governments; calculated to lead them to look to this House for pecuniary favours not based on some general principle, not under the lines of the Constitution, and so to lead towards the hon. gentleman's great goal. Now, I consider, therefore, that we ought to deal with this question after a full development of the tendencies and principles of the policy, and deal with it, as indeed I think the time is ripe for us to deal with several other questions, upon a revision of the Federal Constitution. I think it is not at all unreasonable to say, that even if the Constitution had been framed in a very different manner from that in which it was framed, which was a manner not very likely to produce a perfect instrument—I say, even if it were framed in a different manner, it would not be unreasonable to say that seventeen years' working and experience would have developed difficulties and defects; and I believe all true Canadians, without distinction of party or political creed, ought, if they want Confederation really to prosper, to address themselves without further delay to the question: in what respects does our Constitution at present work well, what frictions and difficulties have been discovered in the working of it, what alterations should take place, and endeavour to arrange it so that it will endeavour to do the work it ought to do, smoothly and to the advantage both of the Provinces and of the Confederation of Canada, as a whole. But I do not think that is any reason why we should proceed upon a false policy, a policy which is leading us with rapid steps in a direction which I think, if presented plainly to the majority of this House, they would effectually disavow and repudiate. Now, Sir, I decline to agree to the proposal that we should undertake any of the proper functions of a Local Legislature by our vote. If we are going to undertake any of the functions of the Local Legislatures, it should be on an alteration of the Constitution, which places any part of those functions within our grasp and leaves to them their diminished functions. I agree with my hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), that these grants are in many cases such as we have no reason to believe will be adequate, and what has passed seems to be a reasonable proof of that. It is stated, and with great force, with all the greater force when you apply it to a peculiarly local line, that the subvention of $3,200, which is estimated to be the cost of the steel rails, is a good limit to adopt, because it insures local backing and intrinsic merit. But then you do not stick to it. Can anybody doubt that we have, thinly disguised under these proposals, an additional subvention, at any rate, in one case. Who can doubt, with reference to the line from Metapediac to Paspebiac, that the practical result is an increased subsidy?

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. At six o'clock, I was pointing out that the Government, even while the hon. gentleman was laying it down as unanswerable, had in fact already departed from the rule, with reference to $3,200 per mile, and I instanced for example the road from Metapediac to Paspebiac. You will recollect that the present proposal is that twenty miles of that road should be built as a Govern-

ment work, at an expense of $300,000, while there remains the subsidy of the company for the remaining eighty miles, granted last Session, at $3,200 per mile. The result, supposing the calculations of the Administration are realized, supposing it to be true that twenty miles can be built for $15,000 per mile, will be that the 100 miles referred to will have cost the country to construct, between $500,000 and $600,000, and if you add the rolling stock, it will amount to a sum nearly double the prescribed maximum subsidy. Now, the pretence under which this is done is, that the 20 miles will be a sort of spur or branch of the Intercolonial. But it is not pretended it would be a satisfactory way of working, to have this branch worked by the Intercolonial, and the other 80 miles worked by a private company. I suggested to the Minister that it would be better to divide this sum of money in the way of subsidy, thus getting a result that would be cheaper for the country, and the hon. gentleman said that his plan was to be preferred, because the first 20 miles was the heaviest part of the work, and they would be also able to go on easier with the rest, if the Government built the first 20 miles. Mark that statement. And yet the Minister estimates that the first 20 miles will cost only $15,000 per mile. Now, to prove to you with how little regard to care are the estimates made and submitted to this House on this subject, it is only necessary to allude to the estimate the Minister gave us last year, when he asked us to vote a subsidy for this same 100 miles of road. He told us, then, that the road was estimated to cost $25,000 per mile, or $2,500,000 in all, to which he added $100,000 for the rolling stock. There is an average cost of $25,000 per mile, and the Minister of Public Works says that the first 20 miles is the heaviest part, and the other is lighter, and it therefore will cost more; but he proposes to add $300,000, or $15,000 per mile, in order to build the heaviest part of the work which, last year, he estimated would cost on the average $25,000 per mile. Now, this shows that it is not an estimate, but a mere guess or conjecture upon which we are asked to act, and I shall be surprised if it turns out next year that the hon. gentleman is able to construct the work for the price he now states. We have not here information of any kind which would lead us to believe that the company's estimate of last year is erroneous or extravigant and yet, with those figures before us, he presents these figures this year, and tells us these results will be produced at an expenditure of $300,000. But I say, even if that be true, the real substance, the real essence of the transaction, with reference to that railway is, that it involves a subsidy of $5,500 per mile instead of $3,200. Again, no proof has been given of the capacity of the companies in many cases to construct the road; nor has it been shown that they have evidenced their view of the *bonâ fides*, or the merits of the enterprise, by subscribing or paying for any considerable amount of capital stock. I am not therefore satisfied that we should be asked to vote this large number of subsidies to these railways, in the manner in which, and upon the information upon which the hon. gentleman has asked us to decide that important branch of the question. Now, Sir, I come to the third of the points of policy into which I have endeavoured to divide these Resolutions, and that is, the recoupment of past provincial expenditure upon railways, which, I think, is a very great and serious question. It is certainly a novel question; it is presented to us now for the first time. In reference to some roads, the hon. gentleman has repudiated the application of this principle. We know that the suggestion has been made, in more than one instance, but he has declined to have anything to do with it, and we have to deal with it as a new question, untouched by any decision of this or any previous Parliament. Now, upon this subject of recoupment, I may say that I think our Federal system, besides other defects, has one

that is, I will not say fatal, but a very serious and radical defect; and that is, the mode in which arrangements are made for the provision of funds for the Local Governments. It violates the wholesome maxim that he who spends should pay; and so long as it continues without some change of system, so long I, for my part, expect nothing but recurrent applications to this Parliament for assistance. The average taxpayer does not realize—it is difficult to get him to realize—that he is actually paying, or at any rate the extent to which he is actually paying, these taxes which are levied upon him indirectly through the Custom houses. He does not understand it, even when these taxes are spent by the Government which levies them. Nor, indeed, have we any right to complain much of that, because I have heard some Finance Ministers declaring to him that he does not in fact pay these taxes, and therefore it is not to be complained of, under those circumstances, if he inclines to such a very pleasant belief. But whatever difficulties of good Government may be occasioned by the impossibility of convincing the multitude of the expensiveness of the system, or of the fact that they are paying, when the same Government that lays the taxes spends them, those difficulties are intensified to an enormous extent when—as according to our system—the Government which lays the indirect taxation pays over a certain portion of it to the Local Government, and that Local Government spends the subsidy. Under these circumstances, the taxpayer is too apt to suppose that whatever is so received by the Local Government is clear gain—that whosesoever pocket it comes out of, it does not come out of his; and, therefore, what is lightly gained is lightly spent; and the result is that proper care and attention and earnestness are not exhibited by the taxpayer or Legislature in reference to the extent of the funds so provided. This is a difficulty easier to state than to remove; but it behoves us to remember that there is that difficulty, and to consider its existence, both when we were called upon, as we are to-day, to deal with questions which grow out of this very difficulty, and when we are called upon to lay down a principle which may have important bearings in the future, Now, at the very first interference which took place in the financial arrangements with the Provinces—as long ago as 1869, I think—I ventured to point to the dangerous path on which we were entering; and I believe our experience since then leads to the conclusion which I endeavoured then to press upon the attention of Parliament that a change in the financial basis was a serious thing—to be engaged in only with the assent of the different Legislatures concerned, and that the system itself was defective. If we could devise a plan under which certain sources of revenue should be apportioned to the Local Governments for their own use, I believe it would be a very great boon; for I think the present system contains in itself the seeds of recurring difficulty—nay, mayhap, of ultimate disorganization. Now, Sir, how stands this question of recoupment for past provincial expenditure on railways? At the start of Confederation the question of railway construction was the subject of local, and also the subject of Federal action, but in two entirely distinct lines. We had, with reference to the Federal Legislature, the first national railway, the Intercolonial; and we had, a few years later, the project for the other national railway, the Pacific; and these two railways being generally conceded to be in their nature for the general advantage, they were prosecuted by this Government. They necessarily combined local advantages with the general advantage to the country. The Intercolonial Railway, designed to complete, as far as the old Provinces were concerned, a system of intercommunication, locally served the Provinces of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick, and of Quebec, particularly the counties and localities through which it passed. The Canadian Pacific Railway locally served the Province of Bri-

tish Columbia, the North-West Territory, the Province of Manitoba, and a portion of the Province of Ontario; so that, besides its general advantage, it was also of local advantage, as tending to develop the various territories through which it passed. Now, in dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the policy of the Administration which propounded to Parliament that great work was that Lake Nipissing should be its terminus, and from that point it was proposed that the Provinces should make whatever connection was required by local enterprise. That was at that time the utmost goal to the eastward. There is no question or doubt upon that question. As it stood, a very considerable gap had to be filled up in order that by a short and direct line, the ocean termini—at any rate, for the summer—of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be placed in communication with it; and the Province of Quebec set itself to work, as far as it was concerned, to supply the missing link within its own territory. And I am not surprised that that Province should have anxiously considered and energetically acted in that relation; because, as I said years ago, if there be any of the older Provinces of Canada which may expect a traffic return from the through trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is those Provinces in which the ocean termini of that enterprise are placed; and so far as their rail-borne trade is concerned, it has always seemed to me that if you can arrange a through road by which the wheat of the North-West is to come down and take ship at Montreal or at Quebec, that of itself involves the proposition that the return freights of imported goods and local manufactured goods, such goods as are manufactured there, or in that neighbourhood, will find their point of departure at the same port at which the grain takes ship, and that therefore there will be a very great and important advantage to whatever point is the ocean terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Such was the view which, on former occasions, on the occasion of the discussion of the very contract under which the road has been built, I ventured to state in this House and elsewhere, and I conceive it is the only sound view to take as to the probabilities of the through all-rail route which has been designed and built by the aid of the subsidies of Parliament Now, then, as I have said, Quebec was alive to this and set about making those local railways through the Province which would serve to enable her to reach these advantages. My hon. friend, the member for East York, proposed, in 1874, to subsidize a line or lines reaching somewhat beyond Lake Nipissing, in order to assist in making connection with existing and projected lines of railway. That was the policy of my hon. friend as was shown by the votes that he proposed to Parliament, namely, to assist in the extension of the Canada Central. At first, it will be remembered, by those who sat in this House at that time, that the road which was supposed to be the best and most direct was somewhat more southern than the route which was ultimately adopted. It was, I think, by the valley of the Bonnechère, which would have taken the road to Renfrew, and that was the link supposed to be subsidized. That proposal did not meet with assent from my hon. friends, many of them Conservative members, from the Province of Quebec, because they said that the best route, the route which would most suit them, the route which was directest and fittest for the connection they were proposing to make, was a more northerly route, of which the terminus would be at or near Pembroke, and there was a considerable controversy on that subject in Parliament, and subsequently further surveys and information satisfied my hon. friend from East York that that was on all grounds the best route, and accordingly the route that was subsidized was settled to be to Pembroke. It is not necessary for me to enter into any lengthened discussion as to the purpose and object for which this link was subsidized, because I have under my hand the statement made by the Minister of Railways, as expounding the policy of the Government, in the year 1882, and in the year 1883, when he proposed to carry out still further that policy of my hon. friend from East York, by subsidizing another link stretching from Lake Nipissing, or from Callander, which was the then fixed terminus of the railway, towards Gravenhurst, and he then stated distinctly the circumstances under and the principles upon which my hon. friend from East York had acted, and upon which he himself was acting. In the year 1882, in moving the first subsidy for the Gravenhurst and Callander branch, he said this:

"It will found, upon reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874, that it was therein contemplated that aid should be given to the lines of railway connecting railways in Ontario and those in Quebec with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The 14th clause of that Act provides:

"'The Governor in Council may also grant such bonus or bonuses, subsidy or subsidies, to any company or companies already incorporated or to be hereafter incorporated, not exceeding $12,000 per mile, as will secure the construction of the branch lines extending from the eastern terminus of the said Canadian Pacific Railway to connect with existing or proposed lines of railway; the granting of such bonuses or subsidies to be subject to such conditions for the securing the running powers and other rights over and with respect to the whole or any portion of the said branch railway, to the owners or lessees of the main line of the said railway, or of any section thereof, or to the owners or lessees of any other railway connecting with the said branch railway, as the Governor in Council may determine; but every Order in Council granting such subsidy shall be laid before the House of Commons for its ratification by resolution in the House.'

"Under the authority and in accordance with the proposal to subsidize lines of railway to connect the railways of Quebec and Ontario with the Canadian Pacific Railway, extending from Pembroke to Nippissing or the point now called Callander Station."

Then, Sir, remember that he makes this statement in support of a Resolution to grant aid from Callander or Gravenhurst. He says:

"The object of this portion of the Resolution is to provide the same facilities for connection with lines of railway connecting the commercial centres of Ontario, and the existing lines of railway permeating the Province of Ontario, with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will be at once apparent that no steps could be taken more calculated to promote the industries of that Province, or to subserve the railways of that Province, or develop the North-West itself by furnishing the most direct, cheap and easy means of communication between the North-West and these great commercial centres. The provision itself is entirely within the scope of the provision of the law, and there is no doubt it was in contemplation at the time that that Policy was adopted that aid should be given to the trunk lines of railway connecting with the Ontario railway system in the same manner as was done in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, connecting in a direct line with the railways in the Province of Quebec. It will be seen, by reference to the discussion, that, when my hon. predecessor was introducing this Act and submitting his policy to the House, I took the liberty of asking the question as to whether it was intended to subsidize one or both lines, and the answer showed the hon gentleman they had in view the subsidizing of both lines of railway. It is possible that the then financial condition of the country induced the hon. gentleman to pause and hesitate about carrying out the original proposal of giving the lines of railway in Ontario the same facilities for connection with our great national line of railway to the Pacific as has already been provided by Parliament for connection with the east. I may say that the Government have been solicited by the company, the Northern and North-Western, for a subsidy of $12,000 a mile for these 110 miles."

That seems to be the end of the passage material to the present question. Then he says again:

"We may now practically take Quebec as the starting point for our traffic, because, as I have stated to the House, the Canadian Pacific Railway, having purchased the line from here to Montreal, and thus having a through line from here to Montreal, and having made traffic arrangements over the line from Montreal to Quebec, Quebec now practically becomes the ocean terminus of the Pacific Railway, because they not only have traffic arrangements, but are entitled to make a rate to Montreal and also to Quebec itself."

Well, then, the hon. gentleman, in the following year, when he proposed to increase the subsidy, which had been but $6,000 a mile in Ontario, discussed the question again, and he said this:

"Those hon. gentlemen who were here a year ago will remember that on that occasion I stated that this was really implementing a pledge given by the leader of the late Government when he became leader of the Government. It will be remembered that that hon. gentleman, before going to the country, issued, as he was bound to do,

a manifesto, stating what the policy of the Government was, and how they proposed to deal with the great question of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And in their manifesto he stated that a part of the policy of the Government was to subsidize lines of railway connecting with the Ontario and Quebec systems. Hon. members will remember that when that hon. gentleman, at a later stage in the Session of 1874, brought down his Canadian Pacific Railway policy for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when he spoke of the subsidies he proposed to grant to these lines of railway to connect the Canadian Pacific at Callander with the Ontario and Quebec systems of railway, I interrupted the hon. gentleman, and asked him, as will be seen by reference to the report of his speech at the time, "Do you mean to subsidize one line or two lines? Is it to be a line to connect with the Quebec system?"—for he was explaining that, and the hon. gentleman's answer was: "two lines." Now, this subsidy provides for the Gravenhurst and Callander section, 110 miles of railway, and is intended to fulfil the pledge that hon. gentlemen made previous to the elections, and in Parliament after the elections, that not only was there to be a direct line of railway communication by the subsidy to the Canadian Central Railway, but there was also to be a line of communication from Callander to connect with the Ontario system of railways. If the hon. gentleman had not said that, if he had made no reference to the subject, I do not believe there is a gentleman on either side of this House who will say that not only is it fair and just to have this provision to connect with the Ontario system, as the Canada Central subsidy, which was given by the late Government, enabled us to connect the Quebec system with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But that, apart altogether from any question of pleadings, apart altogether from any question of even-handed justice, I do not believe that there is a gentleman on either side of this House who will not say that, looking at this great question in the light of the importance of the development of the North-West, it is essential, to the completion of our system, that we should have the most direct, the most rapid and the most independent line of communication between the great Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander and the great commercial centres at Toronto, Hamilton and all those towns on the lakes. That is the reason of placing this subsidy in the Resolutions that will, I say it advisedly, secure the immediate construction of this important link of railway communication, completing and implementing the promise that was held out to Ontario, that the Ontario lines of railway should be connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway as the Quebec lines of railway were."

Thus, you will see that the statement of the Minister in 1882, and his statement in 1883, was that the policy of the Government—which, in that respect, agreed with the policy of the late Government, which policy he was implementing, and which he thought just—was that there should be a subsidized extension by the Canada Central Railway to connect with the Quebec system, and a subsidized extension by a line to be subsidized from Callander to Gravenhurst, to connect with the Ontario system, and that justice to Ontario required that the facilities for connection with Quebec, which had been given by the extension of the Canada Central, should be balanced by facilities to be given by the construction of the Gravenhurst and Callander line, in the Province of Ontario. The Province of Ontario itself had at one time proposed a subsidy of no less than $8,000 a mile for this railway. At that time, no one in the House that I know of pretended that anything more should be done; certainly that was not the view of the Government. The view of the Government was, that the governmental assistance to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the original view having been Nipissing, the original extension having been, as I have just described, by the Canada Central to Pembroke, for the benefit of Quebec, should be implemented by what the hon. gentleman conceived was simply the completion of the pledge, and an arrangement for doing even-handed justice by assistance towards the construction of another link from Gravenhurst to Callander for the benefit of Ontario. The hon. gentlemen has laid upon the Table, in compliance with the demand that all the papers on this subject should be brought down—and I asked him whether this was the only one, and he said, yes—a request from the Local Government of Quebec, dated the 13th February, for assistance in connection with the Quebec lines; and this, therefore, is the first proposal on the subject from the Province, of which we are informed and, as I have said, no member of the Government, during all these years, made any such proposal up to this time. Now, Quebec is not the only Province that has exhausted her resources in building railways. The hon. gentleman, himself, stated that last year and the year before, and notably last year, when he told us that the Provinces had so depleted their resources that they were unable to continue in the course of giving aid to the building of railways, and that he himself had to undertake the task, in consequence of the deficiency in the provincial resources. I do not intend to enter into any great detail, but I wish to give this House a statement of the general results, as far as I have been able to gather them, of the operations of the different Provinces in this connection; and in doing so, I omit cancelled grants, lapsed grants, grants which appear upon paper, but which, for one reason or the other, have not actually become operative. Now, as I understand it, what were called the Government roads in the Province of Quebec, which comprised more than the lines now proposed to receive the attention of Parliament, because they comprised certain branches of a very considerable mileage—the Government roads, I say—including certain valuable lands, city lands, terminal lands and lands of that description, which the Government parted with for the Company, and including as cash, also, certain land arrangements which were made by some of the city municipalities in connection with the adjustment of the bonuses—cost, including these lands and including such sums as are yet payable, for I believe some are yet payable, about $14,700,000; and speaking with a very rugged approximation, for I am sorry I have not been able to get figures which would enable me to do more, I deduct for the branches about $1,500,000 from that cost. That would leave the cost, if I am correct in that deduction, of the main line, about $13,200,000, and on this cost there has been received and is receivable in municipal grants of land and money, paid and payable, about $1,400,000. A much larger sum appears in the Blue Books, a sum of $1,500,000 larger, but as far as I can gather, that sum is no longer exigible, and I have dealt only with the grants not lapsed, such as the grants to the County of Ottawa and other places, which have lapsed and are cancelled—deducting the municipal grant already paid and payable, $1,400,000, this would leave, paid and payable by the Government, in land and money, for the main line, inclusive of the branches, about $11,800,000. There has been received and is receivable, from the sale of the railway, $7,600,000, which would leave a balance of $4,200,000, as the present contribution of the Government to the line between Ottawa and Quebec. If you assume for a moment that the proposed relief is, as some people suggest it should be, as some people say it was to be, practically equivalent to $12,000 per mile over the main line, you reach a figure of $3,360,000. If you withdraw from that this $6,000 a mile, which is suspended, at any rate for the present, you find, of course, a lesser figure; but you will perceive that if the net expenditure on the main line of Quebec is reduced to $4,200,000, the proposed subvention, from either point of view, reduces to a comparatively light sum the remaining subvention to the Government of Quebec towards the construction of this line between Ottawa and Quebec itself. That is not the only thing to be considered, because it is true that the Province of Quebec, whether through its Provincial Government or its municipalities, has expended other considerable sums on other railways; and for the purpose which I have in hand it is necessary to take into account those expenditures. I have to state that the net expenditure by the Government, less the proceeds of the sale, on the main line from Quebec to Ottawa, would be, according to my calculation, $4,200,000; payment on the branches, $1,500,000; Government subsidies to other railways, in cash paid and promised, $4,160,000; municipal aid, paid and payable, excluding cancelled grants on account of Government railways, $1,400,000; municipal aid to other railways, excluding cancelled grants, $1,500,000; making a total of $12,760,000 of provincial expenditure,

governmental and municipal, paid and payable on railway construction in the Province since Confederation, after crediting the amount with the proceeds of the sale of the Government railway. To this is to be added an indefinite amount as representing possible grants of a very large acreage of land, which latterly has been the form in which the Quebec Government has proposed to subsidize the undertakings. The total acreage offered to various companies is between five and six million acres; but it is impossible to estimate either the value of that land to the Province—because I hold that the value of the land to the Province is a very different thing to what its value may be to the railway company—or the number of acres which will be actually excluded by reason of enterprises towards which, with perhaps somewhat too lavish a hand, it has been expended; therefore, I am unable to do more than in point out that to the gross sum of $12,760,000, as representing all the expenditure, governmental and municipal, after giving credit for the cost of the railways, is to be added a certain number of acres of land. Now, in the Province of Ontario, in accordance with her system of Local Government which has developed to a much greater extent than in any of the other Provinces, minuter systems of Local Governments, by means of municipal institutions, municipal taxation, and municipal expenditure, the Local Government has provided more largely for railways through municipalities than that of any of the other Provinces. And there was a reason why, irrespective of that greater development of the municipal system in Ontario, there should be such a large expenditure through municipalities, which reason is to be found in the distribution of a very considerable proportion of the surplus revenues of that Province to the municipalities, on condition that they were to be expended on useful public works, a very large proportion of which was, in fact, expended on railways, through the medium of the municipalities. The general results in the Province of Ontario are as follows: Government aid, paid and promised, $6,520,000; to this is to be added the settlement of the claim of the Canada Central for a large specific grant of lands in the Province of Ontario, made by the Legislature before Confederation, but not provided for in the adjustment of the debt, and earned after Confederation, and in respect of which the courts held that there was a legal claim against, not the Province, but the lands of the Province, for an indefinite amount. That was settled for $550,000, in respect of railway construction which took place after Confederation. This makes a total of $7,070,000 as the governmental expenditure made and to be made. To this is to be added, of municipal aid—I am sorry I have not been able to get all the grants, but the grants I have obtained information of are about $8,000,000, making a payment in all of over $15,000,000 by the Province, irrespective of a very large amount of the old municipal loan fund debt, which was an asset of the Province of Ontario, and which was remitted to the municipalities and had been expended in earlier railway construction. That I do not take into account at all, as my effort has been to ascertain what has been expended in the Province on railways since Confederation. One other observation is fit to be made, with reference to the expenditure of over $15,000,000, to which I have just alluded, in Ontario, and it is this: that no less a sum than $3,200,000 of that expenditure has been made on lines which have been declared to be now, practically, parts of the Canadian Pacific Railway—the Canada Central, an expenditure of $850,000; the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, which it is said is to be the main artery to the Canadian Pacific for a considerable time to come and which has been leased under arrangements, to which Parliament has given its sanction, by the Canadian Pacific Railway as part of the Ontario and Quebec—$1,450,000; the Credit Valley, which forms a link in the line of through communication, which Parliament has sanctioned the acquisition of by the Canadian Pacific Railway, $1,900,000. So that, as I have said, $3,200,000 of provincial and municipal money has been expended in the Province of Ontario for enterprises now practically part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and deemed to be of very great importance for the proper working and complete realization of the benefits to be derived from that enterprise; and under the demands made upon municipalities in respect to these liberal railway grants, very considerable difficulties have arisen, and very great burdens have beem imposed upon many thriving municipalities. Well, Sir, as regards Nova Scotia, the account requires a brief statement. I do not take into account, as I have said, railway obligations which had been contracted before Confederation, and which were in effect provided for by the excess allowed in repect of the debt of the Province upon it entering Confederation, subsequently increased in 1869 by the Readjustment Act; nor do I take into account the expenditure which was made on railways after Confederation, in so far as the balance of that excess of debt provided funds for them. It may be disputed, I dare say it will be disputed, but it seems to me a reasonable gro und, for the reason, first of all, that we have nothing to do with the obligations which were contracted before Confederation that were to be met out of funds which were provided by the financial adjustment before Confederation. Consequently, in so far as the subsequent expenditures were made out of the excess of capital upon which the Province was entitled to draw, it may be said that those provincial debts may be placed upon one proportionate level with reference to public works executed, or to be executed, and that those Provinces which had not executed public works up to the same level of indebtedness as the other Provinces, may not fairly ask to have that taken into account which was required to bring them up to the same level, and the funds for which were provided by the financial adjustment on which they entered Confederation. The result of that, however, is that a sum of $990,000—of which about $830,000, I think, was in respect of railways contracted for before Confederation—is omitted from the nominal expenditure since Confederation, and which leaves expended in Nova Scotia, by the Government, $2,267,000, and by the municipalities, $445,000, or a total of $2,712,000, besides 500,000 acres of Crown lands. Now, taking New Brunswick and regarding the account in the same way,—the Province of New Brunswick had not gone so largely into railway construction before Confederation, and it had a very large amount, consequently, to its credit upon capital account, an account in respect of which it was entitled to incur debt. The omitted items, comprising partly that amount and an amount about one-third of the works constructed before Confederation, amount to no less than $1,830,000; and they leave for Government expenditure, in excess of the allotted debt for railways, agreed upon after Confederation, $1,580,000, and in municipal expenditure, $296,000, or $1,876,000 altogether, besides no less an amount than 1,660,000 acres of Crown lands; and of those, I believe a portion was permitted to be selected by the companies which were entitled to them, and were specially valuable. I am unable to add the value of those lands in any of those cases. But if you add such a value as I would be disposed to put on them, not as the value to the companies or their value now, but as the value to the Province at the time of the grant, I would suppose that the general result would be, so far as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario are concerned, that their railway expenditure, provincial and municipal, since Confederation, is not very far removed from, but on the contrary, closely approximate to those bases upon which we have ordinarily calculated the financial arrangements—I refer to the population basis; and that in Quebec the expenditure is somewhat in excess of that basis, although not very materially—somewhat however in excess of it. Speaking roughly, it is very extra-

ordinary how closely in the whole of the four Provinces the railway expenditure aproximates the basis of population. In the Province of Manitoba over $900,000, I believe, has been given municipally to various railways, either to the Canadian Pacific Railway or to railways which have had more or less connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have shown you an expenditure in the five Provinces of over $30,000,000, and there is this observation to be made with respect to that expenditure: that the railways upon which it has been made are, many of them, aye the most of them, aye almost all of them, of infinitely greater importance, railways which can infinitely more properly be called railways of great advantage to Canada within the meaning of our Constitution, than many of those lines which the hon. gentleman has sought to bring within our jurisdiction and many of those proposed railways for which he is now advocating a Federal subvention. I do not intend to go over the list, but this fact is notorious. Let each member consider the lines in his own Province which have been built since Confederation, and he will see, with the very greatest facility, that the observation I have made is just and correct, namely, that those lines which have been constructed are of infinitely more importance, of infinitely greater consequence and infinitely more national in their character than many of the lines now proposed to be aided, and indeed more important than any line which can be projected. They are the main lines that were required at that time. As I have pointed out, there were two different areas of jurisdiction and action upon which railway legislation and railway subvention proceeded, up to the comparatively recent time at which the new departure has been projected. The Federal which embraced the construction of the great interprovincial railways, the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railways, and the Local which embraced the construction of all other lines, no matter of how high consequence each was within its own Province. But there can be no doubt that there has been, within the last two or three years a change in the situation, and that change, so far as we are concerned, has been, up to this Session, in two directions. The first, that which I have discussed, namely, the adoption of the principle that we should grant Federal aid to what I call local or provincial railways. The second, that to which I have not heretofore particularly alluded, the proposition for declaring by one fell swoop, almost all—not quite all—the provincial railways, which had been constructed before Confederation and which were constructed with so much pain and effort upon the responsibility, entirely so far as legislation was concerned, of the various Governments—to be railways under Federal jurisdiction, on the plea that they are roads of great advantage to Canada. They are adopting a very great change in policy; each step, in my opinion, having a tendency against the spirit of our Constitution. Now, a third proposal is made, namely, that there should be payment to a Province in respect of past expenditure on certain of its provincial railways. I maintain that that is a principle now brought forward for the first time, and which, if it is to be applied at all, must have an application more extensive than that proposed to be given to it. I maintain it is not just to apply that principle to one Province and not to the other Provinces. I maintain that the claims and rights of the other Provinces ought to be recognized when this new policy is inaugurated. We know what the truth is in this matter. We know perfectly well, it is quite notorious to us, that the finances of the Province of Quebec are in a distressed condition. The statement has been made by both parties in the Province, by successive First Ministers and successive Treasurers, and it is evidenced in the very memorial which is upon the Table, as it has been evidenced by prior memorials, that further assistance is needed in order to establish equilibrium in the finances

Mr. BLAKE.

of that Province. I observe the present Treasurer, Mr. Robertson, who has a very extended acquaintance with Quebec finances, having filled that office in former years, and having lately returned to it, declared—I quote from a speech of Mr. Mercier in the Local Legislature on 31st March, which gives these extracts from Mr. Robertson's speech, delivered at Sherbrooke on 14th February—that:

"For the year ended on 30th June last, 1883, there was to the account of the revenue and expenditure of the Province a deficit of about $300,000."

I observe that that hon. gentleman further stated, calculating the state of things for the current year, and as I understand it, for the future:

"If these credits are not exceeded, which may well happen, and that the revenue of the year as estimated is all collected, there will be this year a dificit of about $350,000. That is to say, that the deficit will be $350,000 if the credits are not exceeded and all the receipts as estimated are collected. * * * Thus we can conclude that we will have an annual deficit of from $300,000 to $400,000 in the ordinary affairs of the Province—in other words, in the ordinary revenues, without taking an account of loans and extraordinary outlay for railways and permanent works."

That is the statement made by Mr. Robertson to his constituents in a speech delivered by him at Sherbrooke on the occasion of his election by acclamation. It is not, of course, necessary to enquire in any detail how those results, which all lovers of Confederation must deeply regret, have occurred. There can be no doubt that the railway expenditure of the Province of Quebec has had much to do with it. The figures of the Public Accounts, to which I have referred, indicate that. Although I think the statement of the Minister of Railways, which did not take into account the municipal expenditure, which did not take into account the amount received and receivable for the sale of the railway, and which spoke of $14,000,000 as the governmental expenditure, was not calculated to lead to an exactly accurate impression, without considerable modification, of the extent to which that is a charge. But still, with all allowances, placing it on the bases on which I have endeavoured to place it, there is no doubt that railway expenditure has had much to do with that difficulty, particularly as we are to remember that anterior to the sale of the railway, they were producing nothing to pay interest, and there was a large accumulation on that account. I do not myself attribute the condition of the Province of Quebec entirely to that. I attribute the condition, as I attribute the condition more or less of all the Provinces, in part, to our vicious system of subsidies, to which I have referred. I have pointed out—it is human nature—lightly come is lightly spent, and the truest spur of economy is the knowledge on the part of the taxpayer that he is paying any governmental expenditure, and the knowledge on the part of Governments and members, that the taxpayer will hold them to account for that expenditure; and I believe our system which, instead of supplying the Local Governments with certain sources of revenue, which they might lessen or increase at their pleasure, providing as it does these subsidies, which are to a considerable extent regarded as a clear gain, has been, in the case of Quebec and other Provinces, a reason why the expenditure has risen faster than it otherwise would. There also has been, to a considerable extent, an extravagant expenditure. That will not be questioned, because we find now that the policy of the late administration, that of Mr. Mousseau, was one of retrenchment, and that he announced officially on several occasions, that by retrenchment, by abolishing useless offices, by diminishing extravagant salaries, by economizing in expenditures in other ways, he had found that he would be able to promise, and that he would succeed in saving a large sum of money. Therefore, something is to be blamed to that account. And it may be also that more liberal resort to local sources of taxation, to the principal of municipal taxation, would have been advisable in the condition of the Province of Quebec. And though that may be the case, it is clear that the Province of Quebec at present, on the state-

ment of its provincial officers, a statement made with authority, vouched upon the statement of the provincial politicians on both sides, is in a condition which demands the serious consideration of the Confederation. But she is not alone in that condition. You will find statements made from the Province of Nova Scotia, for example, and those who have endeavoured to analyze, I know with difficuly, with very great aptitude to err for want of information, those who have attempted to analyze the expenditures of that Province will, I think, find that there has not been a very great deal to complain of in the way of extravagance. At least that was the result of such cursory investigation as from time to time I have been able to make into the expenditures of that Province, and I am not singling out any Government from another—there has been alternation of Governments—I do not find that there has been much extravagance, or that the expenditures have been in excess, to a large amount, if at all, of the demands of that Province. We know, however, that its resources are cramped, that it is more or less in a state of difficulty and distress locally. So with reference to New Brunswick, which was better off. It also turns out to have been exhausting its revenue; it has been drawing from the Finance Minister in advance of its subsidy, until, I believe, somewhere about a year or perhaps more of the subsidy, turns out to have been overdrawn in advance, and the proposal is now made, I understand, to create a funded debt in order to meet the deficit on current revenue in that Province. And in the Province of Ontario, there can be no doubt whatever, that affairs there are assuming such a shape that notwithstanding a very large amount of municipal taxation which exists in that Province, the Government, as the hon. Minister of Railways has said, has been obliged entirely to give up any effort to assist further in railway construction and the expenditures and receipts have got to that point that if the expenditure is to be progressive that Province also will be in a condition in which it will be pinched. That is my opinion of the condition of that Province. Now, I do not allude to the Province of Manitoba, because we know that it is in an exceptional and transitory condition. It is generally recognized that the condition of that Province is such that the proposals which the hon. gentleman made a couple or three years ago, cannot be held to be adequate, and we must review its situation from time to time, according to its progress. Nor shall I allude specifically to the Provinces of British Columbia or Prince Edward Island, inasmuch as I am not able to point out to the House any questions of railway expenditure, with reference to those Provinces, but I will say, as to them, that their situation requires to be considered. Now, Sir, I think that the condition of the Province of Quebec, as I have pointed out, has demanded for sometime past, and is now demanding, the attention of this Parliament; and for my part, I have always been prepared to deal fairly by that or any other of the Provinces, but on condition of equal and fair justice to all. And I do not suppose my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec will ask more, or those sitting on the other side, though they might view my proposition differently from what I view it, I do not think they will dissent from the spirit in which I now address myself to them, namely, that it is fair and reasonable, under these circumstances, when a new policy of this kind is being proposed, to consider what its real basis is, to consider what the real condition of the other Provinces is, relatively to that basis and otherwise, and to see whether what is being proposed as it stands, and without effecting proper remedies for the application generally of the new principle you propose, can be called just. I say, Sir, that for my part I should desire, and it is one of the things which is most important for us to consider, next to the constitutional question—I should desire that we should address ourselves very early and very earnestly to the solution of the question, by the adoption of some plan whereby once for all the question of the Provincial subsidies should be placed on a permanent and lasting basis. I believe it to be destructive of the independence and automony of the Provinces that they should be looking to Ottawa for favours, that they should be dependent on the Central Government for the means of carrying on their affairs. I believe it to be destructive to Confederation itself, that a system should continue under which it might be said: O, we will go on, we will expend more, we will go into debt, and when we get to a pass that we cannot carry on any longer, the Ottawa Parliament must relieve us. Any sentiment of that kind, any feeling of that kind, any notion on the part of provincial Ministers or politicians, or the citizens or electors of the Provinces, of that kind, must be destructive, in the first place of good economical Government in the Provinces, and, in the second place in its influence, moral and financial, on the Confederatio,n—destructive, ultimately, of the Confederation itself Therefore, I think it is a pressing and incumbent duty upon us to endeavour, if we can, to devise a plan which will set these matters permanently upon a basis different from that upon which they now unhappily stand. But, Sir, we are dealing at present with only one aspect of this subject—with the question of the difficulties which have been created, not in Quebec only, but in Quebec and elsewhere, by an expenditure on railway construction beyond the resources of the different Provinces; and, as it is proposed to deal with that question, I say that it ought to be dealt with on a general principle applicable to them all; and I maintain that the proposal of the hon. gentleman, isolated and exceptional as it stands, is not just. If just, why was it not proposed in this House years ago? If just, why does it come now, and in the way it comes? We know now quite well how it comes. The hon. Minister of Railways, when bringing down the railway policy of the Government, which touched this very subject, in 1882, said that in order to balance things and to do justice to Ontario, having regard to what had been done for Quebec in the mattter of the Canada Central, he was going to assist the Gravenhurst and Callander line. In 1883 he argued in just the same way. Did he then think that justice to Quebec required him to give her, without considering the railway expenditure of the other Provinces at all, a railway subsidy for her railway expenditure? If he thought so, why did he not say so? Instead of justice to Ontario requiring that a subsidy should be given to the line from Gravenhurst to Callander, justice to Quebec required an expenditure on the line from Ottawa to Quebec. Justice this Session has been justice last Session, has been justice for years past. But it is only now that the Government have found out that this proposition, as it stands, is defensible: and how do they find it? We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway loan measure was brought down early this Session; we know what was the attitude towards that measure of the hon. gentleman's supporters, or the bulk of them, from the Province of Quebec. We know that they pointed out what they thought the interest of their Province required. We know, because we have had a statement in the various Ministerial papers in the Province of Quebec, that the First Minister declined to assent to their proposal. We know that there was a hitch and a difficulty. We know that there was a settlement of that difficulty. We know that assurances were given by the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Secretary of State to their supporters. We know that there was subsequently an agreement with the First Minister, who was understood to ratify those assurances, and the loan passed. We know that the debate upon that question was not conducted in a full House. We know that the bulk of our hon. friends from the Province of Quebec did not do us the honour of attending when we were endeavouring to point out what the evils of the Government measure were. We know that there was a parliament of their own in Room No. 8, in constant Session, during the progress of that exciting debate; and we

know that into that Committee Room No. 8, after some difficulty and some demur and a good deal of pressure—constitutional pressure—I believe that is the hon. gentleman's phrase—the First Minister himself *in propria persona* was drawn, and there announced—not to representatives of the people of Canada in Parliament, with the reporters to hear it—there announced what the policy of the Government would be. And now the Government say: Now light has dawned upon us, and we perceive suddenly, what for these many years we have been wholly blind to, what we never saw before, that justice to Quebec requires this particular and exceptional treatment which is involved in these Resolutions. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am a little suspicious of this justice, which was so long delayed, so long denied, and which is at length granted under the peculiar circumstances which attends the grant of it on this occasion. I am inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman did not think, at the commencement of this Session that this was justice, else he would have proposed it. I am inclined to think that at former Sessions the Government did not think it was justice, or they would have proposed it; and I am inclined to think that they have brought it down now under the constitutional pressure to which the hon. gentleman referred on a former occasion—not because they thought it just, but because they thought they must. It was yielded, Sir, at the point of the bayonet. Now, I do not want this distress of the Province of Quebec to continue and, as I say, I believe it is disorganizing, not only to the Province of Quebec, but to the whole Confederation, that the present condition of things should continue. I have been amused to watch the various views taken on this subject, and the various suggestions made by hon. gentlemen on both sides, on this question. I was amused to read yesterday, in *Le Canadien*, a slight forecast of the future. It is from Ottawa, dated the 9th of April:

"Toutes sortes de rumeurs circulent. On assure que des amendements aux résolutions ministérielles seront proposés par des députés conservateurs dans le but de protester contre l'adoption de la ligne du Sud. Je n'en crois rien; non pas parceque les députés ne comprennent pas l'énorme faute qu'ils vont commettre, mais parce qu'ils sont indécis, ci-convenus, et que chacun redoute de prendre la direction d'un mouvement de cette importance pendant que les ministres du Bas-Canada gardent leurs portefeuilles.

"Pour tâcher d'effrayer nos amis, certains conlissiers répètent que les *tories* du Haut-Canada menaçant de voter contre les résolutions en haine de notre province. Ces gens-là nous détestent, c'est sûr; mais voter contre nous c'est autre chose, car nous sommes leur seule planche de salut. Cette rumeur me parait un tour de passe-passe de Sir John."

Well, just consider a little the details; just consider how they hang together with the general proposition of the Ministry to deal exceptionally with the Province in this direction. The present course is taken because this railway from Montreal to Quebec is considered a part of the national road, of the Pacific road, and for that reason $12,000 a mile are given in recoupment of the expenditure between Ottawa and Montreal, and $6,000 a mile are given in recoupment of the expenditure between Montreal and Quebec. Well, why $6,000 a mile only? Because everybody knows it is not a part of the national highway; everybody knows that the Quebec Government and people sold it away, so that it may not be, unless it be acquired at a great price now, a part of the national highway, because everybody knows it does not fill the character in respect to which especially it is proposed the Province of Quebec is to receive this grant. On the other hand, you find therefore that the scheme cannot properly be pressed between these narrow lines. I admit the railway is a very important railway, no matter who owns it, or whether it is part of the national highway or not. I consider it one of the most important that could be constructed in the Province of Quebec, and I do earnestly hope, whatever may be the fate of these resolutions, it may be found possible to utilize that railway instead of constructing another, for the purpose of obtaining communication between the west and Quebec by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the $6,000 a mile which is devoted now for the construction of another railway, if necessary, may be placed in the position in which it will do most good, viz., placed against the indebtedness of Quebec. But there are difficulties about that. Once the general principle is agreed on, the details have to be settled and then the forces, up to that time tolerably united, are divided, and it is said the Ministerial forces themselves exhibited symptoms of disorganization. In this, as in the other particulars of this scheme, we find proposals to take leaps in the dark; we are to leave this thing to be settled in some shape or other, and left as it is, I dare say it will be a good while before arrangements will be made for this latter $6,000. I have pointed out the railway expenditure of the Provinces which have expended money on railways, and have shown you it bears approximate relation to the population and resources of the various Provinces. I have shown you that other Provinces stood in the same position as Quebec, with reference to this railway expenditure; I have shown you, for example, that the Province of Ontario has, through her municipalities, expended $3,200,000 on railways which are now part of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and I say that in dealing with these lines, dealing with the question of railway expenditure, proposing to recoup Provinces in respect of railway expenditure, the proper, just and equitable mode of dealing with the case is, to place all the Provinces on the same relative footing—to do justice not to one but to all. I have no desire to interfere with the aid it may be necessary to give, in the interests of Confederation at large, to place on a somewhat better footing the finances of Quebec; but whether the hon. gentlemen of that Province agree with me or not, I am prepared to advocate in this House, while I yield what I think just, the claims of justice to all, and I believe that justice to all is not done by these Resolutions. I believe that justice to all requires a wider application and a sounder basis for the application of the principle which the hon. gentleman proposes to incorporate in our legislation, and I move the following amendment thereto: that the following words be added to the said motion:

"But this House feels bound to express the opinion that Canada, when (as proposed by the said Resolution) recouping of the Provinces for part of the past local expenditure on railways, should have regard to the past local expenditure in other Provinces on railways, almost all of which have been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada; and this House regrets that the Government, while proposing a measure of relief to one Province, has not taken steps with a view to a fair and proportionate measure of relief, in respect of local expenditure, in the other Provinces"

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As I do not propose to speak the language of the majority of this House, I must ask hon. members, while exercising my right to address the House in French, to bear with me in patience during the few moments in which I will occupy the attention of the House, and if I speak in the French tongue it is not to have our representation by population in the columns of the *Hansard*, but to be able to expedite business, by making my remarks in my own tongue, and not in a language with which I am not sufficiently conversant. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I will not undertake to answer all the questions that have been raised in this debate by the hon. leader of the Opposition. According to his custom, he has included in the discussion of the subject on which we are engaged the whole range of questions which it comprises, and has dealt with them in a manner no less lucid than comprehensive. I will leave to those of my colleagues to whom that task belongs to reply to the charge of undue pressure exercised by the Government, according to the hon. member for West Durham, on the representatives of the Province of Quebec. I would, nevertheless, inform my hon. friend that he has revealed only one aspect of that period so full of anxiety, and I will try and show him what the other is. If we believe the hon.

member "the Government awaited with anxiety, when the great Pacific question came before the House, the attitude which a portion of the members would assume regarding it. Every one was asking what would happen; Parliament was not sitting with its ordinary number of members, and the *denouement* was anxiously expected. After interviews between the Ministers of the Quebec Government and the members of that Province—after interviews between the heads of the Canadian Government and the representatives of the Province of Quebec—the result was announced. Faces brightened up, peace was restored to the camp, and the Pacific Bill was voted." My hon friend should have said that it was on the side of the Opposition that the faces of members betrayed most anxiety. The smallest rumours that escaped through closed doors were eagerly caught up, and whatever secrets were thus exposed were immediately transmitted by telegraph, corrected and enlarged, to the great organ of the Liberal party in Ontario. On one occasion that journal announced that the members of the Province of Quebec had thrown themselves into the open arms of the leader of the Opposition who, in return, promised them an era of prosperity before unheard of in that Province. But the *denouement* soon destroyed that hope; the loan was voted and the faces of the Opposition fell accordingly. It is a wonder the *Globe* did not come out in mourning the next day, as if for the loss of a political friend. Certainly its cherished dream had faded away into thin air; for the fact is that all those conjectures were false. The Conservative party had remained faithful and united as in the past. The leader of the Opposition may be assured that the Quebec Conservatives were unanimous in following the Government on that great question. It is true that a certain number of members had asked that all the questions connected with the Pacific should be settled at the same time, and it was quite *legitimate for them to enquire if the Government* had the intention, not to purchase their votes, but to make good a claim which had been made constitutionally by the Quebec Cabinet and which had already been for several days before the Privy Council. What! Mr. Speaker, will the hon. chief of the Opposition deny that the Quebec members had a right to ask just treatment for the Province that they represent! Do such rights belong only to the other Provinces? Did not British Columbia submit to the Government the questions in which it was concerned, and who hesitated to acknowledge its right to ask if the Government had given them due attention, and had come to a decision regarding them? Did not the *Globe* cry out indignantly because the grievances of Manitoba had not been definitely redressed when the hon. Premier of that Province left Ottawa for Winnipeg? What reason is there why the same consideration should not be shown to the Province of Quebec? That Province had laid its claim before the Dominion authorities. The Federal Government had concluded not only to give it attention, but to take it into favourable consideration, and that is the business which occupied the attention of the Quebec members. No, Mr. Speaker; the hon. member for West Durham has no reason to reproach either the members of our Province or the Government for their action in the circumstances. The hon. member, as I have just said, looked at the question from every point of view. I will only answer him on one point which has been raised in this debate, and that is, in my eyes, a most essential one. It is embodied in the motion which the hon. member has just placed in your hands. It is a captious motion, directed evidently against the Province of Quebec, and all the more dangerous as it asks the members of the other Provinces to refuse Quebec what is legitimately its due, by giving the representatives of the other parts of the Dominion to understand that what the hon. member calls a great favour on the part of the Federal Government should be shared with all the Provinces. This motion is most insidious, as while seeming to be based on a principle of equity for all the Provinces, it is really directed against the Province of Quebec, whose claim is qualified as extravagant and the result of maladministration. This motion, Mr. Speaker, will not be more successful than those which the hon. member has already presented, and to which the House has done justice. The leader of the Opposition said that in all the Provinces there had been an excess of zeal in the construction of railroads, and that several Provincial Governments had, in their desire for progress, exposed the financial means at their disposal. Mr. Speaker, I would not on this occasion have broken the silence which I maintained since I have been a member of the House, that is, during the almost two years that I have been one of Her Majesty's advisers in the Privy Council of Canada. In keeping a silence, which is not at all my wont, I must have disappointed the expectations of my friends and no less the curiosity of my opponents. More than one person must have said: What has become of that former vivacity, that asperity in debate which provoked combat rather than remain at rest? Others may have thought it the result of calculation. No one that I know of is likely to have attributed it to fear, and with that conclusion I am satisfied. I am the youngest member of the Council, and I think it my duty to practice here what I preach elsewhere—subordination. I have kept silence, which is useful at times, but I must say, it is also tiresome. To-day, if I think it right to engage in this discussion, it is because the question that occupies us is one that interests the Province whose affairs I administered as head of the Cabinet for more than two years. This question not only interests the Province from which I come, and which I more especially represent in the Privy Council, but it also concerns not a little the administration of which I was the head. I would gladly set aside my own personality in the observations which I have to make. But I cannot do so. My name and my administration are constantly coming up in the discussion of this question The hon. member for West Durham has asked for the reason of the Quebec claim. He said the source of it seemed to him to be the extravagance of the Government that had the direction of this Province; and if he has not brought forward all the objections that are made in the press, perhaps some of his friends may do so. I think it my duty to reply to the attacks that have been made and which have not only stirred up, but, it may be, deceived public opinion. During the last eighteen months there is no charge that could be brought against an Administration that has not been preferred against that of which I was the head, especially in relation to that question of railways which is now before us. In the press I have been subjected to all kinds of ill treatment, not only by my natural enemies, who are logically impelled by their position to make war against those who differ from them, but even in the circles where I had reason to expect to find friends. The Province of Quebec has a right to the subsidy which the Government gives it, because it has constructed, at a great expense, a line of railway which, sooner or later, must be the continuation of the Pacific to the ocean. But the expenses thus incurred are not the only causes of the deficit in the Quebec Budget; other causes which I will enumerate have also contributed to that result. I will even go further, and say that the Province of Quebec has more right to the consideration, to the spirit of justice, of the members of the other Provinces, than any other portion of the Dominion. Before entering on this subject, Mr. Speaker, let me be permitted to make a protest against on of the accusations made by the member for West Durham—an accusation which has been for some time made a pretext for attacks on the Government of Canada—the accusation of centralizing, not only all the forces, but even all the powers of the members of the Confederation, by absorbing rights that justly belong to the Provinces. I believe it my duty to protest against the charge. It has been said that the leader of the Govern-

ment, the leader of the Conservative party, entertained ideas of centralization—was inclined, in fact, towards legislative union, and yet he protested eloquently against these very tendencies himself not very long since. "How could I," said he, "almost at the close of my political career, after having created the Confederation as the solution of political agitations so lively and so dangerous to the whole nation, destroy with my own hands the fabric erected with the toil of so many years?" How, we may well repeat, could that old leader, held in veneration by all, destroy the glorious work which he accomplished in and for the country? How could he sacrific his reputation and the right which he has won to the gratitude of future generations destined to see in him the founder of a great nation on this continent? How could he wilfully prove recreant to the mission which he undertook, and so well discharged, by demolishing his own edifice? No, Mr. Speaker. And the best reply to such a charge is found in the generous, liberal and paternal measure which is just now before the House, and which, by aiding the Provinces in their material development, furnishes new guarantees for their autonomy. If he had been disposed to force the Provinces to part with some of their political rights in exchange for material advantages, the moment could not have been better chosen. He had only to refuse them what they asked and which he now so generously grants them. The hon. member for Durham said that it was, perhaps, time to think of revising the Constitution, so as to obtain for the different Provinces a political compromise by the creation of conditions more advantageous. I think, Mr. Speaker, that instead of accepting that proposal, it is the duty of each of us to repudiate it as an innovation, dangerous and menacing to the rights of the Provinces. On any occasion that presented itself, I believe that the Ministry was found repudiating any centralizing tendency. For my own part, I have been accused of being too federalist or anti-centralizing. I have not been too much; I have merely been sufficiently so. I am one of those who think that the autonomy of each Province is one of the most solid foundations of the Confederation. When I was Premier of Quebec, I was charged, strange to say, with a disposition to yield to the Federal power what ought to belong to the Provinces, and since I have been in the Dominion Cabinet I have somehow had the name, in certain quarters, of being too devoted to Provincial institutions, and not being in harmony with my colleagues on the question of Federal authority. Well, Mr. Speaker, when I had the direction of affairs in Quebec, I was opposed to all doctrines that jeopardized the peace among the different groups that constitute our Confederation. Now that I am a Privy Councillor, I consider it my duty to respect the interests of the Provinces, whose harmony with each other forms the firmest guarantee of vitality and fecundity in the central power. If, when I was at Quebec, I contemplated my duties as a citizen of Canada, having come to Ottawa I did not forget that the Federal compact was the art from which none could, without sacrilege, remove the sacred tables on which are inscribed the rights and liberties of the Provinces, made one by intelligent patriotism. That is my political programme, and I have never had any other, nor shall I complain if they accuse me of practising it. That sentiment of Provincial autonomy is one which calls for distrust, in so far as being natural and legitmate, it may easily lead us to an exaggeration which might have deplorable consequences. And yet we must not repudiate it; far from it. But to avoid falling into exaggeration, it behooves every member of this House, from whatever part of the Dominion he may come, to study the different needs of each of the Provinces, and always to bear in mind that the other Provinces have as much right as his own to the protection of the central power. The Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, is right in giving to each Province of the Dominion as much latitude as possible in the exercise of its rights, and whenever the assembled members have been asked to favour, by energetic action, the general interests of the country, the co-operation of all the Provinces has never been wanting. The loan to the Pacific, of which the hon. member for West Durham has spoken, is the most speaking evidence of the fact. It was a bold measure on the part of the Government. The Ministers never said to the members that the sacrifices asked were not most important, as touching the resources of the Dominion. Neither the leader of the Government nor the proposer of the Bill denied but it was one of those pressing necessities that called for an appeal to the generosity of all the Provinces. And if that measure overcame all the obstacles which it encountered, it was because the Government could depend upon a party which is as intelligent as it is loyal. By the adoption of that measure, the Government wished to prove to our neighbours across the frontier that this country does not fear the financial machinations of Wall street brokers, and that when the Government of Canada makes an appeal to the intelligence and patriotism of the Provinces, it finds a faithful echo, whenever the object is to maintain the credit of the nation and the honour of the Government. The leader of the Government has been accused of endangering the existence of the nation by imposing upon it, by such legislation, a burden which it was unable to bear. He has been told that he was mistaken in his estimate of the resources of the country when he thought them capable of extinguishing so enormous a debt. But he was not mistaken, or if he was, it was on the right side of the account, on the side of hope, of confidence, of ideas of progress; and it is with such ideas, with such hope and confidence, that a people becomes great. I prefer that he who has the direction of a nation's destinies should err in the direction of its greatness, by showing an exaggerated sense of the national progress, to seeing a people cramped and held back by a policy of timidity and distrust. That policy fears no comparison with that of the Opposition. On the one hand, the aim is greatness, prosperity, national happiness, while on the other it is a mean peddling calculation and a belittling of the country's resources rather than a launching out on the broad path of progress. Nations grow great by confidence in the future. There are different expressions in the vocabulary of different nations for rendering the same idea. Thus, in France there is chauvinism, in England there is jingoism, while our neighbours have their spread-eagleism. In other words, what is meant is the national pride and confidence in their own civilizing mission of the British people; the optimism of the French, and the vaunting go-aheadism of the Yankee. Those are faults, it is true, but venial faults, for they have their source in a profound national sentiment. We must not forget that it is with that exaggeration of the national feeling, that it is by the confidence of nations in their own star, that they have become great in the world, while the system of blackening one's country has never led to anything but bankruptcy and ruin. It is a long time now since the claims of the Province of Quebec were first presented to the Federal Government, although the member for West Durham affects to regard the question as a new one. The demand, it is true, was not previously invested with that official character which it has to-day, but it has not the less occupied the attention both of the present Government and their predecessors. My hon. friend is strangely mistaken if he thinks the claim of the Province of Quebec only originated in the difficulties of the Government during the present Session. My first duty, when I took in hand the reins of power at Quebec, was to insist on the Federal Government granting compensation to Quebec for the sacrifices incurred by the construction of what was destined to be the most important link in the Pacific Railway. My hon. friends of the other side can hardly forget the defeat which they brought upon Sir George Cartier in 1872, in connection with the Pacific

terminus question. Sir George Cartier, at that time the colleague of the present Premier, openly declared, in the electoral campaign of that year, that the Pacific terminus was the harbour of Montreal. I did not forget those declarations, when on the 13th of May, 1880, I addressed an official memorial to the Federal Government, claiming its co-operation in the cost of constructing that road. It was not a refusal, but an encouragement that Quebec then received. Our demand was not secret, for the hon. Mr. Robertson, at that time Treasurer of the Province, said, in his Budget Speech of June 16th, 1880: "The Quebec Cabinet has made representations to the Federal Government with regard to our railroad; we have represented to the Federal Government that it had contributed $12,000 per mile to the construction of a part of the Canada Central Railroad, in Ontario, at the expense of our Province as well as of the others; that the line will form part of the Canadian Pacific; that the Intercolonial was built and other lines purchased in the Maritime Provinces for their special advantage, also at our common expense; that Manitoba, the great west, and British Columbia, must have the Canadian Pacific to open up their territories, and that it will be likewise built at the general expense; that other Provinces had benefited, and would still benefit by lines for which we had contributed; and, moreover, that for the lines built in this Province since 1867, and particularly for the North Shore, destined, as well as the Canada Central, to form part of the Canadian Pacific, we did not receive a single cent, although we had thus contributed to lines in the other Provinces. We have accordingly made those representations to the Federal Government. I insist that we have as much right to be aided at Ottawa for the cost of our railway as the Canada Central had. The building of that line may be advantageous and, no doubt, is so to the North Shore Railway, but this latter is of equal necessity, as it offers the shortest and most direct route from the west to the ports of St. John and Halifax, and has equal rights to a sudsidy from the Federal authorities. We therefore wish one of two things; either that the Dominion take over the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, or that we be paid a subsidy per mile equal to that paid to the Canada Central. Those questions are now under consideration at Ottawa, and we await a decision. My opinion, after careful deliberation, is that we are sure to succeed." And Mr. Robertson still further emphasized this demand in his speech of May 30th, 1881:

"I also said last year that the Quebec Government had memorialized that of Ottawa that justice be rendered us in the matter of the provincial railway. It cannot be doubted that the sister Province of Ontario received from the Federal Government, at the expense of the other Provinces, subsidies for the construction of railways which were not granted to Quebec. (Hear, hear.) In this respect we have not received justice from the Federal Government, and we are not disposed to leave the matter in its present unsatisfactory position. It may be recalled that the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, when he was Premier of the Dominion, replied to a deputation asking for the development of railways in Quebec the same subsidy that had been granted to Ontario, that our Province ought to receive and should receive, the desired aid."

And since then, the Federal Government must have perceived that the Province of Quebec had no intention of allowing its rights to be sacrificed. There had been recrimination. Some had gone so far as to say that the Province had no right to such an indemnity, because it had been too extravagant, because its Governments had shown themselves unworthy of such assistance. I will not reply to personal questions addressed to Administrations, but I will reply to those who say that the Province of Quebec has no right to that just claim. If Quebec's debt were due to maladministration, I would say that those reproaches were just, and that its claims of indemnity ought not to be satisfied. But the contrary is the truth. With less resources, Quebec has done more in the way of progress than any other Province; and, to-day, among the motives that should induce us to vote for the Resolutions, it is well to recall that Lower Canada has always shown broad views, and has never been animated by a sectional spirit. In 1840, with a population of 550,872 souls, and a surplus on hand of $189,306, it accepted the Union, on a footing of equality with Upper Canada, which had a population of 427,441 souls, and a debt of $5,925,779. If I give these figures, Mr. Speaker, it is from no desire to discredit the Province of Ontario, which has succeeded in gaining so enviable a position in the Confederation. It is simply to make good my argument that the Province of Quebec has a right to expect, especially from the Province of Ontario, the liberality, the spirit of justice and consideration which it deserves to have. The figures I have given, Mr. Speaker, I will allow myself to support by a citation, which perhaps, will be new to some members of this House. In 1840 Lord Sydenham wrote these lines:

"In the summer of 1839, Upper Canada was on the eve of bankruptcy. With an annual revenue of not more than £78,000, the interest on the debt amounted to £65,000, and the ordinary expenses of the Government amounted to £55,000, thus leaving an annual deficit of £42.000, while the absence of a seaport deprived it of the power of augmenting its revenues by the ordinary and less onerous means of imposing taxes."

In a letter, written in November, 1839, Lord Sydneham had said:

"The finances are still more dilapidated than is believed in England. The annual deficit is already £75,000, and exceeds the revenue All the public works are suspended. The emigration from the Province goes on rapidly and in great numbers The union offers the only means of settling the finances, inasm ch as it will determine England to aid Upper Canada to fill its empty treasury."

Such was the position in 1841, as described by the British Governor, whose name I have just mentioned. It may be said, perhaps, that it is an old story, to say that Upper Canada in 1841 was in a deplorable financial condition, while Lower Canada was advantageously situated. But these facts cannot be effaced from our history, and are not to be condemned to oblivion because they are to our advantage. Since the Union, it is the Province of Ontario that has the largest share in the sums expended for public works. Another matter to which it is well to draw attention, is that then, as to-day, almost all the funds—and they were considerable—that were expended for immigration, were given to Ontario, until within the last few years, and to the new Provinces more recently. The Province of Quebec has hardly had any share in those grants; and yet Quebec has never dreamed of making a private grievance out of that partiality. Less daring in business than the race beside which it lives, the French race has been impelled by its character in other directions of effort. It has somewhat neglected the material, but it has shown great judgment and political insight. Nor must we lose sight of the difficult conditions in which it was developed. At the conquest, the *noblesse*, all of them who could turn their property into money, and a considerable portion of the clergy, returned to France, so that only a handful of Canadians, without much resources and almost without education, remained in the country. This population had to educate itself in a conquered country, receiving no more from the mother country than the aliment of thought, and unable to receive this aliment from the new metropolis whose language it did not understand. Only one element of strength was left to the people, the few members of the clergy who remained in Canada. But those true shepherds of men were equal to the task. They gathered together the scattered fragments of the decimated community and by their own efforts made and kept them compact and united. Those who speak of the ignorance in which the clergy has kept the Lower Canadians do not know what they say, for it was the clergy who, by dint of onerous sacrifices, founded and maintained our great classical institutions. It was a task, slow, painful, ungrateful, but it gave a sure direction to ideas and morals. Neither zeal nor good-will was wanting to the Canadian clergy; what it suffered from was lack of means and men.

As it was recruited from the population itself, education became general, and manners and ideas improved. Go into our country places, where you will find peace and contentment, and if you consult the registers of the civil authorities you will see that, thanks to the action of the clergy, morality which, in other countries, Catholic as well as Protestant, seems to diminish with the progress of civilization, has followed an upward path, until to-day it has reached a point of remarkable purity. And now that the task of the clergy has attained such a success, and that we can boast of having joined with the sister Provinces in the domain of education, it does not hesitate to throw itself into the movement of industrial progress in which the others have distanced it. Needless to say that I share with all my heart the praises accorded to that great promoter of railroads, to that apostle of colonization (as clergy and laity have united to call him), who has done so much for our province, *Curé* Labelle. This digression was necessary to establish my assertion that Quebec, instead of being in the rear, has always, in the domain of ideas, answered to the first appeal, and through a pure spirit of chivalry has defended the great projects with more energy than material interests. During the crisis from 1860 to 1864, when the two great Provinces were waging war against each other, Lower Canada had only to persist in order to win back her liberty of action by separation from Upper Canada. But it could only have obtained liberty at the expense of its own expansion, and so, setting aside the sectional spirit, it entered boldly into the consideration, notwithstanding the dangers that might arise from a majority. With that majority it ventured to ally itself, though neither their language nor laws nor character were alike. The rage and struggle in Upper Canada against French domination might have its reaction on our part, exciting the prejudice of some and the fears of others. But Lower Canada, strong in its vitality, and having faith in his future, would not allow these sectional interests, however dear they might be, to be an obstacle to the formation of a great Canadian nationality. When the seat of Government was decided to be fixed in Upper Canada there was scarcely a mumur. When the Intercolonial question came up, Lower Canada never thought of opposing a project that placed twenty millions at the disposal of the Maritime Provinces. The first cries in favour of the Pacific came from Lower Canada, although it was to cause the expenditure of scores of millions outside of the Province of Quebec, and although the road was to open up a territory that would soon be its formidable rival. The policy of Protection originated in the Province of Quebec, at a time when almost all Ontario held the British views on the question. The Province of Quebec has, in fact, been the centre, the strength, the life of all the great ideas that have made the Canadian Confederation prosperous. I mention these things to prove that the Province of Quebec has from the first understood the Constitutional *regime*, that it is worthy of the confidence which the metropolis placed in it, in granting the boon of responsible government, and that it has neither retarded the progress of the sister Provinces nor been in any way a cause of regret to them. Its loyalty to the British Crown has been unalterable. It defended the British flag in 1775 and in 1812, with all the more disinterestedness, that it never received a cent for its services. If the other Provinces are proud of their spirit of initiative, of their enterprise, Quebec may be proud of its ideas. Its public men have ever, before the adoption of a great scheme, given the keynote that indicated its possibility and expediency. They have been the pioneers of politics, as their missionaries have been the pioneers of exploration and civilization on the American continent. On the coasts of the Pacific, as in the far retreats of the west, from Louisiana to Alaska, you still find, in the names of its lakes and rivers, the old French names of bold adventurers who were first on the ground; and, in like manner, in the region of politics, all the stages in the conquest of the liberty which we now enjoy have been marked by French Canadian names. Is it surprising that, with this chivalrous character, this abnegation that has made it ever loth to claim its just share, this dominant breadth of view, so conspicuous in its whole career, Lower Canada, when inspired by the sudden desire for railway development, should have thrown itself into the work of construction, with characteristic ardour? The difficulties in which the Province finds itself to-day prove nothing against its aptitude. It was never favoured like Ontario. If the Province of Quebec had been in an ordinary conditions, it would not have needed so many sacrifices, and it might have followed the other Provinces without exhaustion, as it did before 1841. From the conquest until that date, there had been spent in Upper Canada $5,592,746, and in Lower Canada $4,253,436. The works that were finished by the Canadian Government in Upper Canada, from 1841 to 1867, cost a total of $30,029,063; those of Lower Canada for the same period cost only $20,335,353, making a difference in favour of Upper Canada of $9,693,710. During the same period the other works constructed, either by the Imperial Government or by other means, amounted to $84,828,450 in Upper Canada and to $37,336,301 in Lower Canada, showing a difference against the latter of $47,492,149. These authentic figures are taken from the Sessional documents of 1867. To these statements we may add the following:—

Balance in hand in Lower Canada in 1481	$189,306
Debt of Upper Canada assumed by the Union	5,925,779
Total	$6,115,085

I may say, therefore, without fear of contradiction, that in 1867 Upper Canada had, over Lower Canada, the following enormous advantages:—

Surplus received from Lower Canada and debt of Upper Canada	$6,115,085
Surplus of works completed in Upper Canada by the Government	9,693,710
Surplus of works constructed by the Imperial Government or by private capital	47,492,149
	$63,300,954
Plus excess of works before 1841	1,339,310
Balance against Lower Canada	$64,640,254

Such are the enormous advantages that, in 1867, Upper Canada was found to have over Lower Canada. Since Confederation there was spent by the Government, up to June, 1882:

QUEBEC.

Railways (Intercolonial)	$ 8,400,000
Canals	11,000,000
	$19,400,000

ONTARIO.

Railways	$13,100,000
Canals	21,000,000
	$34,100,000
Add since 1882:	
Works on the Pacific, in Ontario	$ 2,500,000
	$36,600,000
Quebec	19,400,000
Difference in favour of Ontario	$17,200,000

Seventeen millions! An important factor in the financial economy of a young Province! Mr. Speaker, the Government has not, in the ordinary management of its affairs, been convicted of extravagance. Since Confederation, in fact, with a subsidy of over three hundred thousand dollars less than that of Ontario, with an administration more difficult and more costly than Ontario, it has shown the following surpluses:—

1867–68	$ 203,598
1868–69	350,913
1869–70	79,091
1870–71	57,979
1871–72	106,756
1872–73	268,104
1873–74	116,189
Making a total	$1,182,630

I might add to the amount the sum of $625,000 which had remained of the Federal subsidy itself, in the hands of the Canadian Government, and was paid into the Provincial Treasury as follows :—

Drawn by the Joly Government in 1878–79	$500,000
And by the Chapleau Government in 1879–80	125,000
	$625,000

Never have the ordinary expenses exceeded the ordinary revenue in the Province of Quebec. On the contrary, there has always been a considerable balance on the side of receipts. I will have occasion, later on, to examine the circumstances which imposed a debt of $19,000,000 on the Province. I only make allusion to it now, in order to observe that, were it not for the obligation to pay interest on that debt, a charge which has nothing to do with ordinary expenses, the Province would always have maintained a surplus. The four or five figures following show this to be the case :—

From 1867 to 1882—	
Expenses	$33,968,413
Receipts	33,594,297
Apparent deficit	$ 374,115
Interest on debt from 1875 to 1882	1,897,738
Real surplus	$ 1,523,623

The Province has incurred an onerous debt, because it stood in absolute need of railroads. It must not be forgotten that in 1867 however, Quebec had only the following lines :—

	Miles.
Grand Trunk, from Rivière du Loup to Montreal	290·50
Richmond to the frontier	55 00
Montreal to Lancaster	44·00
Arthabasca to Doucet Landing	35·00
Montreal to frontier (via Caughnawaga)	40·00
St. Lambert to Rouses Point	43 00
Carillon to Grenville	12·75
Joliette	12·00
Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly	43·00
Total	575·25

Those were all the railroads that Quebec had at that time. As for the Province of Ontario, let us see what railways it had at the same date. On consulting the public documents for 1867, we find that Upper Canada had then, of the Grand Trunk, 451 miles, and 912 miles of the following lines, through different portions of the Province :—

Ottawa & Prescott	54 00
Brockville & Ottawa	86 40
Cobourg & Peterborough	28·00
Peterborough & Lake Chemung	4·00
Port Hope, Lindsay & Beaverton	56·50
Northern	94·14
Erie & Ontario	17·00
Welland	25.00
Great Western	363·25
London & Port Stanley	25·00
Buffalo & Lake Huron	160 00
Total	912·00

Thus, we have in all a length of 1,393 miles of railway for Ontario, against the 575 miles Quebec possessed, giving a surplus of 818·14. It was in these circumstances that the Province of Quebec had to make sacrifices amounting to nearly $19,000,000 for railways. My hon. friend the member for West Durham has quoted at random, it would seem, the sacrifices made by each Province for its railways. He regretted not to have complete and exact statistics on the subject. I have endeavoured to supply the want, as far as regards Quebec. During the fifteen years, from July 1st, 1867, and July 1st, 1882, the Province of Quebec subsidized 1,678 miles of railway belonging to private companies, the total amounting to $4,146,164.94 in money, and 5,829,000 acres of land. In estimating the value of those lands, on which my hon. friend would not put any estimate, at $1 an acre—and that is certainly not exaggerated—the total of the subsidies granted by the Province for the encouragement of railroad construction by private companies, up to the 1st of July, 1882, amounted to $9,987,038.99. At that date there had been paid of the subsidies in money a sum of $2,410,441.54, so that there remained due to those subsidized companies $1,757,597.45 in money and 5,829,000 acres of land. These statistics relate only to railways built by private companies. To those we must add the amount paid up to the 1st of July, 1882, for the construction of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental, namely, $12,537,980.48 (more than a quarter of a million has been added to that amount since then). As I have already said, on the 1st of July, 1882, there remained due of the subsidies granted to those companies $1,757,597.45 in money and 5,829,000 acres of land, or in all, a balance representing $7,586,597.45. By adding these different sums, we shall find that at the above-mentioned date the amount of the debt contracted by the Province of Quebec for the construction of railways was, if one adds the interest on the sums paid, a total of $25,347,542.14, thus divided :

Money really paid	$17,760,944 69
Subsidies to pay	1,755,597 45
Making a total of	$19,518,542 14
Land, at $1 an acre	5,829,000 00
Making in all	$25,347,542 14

These figures clearly prove that the different Governments that have administered the affairs at Quebec since 1867 have not shrunk from sacrifices in order to place the Province in a position worthy of itself, worthy of the *role* which it is called to play in the Confederation, and to prevent it being left behind in the march of general progress. Those railways have, moreover, stimulated, in a powerful manner, the commerce and resources of the Province, and to this cause is, in a large measure, due the progress and rapid increase of $103,540,000 or 59 per cent. in the value of property, from 1867 to 1881. In the former year the figure was $174,978,174, and this had increased to $278,482,068 in 1881. In the summer of 1882 there were in the Province of Quebec 1,812 miles of railroad, or one mile for every 104 square miles, and every 750 inhabitants. The following table indicates the position occupied by Quebec in this respect compared with the other Provinces of the Dominion :

	Superficies in sq. miles.	Pop.	Sq. miles per mile of rail'd	Pop. per mile of rail.
Prince Edward Island	2,033	108,991	10·75	549
Nova Scotia	20,907	440,572	34·37	724
New Brunswick	24,174	321,233	31·02	367
Province of Quebec	188,688	1,359,027	104·13	750
Province of Ontario	101,734	1,923,228	26 47	500
British Columbia	341,305	49,459	6,826·10	991
N.W. Territory	2,665,252	56,446		
Dominion of Canada	3,470,392	4,224,810	426·19	521

The proportion of the Province of Quebec compared with the other Provinces was as follows : Prince Edward Island, 198 miles of railway ; Nova Scotia, 608 miles ; New Brunswick, 876 miles; Ontario, 3,843 miles ; Quebec, 1,812 miles; Manitoba, 504 miles ; British Columbia, 50 miles, and the Territories, 226 miles, making at that date a total for the Dominion of Canada of 8,147 miles of railroad. But, said my honourable friend, following those who spoke before him, why does not the Province of Quebec tax itself. Mr. Speaker, when Quebec entered the Confederation it was not

to make its position worse. It was, on the contrary, to be assured of its autonomy, institutions, language, laws. Does not all that constitutes autonomy—the character and habits of the people make part of it. Direct taxation is then opposed to the feelings of the people of Quebec. Ill treated under their old French governors, who transplanted to these shores the absolutist monarchy of Europe, without the restraint which the kings there thought it their duty to impose upon it; later on taxed under the military *regime* and the half-constitutional *regime* that succeeded it, until 1841, our population imbibed such an aversion to taxation that to-day it has become a part of their character. It has been said that we should, as they do in Upper Canada, tax the municipalities for expenses of justice. Why adopt a plan which would leave the impression that Confederation had made our position more intolerable than it was before? In 1866, before Confederation, Upper Canada had, for the expenses of justice, with its excess of population, only $336,257; Lower Canada had already $413,903. The administration was common to both Provinces which formed the united Province of Canada; and still the expenses of administering justice in Lower Canada were much more considerable. It was concluded that circumstances, or the nature of our organization, rendered the administration of justice more costly. The reason is not far to seek. There is first, the collection of the population and of capital in the large cities and in the seaports, which tend to considerably increase such expenses. Although the population of Ontario is larger than that of Quebec, circumstances multiply business in the latter Province in a manner out of proportion to its population. Almost all the commerce of Ontario has to pass through the Province of Quebec, and to stop on the way at Montreal or Quebec. The consequence is a series of transactions, insurances, transports, storage and other business movements tending to cause disagreements and judiciary expenses. And, independently of these transitory causes of lawsuits, there is the amount of imports and exports in each Province. The imports of Quebec, according to recent returns, were $53,105,257, and of Ontario, $41,690,760. The exports from Quebec were $38,972,121, and those of Ontario, $40,765,921, making a total for Quebec of $92,077,378, and for Ontario of $82,456,681, a surplus in favour of Quebec of $9,620,697. The capital embarked in oceanic navigation, consisting of from thirteen to fourteen lines of steamships, and which is almost exclusively centred in Montreal, and to some extent at Quebec, amounts to a least $15,000,000, and creates a business of at least $10,000,000 a year, the freight alone amounting to $1,000,000 per annum. The capital of the banks imposes on the Province of Quebec another class of business in the courts, of considerable importance, as may be seen by the following statement:—

QUEBEC.

Capital of Banks and reserve fund	$45,000,000
Bank deposits	55,000,000
Discount and loans	81,000,000

ONTARIO.

Capital of banks and reserve fund	$25,000,000
Bank deposits	40,000,000
Discount and loans	62,000,000

SURPLUS.

Capital of banks and reserve fund	$20,000,000
Bank deposits	15,000,000
Discount and loans	19,000,000

We obtain, therefore, on these points alone, the following statement of business which Ontario has nothing to meet and which creates considerable judiciary expenses:

Surplus of imports and exports	$10,000,000
Capital and business of ocean steamship companies	10,000,000
Banking business	19,000,000
	$39,000,000

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the general expenses of the Province of Quebec are necessarily greater than in the other Provinces, and it is not surprising if it is not in the same financial condition as the other Provinces are. We must also bear in mind that Quebec is inhabited by a mixed population, and that there is thus occasion for more considerable general expenses in order to satisfy the majority. We have:

For the Legislative Council from 1867 to 1883	$680,000
For the same period for parliamentary translations, printing in both languages, double subsidies to education and charity (the last from 1867 to 1883)	700,000
Total	$1,350,000

I will not speak here, Mr. Speaker, of the position which we assumed by arbitration after 1867. In fact, on the division of the assets and liabilities in 1867, it would seem that the least that should have been done was to give us each in the same proportion. Far from that, however, our proportion of assets was augmented, so that our debts, the assets being deducted, stood thus:

Quebec	$4,193,520
Ontario	3,107,432

When the Federal Government assumed our debts, in 1879, it allowed:

For Ontario's debt	$5,013,608
Amount due	3,107,432
Surplus of assets for Ontario	$1,906,186
For Quebec's debt	4,487,179
Amount due	4,193,520
Surplus of assets for Quebec	$ 293,759
Difference in favour for Ontario	$1,612,527

Then, Quebec receives only $1,014,712 of subsidy against $1,333,568 which Ontario receives, or a difference of $318,000 a year. Now the expenses of administration are the same. The expenses of government do not increase in exact ratio to the increase of population. We have, therefore, to contend with three disadvantages: surplus necessary for the administration of justice, $100,000; surplus for the Legislative Council and expenses necessitated by the use of two languages in parliamentary procedure, $35,000. If we add the difference in the subsidy $318,000, we have every year, in the Province of Quebec, for the carrying on of the Government and the working of our institutions, an excess of expense of over $503,000. This amount is sufficient to show that in the respective situations of Ontario and Quebec since Confederation, our Province has been placed in a position of inferiority, which gives it a right to look for the good will, if not the liberality, of the other Provinces. The debt contracted in the Province of Quebec during the period, from 1873 to 1883, is here set forth:

Loan of 1874	$5,893,333
" 1876	4,185,335
" 1878	3,000,000
" 1880	4,275,853
" 1882	3,000,000
" 1883	500,000
	$18,854,521

The dates indicate the obvious responsibility of each Government. The Government of Mr. DeBourcherville augmented the debt by $8,078,668; the Government of Mr. Joly, $3,000,000, and that of which I had the direction by $7,775,853. Such is the responsibility of the DeBourcherville, Joly and Chapleau Governments respectively, in regard to the railway debt. The following sums were paid for the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway by the Governments specified:

The DeBourcherville Government—	
1875	$ 650,700
1876	1,322,055
1877	3,203,130
1878	2,146,108
	$7,321,999

Joly Government—

1878	$ 86,789
1879	1,900,980
1880	200,000
	$2,187,766

The total expended for the year ending June 30, 1880, was $268,129, but there was a sum of $68,129 chargeable to the Chapleau Government, which came into power at the close of 1879:

Chapleau Government—

1880	$ 68,129
1881	2,206,328
1882	837,391
	$3,958,727

I have not to justify the Administrations of Messrs. DeBoucherville and Joly, which are not attacked, but I may justify myself against the attacks that have been made on me, and which have served as a pretext for those who are really opposed to granting Quebec her claims. The expenses of the Administration of which I had the direction, the employment of all the sums that were borrowed under it, have been verified dollar for dollar. Besides, the accounts and statements of these expenses are at Quebec and accessible to everyone. I defy any person to point out the expenditure of a cent that was not legitimate and profitable. But I will spare this House the enumeration of figures that would weary it. Nevertheless, I had thought it proper to bring them together in such a way as to be able to give any desired information in the most complete manner possible. I will, for the present, content myself with a mere recapitulation. There was paid for the railroad:

By Mr. DeBourcherville	$7,321,999 00
By Mr. Joly	2,187,767 00
By Mr. Chapleau	3,958,727 00
Mr. DeBoucherville contracted the first obligation and spent	7,321,000 00
Estimated expenses for completion and for engagements incurred, at	2,516,955 00
	$9,838,974 00
Mr. Joly, on assuming charge of the road, spent	$2,187,765 00
Left engagements incurred, for	2,113,314 00
	$4,301,081 00
Mr. Chapleau completed the road for	$3,958,727 00
Less—Engagements left by Mr. Joly	2,113,314 00
Responsibility of the Chapleau Government	$1,845,413 00

For completing the works, for rolling stock and furnishings (the last having added $1,200,000 to the value of the road, that valuation having been accepted by the Pacific Company). Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet of which I was head has been blamed for having sold the railroad, and the hon. member for West Durham has said that the Quebec Government had robbed the road between Quebec and Montreal of its character as part of the Pacific Railroad, by selling it to another company. Moreover, I have been accused of having sold the road on terms disadvantageous to the Province. Let us first discuss the former charge. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that from the very beginning of my parliamentary career, since my earliest utterances in the Legislative Assembly, I have had two object in view: I made up my mind that the Province of Quebec should be a manufacturing as well as an agricultural community. A country which for five months in the year is covered with snow cannot be exclusively agricultural. Agriculture should always have the first place, for the returns of the soil are the surest and the most considerable, and their abundance or their scarcity determines whether the year shall be one of prosperity or of general crisis. But I always said that in the Province of Quebec the efforts of legislation should be turned towards the development of its industrial and manufacturing wealth. We have a country of splendid water powers. In the advantages which it thus offers for industrial operations, it is second to none. All that it needed was railways, and these it behooved us to give it at any cost. Another object that I had in view was that the region north of the St. Lawrence, even as far as the Laurentides, a region which if ever evil days should come again, may be the bulwark of our liberties, should be developed and connected with the great centres of population. For that end it was necessary to build a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, along the north shore of the great rivers St. Lawrence and Ottawa, with branches towards the interior. I differed, however, from those who thought that the Government of Quebec should undertake that work. When, in 1875, the Hon. Mr. DeBoucherville undertook the construction of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, I thought, with one of the companies that commenced that enterprise, that the Quebec Government ought not to assume charge of it. At the time I wrote an article, which I have since had occasion to quote in the House, asking that the construction of the road should be left to the Northern Colonization Railroad Company, of which Sir Hugh Allan was president. The Hon. Louis Beaubien, who has changed his mind, was then of the same opinion as I was. We asked the Government to give an additional subsidy of $1,000,000 to each company, rather than undertake the construction of the road itself. I do not mention this to exonerate myself from the responsibility resting on the DeBoucherville and succeeding Governments. My advice was not followed, and then, seeing the generous effort made for the construction of the road, I supported the DeBoucherville Administration, and to-day I take, as I took then, upon me, both by vote and utterance, all the responsibility of the construction of the line. When the question of the advisability of keeping and operating the road came before my Government, I said, as I still say, that it was better to sell it. I declared that a Government could not administer a road so as to make the income proportionate to the capital spent in its construction. In the General Elections of 1881 I enunciated these views, saying that the road should be sold, and that the Government should sell it. I described the method by which I thought the sale should be effected, and stated what price I would accept. As soon as the Legislature met I submitted my plan for the sale, and a discussion arose in the press, which is not yet ended, and of which more of passion than of reason is brought to bear in the argument against my policy. I will not go back to those struggles of the past. It is not my desire to recriminate against those who have wrongly interpreted my policy, my words and my acts. Nor will I weary this House with the recital of all the charges, more or less malevolent, of which I have been the aim. Jealousy and animosity bore their natural fruit, but I would forget all that. A statesman who would serve his country must not bear rancour for the contests of yesterday. A politician who cannot stifle his resentment is unworthy of his position. Let it suffice for him that he has the consciousness of having done his duty. There is one remark I would like to make in defence of the course which has called forth such bitter comments. It is this: The sale of the road which I was able to make—one portion to the Pacific Company, another to a syndicate—was made on conditions not only advantageous, but such as could only occur at the time when the sale was effected. I may say without vainglory that I had the good fortune to complete that transaction just at the moment when all the American railway companies were quoted at their highest figures—at a moment when rival companies believed the acquisition of a line to be a fortune for the shareholders who acquired it. Three months after the sale the members of the syndicate that bought the east end of the line and had invested some thousands of dollars in the enterprise, withdrew from it with all haste, fearing a total loss. I regret that the hon. member for Montreal West is not in his seat, as he

could edify us on this point. I said that the Pacific people had refused to buy more than the portion between Montreal and Ottawa. It was a great mistake on their part, and if I were to avail myself of expressions of the hon. Premier, I would say that it was not only a mistake but a blunder. We see some of its consequences to-day. Mr. Speaker, I told those who attacked my Administration, those who imputed bad motives to me, those who condemned my sale, that I would defy them, as I do now, to find a man acquainted with the administration and value of railroads who will say that our road did not bring its full value. Some have retorted, that if the east side, from Montreal to Quebec, had been sold for $4,500,000—$4,000,000 in money and $500,000 in works to be completed—how is it that the purchasers re-sold it to the Grand Trunk with an evident profit of $1,000,000? I must ask the House to pardon me this digression, which is of a personal nature. I am obliged to establish my position before this House and before the country, and I do so to-day, because it is the first opportunity that I have had. When it was said that the part of the road between Quebec and Montreal was sold for $4,000,000 by the Government, and that the purchasers re-sold it for $5,000,000, one thing is lost sight of, and that is that after the sale the purchasers had finished works at Montreal valued at over $100,000, on the road for over $75,000, while at Quebec they had spent $250,000 to change the route and transfer it by getting along the St. Charles. Nor did the objectors state that the purchasing company made the acquisition at the city of Quebec of 600,000 feet of land, that had been offered to my Government at the rate of $1 a foot. It is not surprising then that all those acqusitions and improvements should have increased the value of the road, and that the owners made their estimate in accordance with the fact. Besides, the profit, if it exists, is not a profit in money on the price of the re-sale, but the amount of debentures issued on the road—debentures whose realization will greatly depend on the state of the market of railway property—debentures, moreover, foreseen in the legislation Act authorizing the sales, and the profit of which was to serve for the completion of the road. In fact, there was no re-sale of the road. Those who control it to-day have only assumed the responsibilities of the debt of the first acquirers towards the Government. They have given, it is true, their guarantees to the debentures authorized by the Act, and have assumed the interest by means of a new traffic, augmenting by so much the productive value of the road. In vain has prejudice tried to play upon the popular credulity. It was well enough that the holders of the bonds, eager to find buyers in the European markets, would not contradict the fabulous value ascribed to them. Once more I repeat, I defy my detractors to find a man competent in railway business to say that the road did not receive the highest price the Government could then obtain, and higher than could be got to-day if the road were in the same condition as when it was sold to the Syndicate. If I take so much time in explaining this matter, it is because circumstances have associated me with the financial destinies of the Province, and that my past share in its affairs identifies me in a manner with its present condition. It would have been well nigh impossible for me to explain the situation of the Province without occasional reference to the Administration which I had the honour to lead before being called to the post which I occupy at present. It must be well known that in all the attacks directed against the Province of Quebec it is the period of my Administration especially that is in question, and I whom they charge with being responsible for the deficits in the Provincial Budget. In fact, it is with this false pretence that my enemies tried to destroy my reputation, and to ruin me in the Parliament where I had obtained a seat. I thought, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I would not be abusing your good will, and that of my fellow members in this House, if I profited by this occasion to vindicate my personal honour and political credit in the country. I have nothing to conceal; nothing to fear. I never looked for the approbation of every one. In the numerous and eager political frays of which our Province has been the theatre, we had to take blows as well as give them. I have had my share of wounds, but the only ones that rankled were those inflicted by my own friends. It was my ill-fortune to be attacked in my own camp. I deplore and still regret this division. But I declare that in spite of those attacks, in spite of the natural impatience which they have caused me, there remains in my mind neither bitterness nor resentment. Having never acted through passion, I can speak without bitterness, and it is with the desire and the hope of bringing those who combat me to sentiments more just regarding me that I have entered so minutely into the details of that railway policy on which they have based their attacks. So much for the railway policy of the Quebec Administration of which I was the head, and so much for the position of the Province of Quebec on that question. I have showed that the Province of Quebec, in making that sacrifice, did so to place itself on a level with Ontario, to which the Treasury of United Canada had been so lavish, while it forgot Quebec. The railway policy of our Province was a Federal rather than a Provincial work. Its debt, as shown by the figures which I have laid before the House, was not caused by its bad administration, for, notwithstanding the difficulties under which it laboured, with its more costly administration consequent on the use of two languages, the ordinary expenses have generally been balanced by the receipts, its debt grew to $15,000,000 in the space of ten years by the construction of railways, which give benefit to the commerce of entire Canada and yield revenues to the Canadian Government, without any compensation for the Provincial Treasury. Every piece of iron purchased, every instrument imported, every man brought to the Province of Quebec to build that railway, was a profit to the Canadian Government and an expense to Quebec. In such circumstances the Province of Quebec asks only one thing. It asks the Federal authorities to relive Quebec of the burden of that part of its debt which was contracted in the execution of an undertaking essentially Federal in its character. Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that, in consideration of what the Quebec Government has done for the Dominion, it merits the indemnity which is offered to it by to-day's measure. My hon. friend, the member for West Durham, tries to maintain that the subsidy given the railroad from Pembroke to Lake Nipissing represents an expenditure in favour of Quebec, the equivalent of which was devoted a couple of years ago and last year to the building of the Gravenhurst and Callander line, which is intended to direct the commerce of the West by the Pacific into the Province of Ontario. I beg to differ from my hon. friend. What was spent on the road from Lake Nipissing to Pembroke was spent in Ontario and serves the local traffic of that Province. According to the argument of the hon. member, the harbour of Montreal would be no profit to the Province of Quebec because its immense trade is to a great extent that of an *entrepot*. But no, the geographical position is what should guide us in the distribution of public improvements. Moreover, if the territory in dispute between Ontario and Quebec falls ultimately to Ontario, the portion of the Pacific built in that Province will be doubled and its local trade benefited in the same proportion. Even if an indemnity of $12,000 a mile had been given to the Province on the line from Quebec to Montreal, it would not have been unjust. The Government, in its solicitude, would have given a portion of that subsidy, under the form of useful works, to the part of the Province that extends from Montreal to the port of Quebec, with the assurance that in a near future the latter would be the terminus of the Pacific. It is not for me to reproach Ontario for its

demeanour in dealing with this part of the question. I have only tried to appeal to the sense of justice of the members of that Province. I am glad to say that that great Province deserves our admiration and our praise for the immense progress that it has achieved, both to its own credit and to the profit of the whole Dominion, and I am sure that my appeal will not have been made in vain, that we may rely on the good will, the spirit of equity and liberality of those members. And now, Mr. Speaker, I draw to a close, with the remark that the motion of the hon. member for West Durham is one that ought to be rejected by the Ontario members, to whom especially it is addressed. As for the Maritime Provinces, the Government has treated them liberally. Ontario, richer, and better endowed with the fostering help of the last half century, would be lacking in justice if it now told the Government that it would not support its policy unless it received an equivalent to Quebec's subsidy. That Province is wealthy, its Treasury is well filled, and no one is jealous of its properity; but every one has a right to demand that Ontario shall deal in no mean and jealous spirit with the claims of a Province which begs no favours, but only seeks what it is fully justified in seeking. My hon. friend, unless I am mistaken, will not find his sentiments echoed in this House. His proposal may be a good stroke of party management, but it cannot command the sympathy of those who regard the question from the lofty standpoint of a generous and enlightened patriotism. That motion was meant to allure public opinion, by raising sectional prejudices under the disguise of equity. It is essentially unjust in its character, and for that very reason it will be rejected by this House, in favour of the equitable Resolutions which are now submitted.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to answer the *oratio pro domo sua* which we have just heard from the hon. Secretary of State. In the first place, the hon. Minister has defended his administration of the affairs of the Province of Quebec from the charge of extravagance. He has continued in the same strain during the whole of his argumentation. In my humble opinion, the time was ill-chosen to make a panegyric upon the administration of the hon. gentleman. This is neither the time nor the place to discuss the affairs of the Province of Quebec. I do not propose to wash our dirty linen here; it is better to wash his dirty linen at home, and the time and place to discuss the affairs of his administration is not here in Ottawa, but in Quebec. I simply propose to deal with the question now before the House. The hon. Minister has answered, in a rather laconical way, I must admit, to the amendment of the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake), and I was astonished, I must say, to find that he had so badly misunderstood the meaning of this amendment. He has dealt with this amendment as though its effect would be the withdrawal of the subsidies granted to the Province of Quebec by these Resolutions. Such is not the object of the amendment. The amendment only asks that the same measure of justice which is dealt out to Quebec, be also extended to the other Provinces, which have the same right to it as Quebec has. The amendment commends itself to the sense of equity and of justice, not only of the members from the Province of Quebec, but also of all the other members from other Provinces which have expended moneys for the construction of railways. The Resolutions begin with the statement that the Government of the Province of Quebec is entitled to an indemnity from this Legislature, because the Province of Quebec has spent a large sum for the construction of a road which, owing to its character, must not be considered as a provincial road, but should be looked upon as a national route. Since the Government has adopted the policy of aiding the construction of future railways, even of those of a provincial character, when these railways are, in their opinion, of a general usefulness, there must be just as good reason to say that the Provincial Legislatures who have aided the construction of such railways are entitled to a compensation. But the moment the principle is adopted, it is certainly equitable and just that this principle should not apply to one Province only; it must apply to all the Provinces, which are placed in the same position as the Province of Quebec in that respect. Now, it may be asked, when is a road of a purely local character, and under what circumstances it happens to be of general usefulness to the country. On this point, so far, we have had nothing but the arbitrary statement of the Government, but according to the precedent just established by the Government themselves in the Resolutions now on the Table, it may be said that there are now no more local roads, but that we have now only Federal roads. For instance, when the small road from Lachute to St. Andrews, which only covers a distance of 7 miles, is considered as having such importance that it must be subsidized by the Dominion; when the road between St. Jerome and New Glasgow, which is only 6 or 7 miles long, is also of such importance that it must be subsidized, it follows that there are no more local roads, but that all railways, without exception, must be considered as roads in the interest of the Dominion. Mr. Speaker, Quebec is not the only Province which has granted subsidies to lines of railways. Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba have all equally subsidized local lines within the limits of their territory. It is now proposed to give a compensation to the Government of the Province of Quebec for the aid granted by that Government to lines of railways in its own territory. The hon. member for Durham simply asks, by his amendment, that the same justice be dealt out to Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and that it should not be given to Quebec only. Can there be any reason why this justice should not be dealt out to these Provinces as well as to the other? For my part, I do not object to a subsidy being granted to Quebec, nor does the hon. member for Durham, but we ask that the same measure of justice which is dealt out to Quebec be also dealt out to the other Provinces.

Mr. HOUDE. (Translation.) It has been dealt out to them before this. There is all the difference.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) It has been dealt out to them before this. In what manner?

Mr. HOUDE. (Translation.) My hon. friend asks in what manner? I shall tell him: It is through the millions which have been expended in Manitoba and British Columbia, through the millions which have been expended in the Maritime Provinces, on the important branches of the Intercolonial Railway; in Ontario, on the Canada Central, and then on the branch railway from Gravenhurst to Callander.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) If the hon. member says, that is the recompense which has been given in advance to the other Provinces, I am far from agreeing with him. Whatever has been expended in British Columbia and Manitoba, was expended in the general interests of the Dominion; what was expended on the Intercolonial, in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, was also expended in the interest of the Dominion. What was expended on the Canada Central was also expended in the interest of the Dominion; and if there has been a particular advantage, it has been for the Province of Quebec, as has been said two years ago by the Minister of Railways. Now, people will come here and say that the Province of Quebec is entitled to a special compensation, and for what reason? Because it is said that the Quebec provincial railway, built between Quebec and Ottawa, forms part of the Pacific line. I have heard other reasons—this is not the only one I have heard—given in the course of the debate, in the press, for the subsidy which it is intended to give to-day to the Province of Quebec.

In the different memorials presented by the Province of Quebec, through the Secretary of State when he was Prime Minister, or through the Hon. Mr. Mousseau or through Dr. Ross, now Prime Minister of the Province, I have seen no other reason given why it should be entitled to a compensation on account of this line, which it has built from Quebec to Ottawa, but that it forms part of the Pacific. Therefore, I do not hesitate to say, for my part, that the Government of the Province of Quebec has no claim on that account, any more than the other Provinces. They have themselves acknowledged that they have no claim, and that, on that account, they have received that special compensation to which they are entitled. Let us start from the beginning: when it was decided to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was decided to build this road, not from ocean to ocean, as has been said, but from British Columbia to the Eastern Provinces. The object of the scheme was to build the road from British Columbia to the shores of Lake Nipisssing. Lake Nipissing was then a wilderness, and if the road had stopped there it would have been perfectly useless. However, it was then supposed, and rightly supposed, that private enterprise would build the lines from the old settlements of Ontario and Quebec, and so it happened. The Canada Central was the first line built; they applied to this Parliament to obtain a special subsidy, which was granted. A subsidy of $12,000 per mile was granted, between Pembroke and Lake Nipissing. This took place in 1874, and four or five years before that two companies were organized in the Province of Quebec, for the construction of a railway to connect the Quebec harbour with the Pacific line at Ottawa. Two different companies were organized, to wit: the North Shore Railway Company, who undertook to build the line between Quebec and Montreal, and the Northern Colonization Company, whose line was to extend westward, through the Ottawa valley. It is not within my knowledge that these two companies, or either of them, applied to the Federal Government to obtain any aid whatever; still, they were both largely subsidized by the Provincial Government; they were expecting aid from the municipalities, and they did get aid from the municipalities, to a certain extent; but notwithstanding this aid from the Provincial Government and from the municipalities, the undertaking was not a success. The work was given up and the Government of Quebec took hold of it, in 1875, and undertook to build the whole road from Quebec to Ottawa—and how? Simply as a provincial line and without any aid on the part of the Federal Government. It may be said, and with reason, I believe, that the Government of the Province of Quebec might have been entitled to a subsidy from the Federal Government, just as much as the Canada Central Company. There was this point of similarity between the line of the Canada Central and that of the Quebec Government, that both lines were to be used as an outlet for the Pacific Railway; but there was this point of difference, that the line of the Canada Central was passing, for the most part, through an unsettled territory, and that for years it could not be of any local usefulness, while the St. Lawrence valley road, and the Ottawa valley road, were passing through land which had been settled for years, through settlements which were comparatively rich, so that that part of the country was to reap immediate benefits from the construction of those railways. It might have been said at that time that the Province was entitled to a subsidy on the same ground as the Canada Central was entitled to it, for the reasons I have just given. The idea to which I now give expression was not unwonted in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Joly, the leader of the Opposition, was of opinion that the Provincial Government ought to receive aid from the Dominion Government for the construction of that line of railway, and during the Session of 1875, he moved in the House an amendment to that effect: When the Provincial Government announced their intention to undertake the construcion of a railway to Ottawa, Mr. Joly moved the following amendment:—

"But this House is of opinion that after the great sacrifices which Quebec has made to promote these enterprises, it is fair and just that the Dominion of Canada should come to our aid, since these two roads, the North Shore and Montreal, and the Ottawa and Occidental, virtually form part of the great Pacific line."

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) That is just what we are saying now.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) That is what you are saying now, but why did you not say it then? You are saying it now, but at that time you did not wish to say it, and you have commenced the building of that road as a local line. The idea of Mr. Joly was repudiated, and it was rejected in an abusive manner. Mr. Speaker, the Quebec Government then made for themselves the position which they now hold; they refused the aid of the Dominion Govment.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) Did they refuse it?

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Certainly they refused it, since Mr. Joly's motion was supported by only 15 members against 43.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) The hon. member should tell us when was it that the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie offered us this aid, as long as we have refused it.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Well the Mackenzie Government never had any occasion to refuse this demand which has never been made. It would be strange, to say the least, if Mr. Mackenzie was to be held responsible for the refusal of a demand which has never been made. At all events the Provincial Government chose to take that position; they decided to build the road as a Provincial line and without any aid from the Dominion Government. I know that they have repented since, and by-and-bye I shall state under what circumstances. After having decided to build the road as a provincial line the Government carried out their intention; they built the road and when it was completed or nearly so, the Government found themselves in a critical position from a financial point of view; I will not say that it was owing to the construction of this railway, I might say it was rather due to their own extravagance; but as I have said before, this is no place to discuss local affairs, and I shall limit my remarks to the question now before the House. When the Provincial Government found themselves in the difficulties to which I have referred, they changed their policy; they thought that what they had refused in 1875 they might demand it in 1880, and after having refused the aid of the Dominion Government, they applied to that same Government to demand of them that which they had refused in 1875. The whole history of what took place then has been given by the hon. Secretary of State, when he was Prime Minister of Quebec, in the speech made by him on the Resolutions which he himself introduced for the sale of that road in 1882. He said:

"As far back as the 13th of March, 1880, the Local Government waited upon the Dominion Government to ask aid for our road. The Pacific Railway question was then being discussed, and as the Pacific had always been spoken of as being intended to connect with our Provincial railway, we went there to ask the Federal Government to do their utmost in order to make of our provincial railway an integrant part of that great line of railway."

The hon. member then went on to speak of a letter sent to the Federal Government in 1881. That letter said:

"Let the Federal Government buy our property for the sum of $7,000,000. This sum would represent, at the rate at which your Government may obtain money in England, an interest of $280,000. With a sinking fund, it would amount in all to $350,000.

"This would represent a loss to the Province of $1,000,000, but Quebec would willingly make this sacrifice which would ensure an independ-

ent line to the future traffic of the Pacific Railway, and at the same time would give a great impulsion to the commercial prosperity of the Province."

The hon. Minister then represented to the Government that the Province of Quebec had expended over $11,000,000 for the construction of the railway between Quebec and Ottawa, and that, in his opinion, it was entitled to a compensation from the Dominion Government, and he went on to determine the nature and extent of such compensation. He stated, among other reasons, that the Dominion Government ought to buy the local road from Quebec to Ottawa for the sum and price of $7,000,000; that, it was true the road had cost $4,000,000 more, but that the Province of Quebec would consent to lose these $4,000,000, that it was its contribution for the benefit it would reap from the entreprise. This proposition was not accepted by the Dominion Government and the road was afterwards sold by the Provincial Government, under circumstances which the hon. Secretary of State has explained a moment ago. It was sold for even more than the compensation which the hon. Secretary of State had asked from the Dominion Government. The amount of the compensation asked for was $7,000,000, and the road has been sold for $7,600,000. It matters very little from what source comes the money which is to be deposited in the Quebec Treasury, as far as the finances of the Province are concerned. It matters very little whether it comes from the Dominion Government or from another source; although the road has been sold to a company the result is the same; that is to say, the road only costs $4,000,000 or the amount which the Province of Quebec had decided to pay for the benefit of having this road. It has had the amount asked for. More than that: a section has been sold to the Pacific, and that part has naturally been paid out of the money furnished by the Federal Parliament to that Company. But the question is, not to know from what source came this money, which it has received for the sale of its railway; the financial result is still the same; that is to say, the Province of Quebec has only paid out the $4,000,000 which it had decided to pay out for having this road. It is said: Why, since the Federal Government have not bought the railway they ought to grant a subsidy of at least $12,000 per mile to the Province of Quebec, as a compensation for the sacrifices which have been made by that Province. If the Province of Quebec, after having realized $7,000,000 out of the sale of its railway, should now receive a subsidy from the Dominion, it would repudiate what it said through its Ministers in 1880, and it would not be contributing in any measure to the construction of this railway for which it had decided to pay at least $4,000,000. What I am now saying is confirmed by the position taken by the Government of the Province of Quebec on this question. The Government did not ask for any aid over and above that sum. They merely asked one of two things: either to sell the road for $7,000,000 or else that they should receive a compensation from the Federal Government. In a subsequent letter, sent by the hon. First Minister of Quebec, Mr. Chapleau, to the First Minister of this Government, he expressed himself as follows:—

"I think it is my duty to inform you that an offer of $6,500,000 has been made to me for our provincial railway, such as the road will be after the completion of the Chaudière bridge."

"Under these circumstances I hope that you will allow me to ask you:

"1st. Whether your Government would be willing to guarantee to our Province, as the price of our road, a fixed amount, which would enable you to transfer it to the Syndicate?

"2nd. Whether you think that the Syndicate would be willing to offer a higher price for our road than that which I have just mentioned, or more advantageous conditions for the lease of our Provincial railway?

"3rd. Whether, in case that the Government of Quebec should keep their railway (Q.M.O. & O.), you would be willing to recommend to the Ottawa Government the granting of a bonus equal to that which was granted to the Canada Central."

The proposition made to-day before the House is to grant a compensation equal to that which was granted by this Government to the Canada Central. The circumstances are not to-day the same as they were in 1880. At that time, when he wrote this letter to the Government, Mr. Chapleau declared that if the present Government bought the Quebec road, or caused it to be bought by the Pacific, he would be satisfied; and if the Government did not buy it themselves, or if they did not cause it to be bought by the Pacific, in that case, he asked for a grant of $12,000 per mile, which was equal to the subsidy granted to the Canada Central. Circumstances have changed, the Government of the Province of Quebec have sold their railway and, according to the very words of the letter, the Government have no more right to the compensation they claimed at that time. I say this, Mr. Speaker, simply to prove one thing, not that I object to the Resolutions before the House, but I say that the Province of Quebec does not hold, on this question, a particular position which might invoke to the exclusion of all the other Provinces of the Confederation. The position I take is this: the Province of Quebec holds, with respect to the grant which it is about to receive, the same position as the other Provinces may occupy with respect to the expenses which they may have made for railways of a general usefulness to Canada. As I said a while ago, I am not opposed to the Resolutions. The Resolutions grant a subsidy to Quebec. I accept it. But the question to which I shall refer again, because doubts have been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, is that the Province of Quebec has no special reasons of its own to invoke in favour of this subsidy. Therefore, I seek, outside of the statement that the road built by the Province forms part of the Pacific, the reason for these grants. As I have said before, the Province of Quebec has already received from the sale of its railway the compensation to which it was thought to be entitled. Consequently, as it does not occupy a *sui generis* position in that respect, it necessarily follows that the advantages which are given must be granted equally to all the Provinces, which, like Quebec, have made sacrifices to build railways whose usefulness is general. The Province of Quebec is just like other Provinces on this point. All other Provinces, without any exception, have made sacrifices, and enormous sacrifices, considering the means at their disposal, for the purpose of building railways for themselves. Last year we passed an Act by which it was declared that nearly all the lines of railway in Canada had been built for the general interest of the country. Well, it follows from this principle that we have the right to ask that the same measure of justice which is to be dealt out to the Province of Quebec should be dealt out to other Provinces as well. The motive of the Resolutions now before the House must be sought for outside of the particular position of the Province. This motive is easily known Unfortunately, the $7,000,000 which the Province of Quebec has already received or is to receive from the sale of its railway, have not saved her from the financial embarrassment in which it was then, and this embarrassment still continues. I desire, as much as anybody else, to see it rescued from this embarrassment and I hope that the aid which is about to be granted for that purpose it will go far towards doing away with it. But after the Government had found out that the sale of their railway had not brought them out of difficulty, they continued to apply to the Dominion Government. Mr. Mousseau, the successor of the hon. Secretary of State, presented, last year, to the Federal Government, a memorial in which he set forth the claims of the Province of Quebec. These claims are based not only on the expenses which the Province of Quebec has made, for the construction of the railway between Quebec and Ottawa, but also on all the other railway expenses made in the Province. This is not, however, the main argument of the memorial. The main argument is that the Federal subsidy now given to the

Provinces is inadequate and should be readjusted, and again this year, the First Minister of the Province of Quebec, Mr. Ross, has presented a memorial in which he, himself, sets forth the claims of the Province. He endorses all that has been said by his predecessor, but he especially sets forth the pretensions of the Province with respect to the enormous expense which the Province has made for the construction of the railway. But one thing is notorious: it is that the memorials which have been presented by the Province to this Government, when they were presented through Mr. Chapleau, have not received an answer. The claims put forth through Mr. Mousseau have equally been left without an answer, and the same thing may be said of the claims presented by Mr. Ross.

Mr. HOUDE. (Translation.) They were being taken into consideration.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) They have been for three years under consideration, and no answer has been given as yet. The proposition of Mr. Chapleau was first considered, then Mr. Mousseau's proposition was considered, and the matter is still under consideration. But an event which took place in this House has hastened the consideration of the memorials of the Province of Quebec. Three years ago the Federal Government considered them, without being able to arrive at a conclusion. But the conclusion has been reached we know when. It was when the Government came before this House, during this Session, with the Pacific Railway Resolutions. I do not know personally what took place between the Government and their supporters. The hon. Secretary of State has pretended that the public had been informed by the *Globe* correspondents who, according to the hon. Minister, had been listening through the key-holes. Now that is a very gratuitous insinuation against the *Globe* correspondents. What we know about what took place between the Government and their supporters has not been revealed by any Opposition papers, but by the most influential organs of the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec, and it is known, by what has been disclosed by their organs, that this Government have given way to the pressure which has been brought to bear upon them.

Mr. HOUDE. (Translation.) Under the pressure of the surplus?

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) What surplus?

Mr. HOUDE. (Translation.) The surplus of $7,000,000.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) I thought it was under the pressure of the surplus of members. What took place then, has been revealed to us even the day next to that on which the Resolutions were voted, by *La Minerve*, the most influential and the oldest Conservative newspaper. The *Minerve* said:

"The Ministrial Resolutions were adopted last night on a strict party vote. We must make an exception as regards Mr. Ross, the member for Liegar, who supported the policy of the Government.

"In the course of the debate which took place on that question, we have strongly advised our friends not to consent to the new sacrifices which were asked of us without protecting on all points the just rights of the Province.

"The French members of the House have endorsed our opinion, and the energetic and firm stand which they have taken has given satisfactory results. It is certain that a compensation of $12,000 per mile will be granted to the Provincial Government in consideration of the millions we have expended for the construction of the Northern Railway, which forms an important section of the Pacific Railway The amount is just the same as that of the subsidy granted to the Canada Central and to the proposed railway between Gravenhurst and Callander, in Ontario. This is an act of justice which we have been claiming for a long while, but which, for all that, will be accepted with feelings of great satisfaction.

"During last night's sitting Sir Charles Tupper has declared, besides, that the Pacific Railway will have to take means to reach Quebec within a very short time. This statement which is of great importance has been very favourably received.

"We owe our sincere congratulations to the Ministers and members whose energy and devotedness to our interests have enabled them to obtain such material advantages for our Province."

Mr. LAURIER.

Now, the *modus operandi* is explained to us by another paper. What is stated in the *Minerve* is related more or less vaguely, but this energetic and firm stand taken by the Quebec contingent to obtain justice from this stubborn Government is explained to us by the *Monde*, of the 21st of March:

"At the caucus held on the 15th of February, Mr. Ouimet, on behalf of the French Conservatives, made the following requests:

"1st. That the Government should grant a subsidy of $12,000 per mile, to the Province of Quebec on the railway which has been built by that Province between Ottawa and Quebec.

"2nd. That the Government should guarantee to the city of Quebec the prolongation of the Pacific Railway to Quebec Harbour."

Here is the answer given by Sir John A. Macdonald to these two requests:

"1st. The Government will have no objection to grant $12,000 per mile on the road between Ottawa and Montreal.

"2nd. Although the road beetween Quebec and Montreal does not form part of the Pacific, $12,000 per mile will also be granted on this part of the Q. M. O. & O. Railway with the understanding that if the Government should so desire they may take $6,000 out of this, to aid the Pacific either to buy the Northern Railway or to construct another line."

Another journal, also an influential organ of the Conservative Party and of the Government, *Le Canadien*, has made revelations still more definite in its issue of the 4th of March. It says:

"On the 5th of February. Sir John A. Macdonald put on the Order of the Day a motion for the purpose of giving precedence to the debate on the Pacific Resolutions, which in other words implied that he intended to press the vote.

On the 6th, Messrs. Ouimet, Amyot and Houde were appointed by the Conservative members of the Province of Quebec to notify Sir Hector Langevin that they objected to the steps taken by the First Minister, and that before voting on the Pacific question, they intended to bring before Parliament the question of the readjustment of the subsidy.

"Sir John had to give way, and the question of the subsidy was discussed by Messrs. Ouimet, Amyot and Landry.

"Sir John did not have the courteousness to answer to the claims of a Province which has kept him in power for more than a quarter of a century.

"Our friends understood what his silence meant: they had made this move in order to find out the intentions of the chief of the Cabinet; they knew what these intentions were and governed themselves accordingly."

"The Ministers from Quebec went to the Capital; Mr. Ross' memorial was presented. It was understood that a position would be taken before the vote on the refunding of the $12,000 per mile for the construction of the Northern Railway and on the terminus at Quebec. Sir John was obliged to give way on the first point, and on the second he made promises of which the members of our district declared themselves satisfied.

"It is an undoubted fact that Sir John was very near being overthrown, and that ifhe had not given us a beginning of justice, he would not be in power to-day."

What was then a beginning of justice has now become, I suppose, complete justice. Such is the origin of the Resolutions now before the House. On a question like this, it is useless to delude one's self and it is better to take the position as it is than try to disguise it. From the standpoint I have taken, I am not to examine whether the claims of the Province of Quebec are just or unjust.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) This is a question to be decided by the hon. members opposite, but if it is admitted that they are just, it is strange, to say the least, that the Government should not have done justice, except under the pressure of their own supporters. Neither is it for me to characterize the conduct of my colleagues from the Province of Quebec on this question. In my humble opinion they have committed a fault in this circumstance. It is always a fault, I think, on the part of a minority—and we are a minority in this House—in any legislative assembly to attempt to throw obstacles in the way of a Government in order to force them to do a thing against their will. According to my humble way of thinking, all questions coming before this House must be decided simply according to justice, equity and fairness. If the Pacific Resolutions were just and reasonable, it was

the duty of the members to adopt them, if they were unjust and unreasonable, it was their duty to object to them. However, I think that if there is in the Dominion, a body of men who should always adhere to the principles of justice, it is the Quebec contingent in this House. I ask no favour; for my part I have often thought and I have often represented, that the peculiar position held in Confederation by our Province was put in jeopardy by the frequent encroachments of the Federal Governments on the rights which belong to the Province. But it would also be at least dangerous for the Province to accept favours which it would not be willing to grant to other Provinces having just as much right to them as Quebec has. In my opinion, the position which we of the Province of Quebec should take on this question, as on all other questions, should be, to be always ready to give justice to other Provinces, justice equal to that which we demand for ourselves, and what is proposed by the amendment of the hon. member for Durham is nothing but equal justice to all.

Mr. GIROUARD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In consequence of the discussion which took place to-day with reference to the Bill which was passed by this House, amended by the Senate, and returned to the Senate, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway, after the remarks made by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and also by my hon. friend from Victoria, and by the hon. member for West Durham, and the opinions expressed by them as to the effect of the amendment, in which, after due consideration, I concur, it must be understood, I think, that those amendments were more than verbal. Under the circumstances, I think the matter must be reconsidered. I find a precedent which arose in 1865, in a similar case, and I will read the Resolutions which were passed on the 16th September, 1865:

"On motion of Mr. Currier, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Dorion,

"Ordered, That the entry in the Journals of this House, of the 12th September instant, in respect to the consideration of the amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled 'An Act to incorporate the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company,' be now read;

"And the same being read,

"Ordered, That the said proceedings be declared null and void;

"Resolved, That a message be sent to the hon. the Legislative Council, informing their Honours that the amendments made by them to the Bill sent up from this House, intituled: 'An Act to incorporate the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company,' were concurred in by this House in error, and requesting that their Honours will return the Bill with the said amendments, in order that they may be reconsidered.

"Ordered, That Mr. Currier do carry the said Message to the Legislative Council."

In pursuance of that I move ——

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will move that on Monday. I want to consider it; we all want to consider it. I think it is a very grave step.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I give notice for Monday.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock, midnight) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS OF PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adoption of the last paragraph of the Eighth Report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament. He said: The report was adopted at a previous meeting of the House less the last paragraph, which was to the effect that the Committee recommended $50 additional per Session to the Sessional messengers in the Distribution Office. That portion was not adopted when the other portion was, because some misapprehension prevailed. It was thought that the proposal was to give the Sessional messengers $50 more than the other messengers were receiving. On enquiry it was found that this is simply to place them on the same footing as the other messengers of the House and to pay them the same amount.

Motion agreed to, and Report concurred in.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adoption of the Ninth Report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament. He said: This report recommends the printing of a number of documents, and also that a number of other documents be not printed. It also recommends the transferrence of the contract for the binding of the Journals and Sessional Papers. The contract was with Mr. A. Mortimer, who was compelled, owing to financial business difficulties, to assign. The Committee recommend that his son be given the contract; but they insisted before they would recommend its transferrence that a new deposit of $1,000 should be made by the new contractor, the other deposit being given up. The report also makes reference to a subject which has come before the House once or twice, namely, as to the distribution of the Journals and Sessional Papers to ex-members of Parliament. The Committee considered this matter very fully, and in view of the indefinite and considerable expense which would be involved they cannot recommend its adoption by the House. I have it in charge from those members of the Joint Committee who are members of this House to call attention to another matter which unfortunately could not appear in the report of the Joint Committee as it does not affect the other branch of Parliament, and that is the employment of additional assistance in connection with the Distribution Office. It appears that formerly during the recess of Parliament public documents were in the habit of being sent to the post office and there put up by the postmaster and his assistants and addressed to members. But last summer the postmaster discovered that it was not his duty to put up Sessional Papers in that way, and that they should be sent to the post office properly put up and addressed, and he declined to receive them otherwise. The result is that some additional assistance will have to be given to the Distribution Office; and you, Mr. Speaker, will have to give orders to the permanent messengers, who really have not a very great deal to do during recess, to answer Mr. Botterell's call and do any work that may be required. The messengers in the Distribution Office are employed in going messages between the Departments and the Distribution Office, and packing up papers for general distribution, to the press and other parties, and their time is fully occupied. I am quite aware it would be a very serious thing for you, Mr. Speaker, to instruct the messengers of the House to obey the orders of an officer of the Printing Committee, because I do not know what might be the consequences to the country if a messenger should do anything not strictly in the line of his duty as appointed by this House.

But at the same time if it were done, if the Constitution was strained to that extent, that a messenger would be compelled to perform duties of that kind, we might possibly save the expense of an additional messenger in the Distribution Office. The matter could not be made the subject of a formal report by the Committee, but I was asked by the Committee to make this statement on the floor of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Report concurred in.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to a report in *Hansard*, of a speech delivered in this House by an hon. gentleman on the 17th of March last. The speech, which was delivered to the people of this country, occupied some four hours in delivery, dealing with secret societies, and dealing with them in the masterly manner in which that hon. gentleman's felicitous command of language enabled him to deal with it. And, Sir, when he closed his speech I had the honour of addressing the House for a few moments, in which, I think, I said that he had attacked the Masonic and other secret societies. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's reply. But when I read the *Hansard* report, I found that he said—I presume he said it—the following:—

"I repudiate entirely that the language I used to-night had any reference whatever to the Masonic order."

Well, Sir, I think his speech had reference to it, if it had reference to anything.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman appears to be referring to a past debate.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is a question of accuracy,

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course it is referring to a past debate, but I understand that the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to bring out some matter touching the accuracy of the *Hansard* report. Is that it?

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is. The hon. gentleman need not be so restive. I can refer him to a case last Session in which he inveighed in somewhat warm terms against my hon. friend from Simcoe, and on exactly the same occasion as the present, namely, the speech on the Orange Bill, in which some words were left out, and the hon. member for West Durham took him to task in the following language, in closing his speech:

"It is worse than useless that we should have a publication, bearing the stamp of authority, issued as a correct report of our debates, from which important passages in the speeches of hon. members are either deliberately or accidently omitted."

Now the present discussion comes up in the same way, and on the same Bill, and I think I am strictly in order. I say, Sir, that the hon. gentleman rose to his feet and repudiated the idea that he meant the Masonic order. I did not hear him say so, and I think some other hon. members on this side did not hear his remark, or some reply would have been made. The hon. gentleman went on at great length——

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman is not impugning the accuracy of the *Hansard* report, but he is discussing the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please state his point.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am coming to that, but I have first to lay the foundation, to show why I have risen to my feet at all. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no one who takes up the time of this House in useless discussion——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman read the paragraph from *Hansard*.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will read it, and I say that the hon. gentleman's speech was reported in *Hansard*, and reported *verbatim et literatim*. *Hansard* has given his speech as he delivered it, and his speech declares that all secret societies——

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman please state, in a few words, in what respect the report is inaccurate.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman is a little bit restive, and he has published a letter. I do not wonder at it, because this is a sore point with him.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I do not blame him for being a little bit alarmed. The *Hansard* report of that speech, which I was trying to give without reading it, says:

"That is my general proposition with reference to secret societies. I believe it brings with it the possibility of evil."

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is not disputed.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I wonder what would suit the hon. gentleman?

Mr. MACKENZIE. The point of order is that the hon. gentleman should either show that something was not reported in *Hansard* which was said, or that something appeared in *Hansard* which was not said.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only reason the hon. gentleman can have for rising now, is to show that something was put in *Hansard* which should not have been put there, or that some change was made after the speech was reported.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think, Sir, I will manage to say what I intended to say.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will speak to that point.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will, and if it is necessary to move the adjournment of the House, I will do it, or get some other member to do it. I will now read from *Hansard* what the hon. gentleman said:

"That is my general proposition with reference to secret societies, a point on which, I dare say, as I said before, I am in a small minority."

And so on. Then he goes on:

"As we know professedly loyal societies have gone in days gone by—how far this may be the case you cannot determine; and, therefore, I say, that State recognition ought not to be given to secret societies. You cannot tell what sort of tyranny may not be exercised by them. It is in the nature of these societies to become tyrannical and despotic. Openness and public discussion are the great guarantees of order, freedom, fairness and moderation. It is in private gatherings of men, all of one turn, all of one thought, all of one opinion, that bitterness and misrepresentation and malignity revel and hold high carnival."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. What is the point of order?

Mr. BLAKE. I understand you, Sir, to have ruled that the hon. gentleman cannot on this occasion refer to a past debate except simply in this sense and to this extent: that he should point out that an error had been made in the report of *Hansard*. I think it is the first duty of the hon. gentleman to say what the error is, and to point it out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think he can go a little further. He can state that the report of the *Hansard* has been impugned on authority, and he can show that the *Hansard* is right, and the authority which impugned it is wrong.

Mr. BLAKE. No, *Hansard* speaks for itself.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand there is a question of privilege, and the hon. gentleman can only impugn the accuracy of the report by showing that something has been put in which should not have been put in, or that something was omitted which was said. I think the hon. gentleman should state his point, and then I will rule upon it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Let the hon. gentleman state his point.

Mr. WOODWORTH. My point? I can understand the hon. member for L'Islet for he did the same thing last Session which I am doing now. I intend to say that the hon. member for West Durham has by a letter to the *Globe* newspaper, over his own signature impugned the accuracy of the *Hansard* reporters, and has declared that they are entirely wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER. I really do not think that that, which is a matter outside of Parliament, can be made a question of privilege. An hon. member may make a different statement of what he has said, but the Official Report is for the purpose of showing accurately what he said in Parliament, and it must stand on itself.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You cannot do that.

Mr. WOODWORTH. In doing so I wish to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been decided in England that an hon. gentleman cannot allude to a matter in an irregular manner, under cover of a motion of that kind; he cannot, for instance, refer to a past debate. If the hon. gentleman moves the adjournment of the House and then alludes to what appears in *Hansard*, that will be alluding to a past debate.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then I will allude to what took place, according to the *Globe* newspaper. I think Your Honour will permit me, in moving the adjournment of this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair; order, order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen opposite cry out because it is inconvenient to have this matter explained. They do not like to have it explained. It is exceedingly inconvenient.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is a pitiable object, Sir, to see the leader of the House defending disorder here.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am entirely within the judgment of the House; and you, Sir, as head of the House, have the right and privilege to direct how its debates shall be conducted. When you say I am out of order, I shall bow to your decision; but I want the point of order to be clearly stated, and your ruling upon it as clearly stated. I am now rising to speak on the motion for the adjournment of this House, and if, speaking to that motion, I say anything outside of what I am permitted to say on a motion of that kind, I am willing to be called to order, if the point of order is clearly stated. I wish to state, then, on that motion, that on the 17th of March last, the hon. member for West Durham made a speech of some three or four hours length in this House on the Orange Bill. He has been reported in *Hansard*, and I believe correctly reported——

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course it is for the House to say whether my ruling is right or not—I am only guided by what I find in the precedents in England in deciding that it is impossible for a member, under the cover of a motion to adjourn, to commit an irregularity by referring to a matter which it is irregular to refer to in any other way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I would like Your Honour to state where that decision in England is.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is irregular to anticipate any question which is on the Order Paper by referring to it, and it is irregular to refer to a past debate. Both are irregularities. May lays it down that a member cannot, under cover of a motion for adjournment, discuss the subject of any Order of the Day that the House has appointed another time for the consideration of; nor can he discuss in advance any motion of which notice has been given, because it is irregular to anticipate the discussion upon it. May says:

"On a member proceeding to advert to a Bill in anticipation of its consideration, the Speaker interposed and stated that it was highly irregular to anticipate the discussion of the order of the day, more particularly as the hon. member had a motion on the paper for the postponement of the Bill."

If it was an irregularity to anticipate the discussion, it was also irregular to refer to a past debate; and I take it that on these grounds an hon. gentleman cannot commit an irregularity under the cover of a motion to adjourn.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Well, I am not anticipating.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is out of order to refer to a past debate,

Mr. WOODWORTH. Well, I will do something else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will say this to the hon. members—that if that game is commenced, they will not hear one of themselves, unless it is the leader of the Opposition, this Session. I am reading a letter from the *Globe* newspaper, addressed by the Hon. Edward Blake, to J. B. King, Esq., Grand Section, Grand Lodge of Ontario, Independent Order of Oddfellows:

"DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged by your letter of the 26th inst., in which you make some enquiries (very natural in view of the misrepresentations which have been circulated) as to the bearing of my recent remarks on secret societies. The most satisfactory reply which I can make is to enclose you (as I do herewith) a print of my speech——"

He does not say from *Hansard*—

"From which you will see what I did in fact say, and the connection in which my different remarks were made. You will observe that, speaking in the first place, of secret benevolent societies, such as that of which you are a member, I used the following language:—

"'I have never joined one, though many of my best friends are members of secret societies, which are, as this professes to be, benevolent—secret societies that do not meddle with political topics—secret societies whose real action, so far as one of the public can know, is not inconsistent with or does not go beyond the avowed purposes of their association. But I believe the tendency of secrecy itself to be injurious. I believe that it brings with it the possibility of evil; I believe that it involves a certain amount of sacrifice of individuality and independence, and gives very great facilities for the misleading of members by designing leaders—very great and mischievous facilities for that purpose. That is my general proposition, with reference to secret oath-bound societies, a point on which I dare say, as I said before, I am in a small minority; for I suppose the vast bulk of at least the Protestant members of this House belong to one or other of those societies; and I do not wish to be understood as saying that these mischievous tendencies are carried out in many of those societies, the operations of which, as far as I know, are beneficial.'"

Now, Sir, if the hon. member delivered that speech last year, I can refer to it. I can say that I was in this House last year, and no such words were uttered by the hon. member for West Durham, and they are not in the *Hansard* to-day. You will find the words "secret societies," but the words "oath-bound" he did not use, and the words "oath-bound" are not in the *Hansard*. The hon. member in his letter goes on to say:

"I then proceeded to refer to secret societies of a very different class, of which I gave as an instance, 'the Ribbon Society,' 'the Phœnix Society,' 'the Fenian Society,' and pointed out the great evils which had resulted from their existence. You will see that it is after having discussed the evils which had arisen from this latter class of secret societies, and exclusively with reference to quasi-political societies that I used the following language:—

"'But we have no right, because we have no necessity, to engage for these purposes in secret societies which, as I have indicated, have often been the fruitful mothers of malignity, misrepresentation and bigotry.'"

If I can point to a speech the hon. gentleman made in this House, not this Session, for I am not infringing the rule by discussing a past debate, as I would be referring to this Session—but if I can show you he did make a speech in this House during one of its sittings, and in it did not use the words: "Have often been the fruitful mothers of

malignity, misrepresentation and bigotry," and if I can show you he has published a letter in which he has declared, over his own signature that he did use these words, that what he stated in this House was "that they have often been" thereby inferring that sometimes they have not been, "the fruitful mothers of malignity, misrepresentation and bigotry"—I can point to a statement made over the hon. gentleman's own signature, as to what he said which is not a correct statement of what he did say; I can point to a statement as clearly incorrect as if, in the case of the verdict of a jury finding a man not guilty of murder, the hon. member for Durham, in refering afterwards to that verdict, said the jury came in with a verdict of "guilty" leaving out the word "not" which makes a sad difference to the man tried. When I can point out that he has published a letter to the Grand Master of the Independent Order of Oddfellows in which he declares he used in this House the words: "Oath-bound secret societies"—he did not use the words "oath-bound"—"have often been"—he did not use the words "have often been" but said *are*—"the fruitful mothers of malignity misrepresentation and bigotry," I can point to a case in which the leader of a great party who, for four hours, delivered a studied phillipic against all secret societies—he did not exclude one—and then, over his own signature, eliminates the whole pith and germ and sting of his speech, after sending out tens of thousands of copies of it through the country. When the hon. member for West Simcoe was taken to task by the hon. member for West Durham in precisely the same manner as that in which I have risen to take the hon. gentleman himself to task to-day, no one objected to his doing so, and the hon. member for West Simcoe defended himself as he knows how to defend himself; but when I take the same course, I am met with opposition on a point of order and have to take another course in order to bring to the notice of this House the fact that the hon. member for West Durham, in reply to a letter which was written to him evidently for the purpose of drawing forth the reply, sought to explain away the statement he made in this House by telling the Independent Order of Oddfellows that, not being "oath-bound," they were not included in his denunciation of secret societies—although the term "oath-bound" is not to be found in the statement referred to. I say that although the words may seem immaterial, yet if he had delivered the speech in this House he said he did, he would not have got the encomiums from certain hon. gentlemen that occupy an independent position in this House that he did get. Had he delivered the speech which he declares in this newspaper, over his own signature, he delivered, he would have not got credit from hon. gentlemen here who do not believe in secret societies; but finding the shoe was pinching the Masons, the Grangers, the Templars, the Oddfellows, he writes a letter in which he gives an incorrect version of what he did say, in which he declares that *Hansard* has not reported him correctly, and yet we all know that *Hansard* has reported him, word for word; and when I take five minutes to bring to the notice of the House this flagrant violation of its privileges, I am met by cries of opposition. I do not think I have been treated by the hon. gentleman in the way we have always treated him; we have always listened to him with the attention that becomes hon. gentlemen in discussions with one another, and I do not think it will add to the courtesy of our debates hereafter to know that when an hon. member rises for the purpose of bringing to the notice of the House that which every hon. member is interested in, we are to be governed by blind party zeal and not by calm reason; and it must be acknowledged that every hon. member is interested in knowing whether the hon. member for West Durham said the words ascribed to him by *Hansard* or whether he used the language he claims, in a public letter over his own signature, to have used. I have brought this to the attention of the House because I have been met by the statement that the hon. gentleman, in his speech, did not refer to the Masonic society, when we all know that his whole speech meant nothing at all if he did not include that society in his denunciation of secret societies.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to say that the words which are stated in the letter which the hon. gentleman has read to have been used by me in this House are the words I used in this House.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I withdraw my motion.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Motion withdrawn.

NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

Mr. SMALL movedt the second reading of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 57) respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The alterations consist in the elimination of a large portion of the Bill and they leave intact two clauses.

Mr. MACKENZIE If the amendments are important, they must go to the Railway Committee.

Mr. SMALL. The Senate appear to have struck out all the clauses in reference to the consolidating of the debenture stock of the company, and the issuing of terminal bonds. They have simply left in clauses 5 and 6. By the fifth clause, it is provided:

"If the directors of the company may enter into any agreement with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company for the payment during the term of the joint working agreement between the two companies, or any extension thereof, by the joint executive committee appointed thereunder, out of the net earnings of the respective companies, of the interest on the bonds or debenture stocks of the respective companies, not existing or hereafter created and issued according to their respective priorities."

The sixth clause gives the company power,

"The Northern Pacific Junction Railway Company shall undertake the construction of the line between Gravenhurst and a point of junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Government shall grant to the said company the subsidy provided for in that line, alone or jointly with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, to acquire and hold in the name of such company or companies, or in the name of trustees, capital stock in the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company to such amount as shall be approved by the Governor in Council, and such trustees shall have and may exercise all the rights of ordinary shareholders."

And another clause reduces the number of directors to no less than seven, of whom four shall constitute a quorum. These are the amendments made in the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon gentleman state the clauses which have been eliminated?

Mr. SMALL The clauses relating to consolidating the bonds, the debenture or preference stock of the company, and issuing new preference stock or bonds. All these have been eliminated from the Bill. Only the 5th and 6th clauses have been left in.

Mr. MITCHELL. How many clauses have been struck out?

Mr. SMALL. Only the 5th, 6th, 8th and 9th are left in.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There was one very important clause put into this Bill in the Railway Committee, as to the result of an amalgamation of this company with the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway. It was put into the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company's Bill and afterwards into this Bill. It provided that, in the event of an amalgamation of this company with either of those companies, there should be an absolute forfeiture by them of the Gravenhurst Branch. It was not in

the Bill as introduced, but was inserted by the Railway Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that struck out?

Mr. WHITE. It was ordered to be put in by the Committee; there is no doubt about that. It was agreed upon as to the Hamilton and North-Western Bill, and this came on immediately afterwards, and it was agreed that this provision should be put in. If it came down to the House without that clause, it did not come as ordered by the Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. This Bill, as amended by the Senate, appears to have eliminated from it all clauses with regard to consolidation of the debt, and also as to an agreement with the the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company. That is struck out. There are but two clauses left, and they are quite independent of those which have been eliminated. The two clauses left provide that this company may acquire stock as stockholders in the Gravenhurst and Callander Junction road. That is all that is left. It is quite independent of what is left out. They have abandoned, in point of fact, the principal part of the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think it is unfortunate that the Bill, as it has now come from the Senate, was not printed and distributed. I do not wish to delay the Bill, but we ought to have that in some way before us.

Mr. BLAKE. Which are the clauses which are left?

Mr. McCARTHY. The 5th and 6th clauses. They are not in the Bill as introduced.

Mr. BLAKE. Then nothing of the Bill as originally introduced is left?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, nothing at all; but the two clauses that are left were assented to by the Railway Committee, though they are not in the Bill as printed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I cannot refer to the Bill at all, because it has never been printed. I would suggest that the best plan would be to get it struck off to-day, and so give us an opportunity of seeing it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that:

"When any Private Bill is returned from the Senate with amendments, the same not being merely verbal or unimportant, such amendments are, previous to the second reading, referred to the Standing Committee to which such Bill was originally referred."

Mr. BLAKE. The question is whether the amendments are unimportant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think these would be covered by the term substantial amendments. The Bill, as it went up from the Railway Committee, as I am advised, contained a large number of provisions which the Senate had struck out, but the clauses which were left in were assented to by the Railway Committee. I am afraid it would be impossible to get a meeting of the Railway Committee, and, if the Bill were printed as suggested by the member for East York, it could be compared with the Bill as if it came from the Railway Committee. Although the Senate have eliminated a number of provisions, they do not change the intention of this House, in reference to those clauses which are left in.

Mr. BLAKE. But they may have very seriously changed the intention of this House by eliminating the clauses which have been eliminated. The clauses which have been left may themselves be unaffected by the others, but the elimination of the others may very materially affect the whole Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill, as it passed this House, contained certain clauses at the request of the Northern Railway Company, giving them additional power for the issue of bonds, debentures and preference stock. They asked that for their own purpose. They also asked that the Committee might agree with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company to extend the duration of their agreement. That was for their own purpose also. They have abandoned that. All their request to issue additional bonds and debentures is struck out. Of course they had a right to do that. They asked it as a favour and have abandoned that. Then they asked for leave to make an extended agreement with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company. They have abandoned that. So it is as if this had never been asked for. The first of the two clauses which remain is:

"The directors of the company may enter into any agreement with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company for the payment, during the term of the joint working agreement between the two companies, or any extension thereof, by the Joint Executive Committee appointed thereunder, out of the net earnings of the respective companies, of the interest on the bonds or debenture stocks of the respectives companies, not existing or hereafter created and issued, and according to their respective priorities."

That clause has no reference to the additional powers asked for to issue debentures or in reference to the agreement with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company. That was adopted by the Railway Committee, and approved by this House. The next clause is:

"The company may, if the Northern Pacific Junction Railway Company shall undertake the construction of the line between Gravenhurst and a point of junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government shall grant to the said company the subsidy provided for in aid of that line, alone or jointly with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, acquire and hold in the name of such company or companies, or in the name of trustees, capital stock in the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company to such amount as shall be approved by the Governor in Council, and such trustees shall have and may exercise all the rights of ordinary shareholders."

That clause has no connection with the other clauses, which the company have voluntarily abandoned. The 3rd clause is in the original Act:

"The company may, by by-law, from time to time, to be passed at any special meeting to be called for the purpose, reduce the number of elected directors to a number not less than seven, of whom four shall constitute a quorum."

That was passed here. The 4th clause is:

"This Act may be cited as 'The Northern Railway Act, 1884.'"

So the two sections I have read, giving them substantial powers, and the two last clauses and the title of the Act, are all that remains of the original Bill, the rest being abandoned by the company, and having no connection with the enacting clauses.

Mr. BLAKE. And no part of the clauses now eliminated were in any way restrictive of their powers? The member for Cardwell said something of a clause which was inserted. Has that no bearing on the present clauses?

Mr. McCARTHY. No bearing at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree in the general proposition that if the company asks six or seven things which are considered for their benefit and then consent that three or four of them should be struck out, I think that the latter could hardly be called important.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The preamble remains the same, does it not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no preamble.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The point raised is not touched in this matter at all. It seems to me the clauses which remain in this Bill authorizes the company to become owners of the Gravenhurst Branch by becoming stockholders in it. When we discussed this question before I gave notice in the House that I would move to insert a clause preventing the possibility of an amalgamation of either the Northern or North-Western, or both combined, by either the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as a result the Bill was referred back to the Committee

on Railways, to discuss it. We are giving to day $12,000 a mile to the Gravenhurst Branch upon the distinct understanding that it shall always be an independent line. When the matter came before the Railway Committee on the Hamilton and North-Western Bill it was agreed that the clause of which I had given notice should not go in, but instead of that it was agreed that a clause should be put in, or words be put in, which would forfeit absolutely the Gravenhurst Branch to the Government in the event of amalgamation at any time taking place; and then when this Bill we have before us now, came up, it was agreed that the same clause should be put into it; and I presumed that that clause had been added when it came down here. The clauses now proposed are precisely the clauses that would effect that object, because they authorize the Northern to become possessors of the Gravenhurst Branch, and inasmuch as the Northern to-day have powers of amalgamation in the existing charter. After we have given $12,000 a mile to build the Gravenhurst Branch, instead of $6,000, we may find this Northern Railway with that extension united either with the Canadian Pacific Railway or with the Grand Trunk Railway. It seems to me that some mistake has occurred, at any rate, in bringing this Bill down from the Railway Committee. The clause was not put in but, as is very commonly done, the simple statement was made that a similar clause should be put into that which was put in the Hamilton and North-Western Bill, a clause forfeiting absolutely the Gravenhurst Branch to the Government in the event of amalgamation of either the Northern or the North-Western with the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say with reference to this matter that I stated to the Committee that it was the intention of the Government to provide in any agreement made with the company for the construction of the Gravenhurst Branch, that in case the Northern and North-Western railways became amalgamated the road would be forfeited to the Government upon the Government paying the amount the road had cost, not to exceed a certain sum to be estimated by the Chief Engineer. That is the statement I made. Some hon. gentlemen in the Committee took exception to that proposal, and said that we ought to forfeit it without any payment outside of the $12,000 per mile. Mr. Boulton was present and acting for the Northern Railway, and he said they had no intention of forfeiting their charter, and consequently did not object to that proposal, and that was the impression upon the minds of the Committee when the clause passed. Mr. Parker and the gentleman connected with the Northern Railway proposed to make an arrangement for the construction of the Gravenhurst Branch, and upon learning Mr. Boulton's statement they declared it was quite unauthorized by them, that he was entirely mistaken as to the position of things, and that it would be utterly impossible to construct the Gravenhurst Branch with an arrangement of that kind. I said then if that is the case, this Bill having passed the Committee with that understanding and with that statement on my part, no arrangements can be made unless that contract is made in Committee and laid upon the Table of the House and subject to the disapproval of the House; and that is the position in which the question stands at this moment. I take the earliest opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the fact that the proposal forfeiting the railway absolutely in case of the road losing its independence, would render it entirely impracticable for them to build it, and as I said before, the only means for getting over that difficulty is to have that contract made and submitted to Parliament to take such action as it sees fit.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it a fact that that particular clause was put into the North-Western Railway Company's Bill?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell)

Mr. McCARTHY. I am in a position to say that it is not so. I was informed by the Minister of Railways that the clause was in both Bills, and I went to the Senate to see the Bills, and found they are exactly the same in that respect—the 5th and 6th clauses in this Bill are exactly the same as in the North-Western Bill. I may say it does not appear to me possible that that clause could be put in. It is a mere enabling clause to permit these railway companies to acquire an interest by stock in the road, and the Government must protect the independence of the Canada branch in the contract.

Mr. BLAKE. The whole question is under the control of this Parliament, and if Parliament insists upon particular terms in granting a subsidy to a particular line, then Parliament can reject the hon. gentleman's proposal or modify it. If at this stage it is found impossible to carry out what he and others thought would be good policy at the time, and he lays upon the Table a different proposal not containing the guarantees which were understood to be assented to, he will accompany that, no doubt, with a statement of the reasons why he has altered his view, and he will invite the House to assent to that modified proposal. We will have the whole before us to say nay or yea to it—and, of course, we will say yea to it.

Mr. SPROULE. As one of the members of that Railway Committee I distinctly understood that some such clause was to be put in the Bill, providing that if amalgamation took place the Hamilton and North-Western Company building this road should forfeit to the Government whatever work they had done. If that had not been the understanding the Committee would have rejected the Bill.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

THE NIAGARA FRONTIER BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria), in moving that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company be concurred in, said: The only amendment that may be for a moment considered important in that Bill which was made by the Senate, is the limitation of the time for the commencement of the work from three to two years—they substitute two for three.

Amendments concurred in.

THE SCOTT ACT.

Mr. TUPPER enquired, Whether the view of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, having decided the Scott Act not to be in force in many counties in Nova Scotia, and the recent legislation introduced to amend the said Act, is it the intention of the Government to make any provision to indemnify those parties who have incurred expense in the said counties of applying for licenses under the provisions of the McCarthy Act in consequence of the Scott Act being inoperative?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid it is impossible for the Government to answer this question until they know the fate of the recent legislation introduced.

INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY SOUND.

Mr. COOK enquired, Whether the Government are aware that the present Indian Agent at Parry Sound, Dr. Walton, keeps a dry goods, provision, drug and seed store, in violation of the regulations governing such officials?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government are not aware that Dr. Walton acts in violation of the regulations governing such officials. All I can say is that Dr. Walton stated, when he was appointed, that he did not

keep a store of any kind. His appointment is dated 1st April.

FRENCH REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE.

Mr. TASSE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take advantage of vacancies which may occur to give to the French element a representation in the Senate proportionate to its numbers? And whether it is the intention of the Government to give the 102,000 French Canadians living in the Province of Ontario a representative in the Senate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that the intention of the Government is to make the best selection they can of Senators, and they will in making such selection have due regard to the number of French Canadians in the Province of Ontario.

THE SCOTT ACT IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. TUPPER enquired, Whether the Government intends to provide for indemnifying parties who have prosecuted in good faith, under the provisions of the Scott Act, in counties in Nova Scotia where the said Act was proclaimed to be in force, but where, according to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, the Act has been declared inoperative?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have not made up their minds to provide for indemnifying such parties.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL O'MALLEY.

Mr. VAIL, in the absence of Mr. WILSON, enquired, Whether any charges have been preferred against Lieut.-Col. O'Malley, of the 25th Battalion of Ontario? If so, when were they made, and what were the charges? Was Lieut.-Col. O'Malley suspended by the Government on account of those charges, if so, when? Has an investigation taken place into those charges? If not, why not? And is it the intention of the Government to do so, and when?

Mr. CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I desire to say that charges have been preferred against Lieut.-Col. O'Malley. That officer has been suspended. Pending the investigation of the charges, and until a result is obtained, it would not be in accordance with the regulations of the service to make public any details connected with the case.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the investigation taken place?

Mr. CARON. It is going on.

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that on Wednesday next Government Measures have precedence after Routine Proceedings and Questions.

Motion agreed to.

THE JUDICIARY OF MANITOBA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on Resolution (page 1478) to provide for the salary of an additional Puisné Judge of the Queen's Bench, in the Province of Manitoba, be received.

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

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 146) to provide for the salary and travelling allowances of an additional Puisné Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Manitoba.

Bill read the first time.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for the second reading of the Resolution (page 1444) reported from Committee of the Whole respecting subsidies to certain railway companies of Canada, and the motion of Mr. Blake in amendment thereto.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, in offering a few remarks in answer to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), I hope the hon. gentleman and the French members of this House will pardon me for not using the French language. I will use the language of the majority of this House, considering that they are as much interested as ourselves in the present debate. Sir, I listened with much attention to the speech of the hon. member for Quebec East; in fact, the members on this side of the House always listen to his speeches with interest and respect. I am sorry, however, to say that on the present occasion I listened to his speech with regret and with disappointment. I was surprised to hear the hon. member declare publicly from his seat that the Province of Quebec had no special claim to the indemnity which is embodied in the resolution under consideration, and that the indemnity had been finally admitted by the Government in consideration of the votes of the French members on the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions. Reference has been made to a caucus of the French members of Quebec—to a little Parliament of their own, to use the expression of the leader of the Opposition, which was held in Room 8 of this building. I know not what took place in that little Parliament, not having had the honour of a seat in it. I presume there was no official report of the proceedings, and we know what weight to attach to newspaper reports of the proceedings of any Parliament. As a member from the Province of Quebec I was in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions upon their merits, upon public grounds, and in the general interest of the country at large. I was not in the least influenced by any consideration that the Province of Quebec was to receive one farthing from the Government of this country. But, Mr. Speaker, even if I had exacted from the Government as a condition *sine qua non*, a promise that the Quebec claims, or what is known as the Quebec claims, would receive favourable consideration, where would be the wrong? Is it wrong for a creditor, from whom a further advance of money is asked, to put the question, how the money due him already is going to be refunded? The claims of the Province of Quebec were a portion of the policy of the Government in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the money was due to the Province I fail to see that the members were guilty of such a grave mistake or fault as has been represented by the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). So far as I was concerned, I did not think any promise was necessary from the Government. I had confidence in the fairness of the present Government and that was the reason why I was willing, as I am always willing, to vote on any question which comes before the House, on its merits. I believe I was right in holding that opinion, as shown by the facts since that time. Did not the present Government grant to the Province of Quebec more than was supposed to have been promised at the French caucus? Did not the present Government grant a good deal more to the Province of Quebec in the adjustment of the interest account on the debts between the Provinces, although no promise was made in that respect? But, Mr. Speaker, what was the nature of the promise which was made? Was it of a nature to do harm to any Province? Was this Government going to give away anything which belongs to any of the other Provinces? Were they going to give any undue advantage to Quebec over the other Provinces? No, Mr. Speaker, nothing of the kind. From the reports in *Le Canadien*, *La Minerve* and *Le Monde*

which were read by the member for Quebec East last Saturday, it would appear that in the first place a change of the Provincial subsidy was advocated by some French members. Mr. Speaker, it is admitted I believe that this change was not promised. It is admitted all round that the Government was not willing to touch the basis, the foundation, of the Provincial subsidy, because all the Provinces were not represented. What was promised was purely and simply, it appears—if we are going to pay any attention to the reports of the newspapers—the payment of the railway subsidy. Why was it so promised? Because that road was a portion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Was this claim an extraordinary one? We have heard a good deal about the bad administration of public affairs in the Province of Quebec. We have also heard a good deal about the good and wise administration of public affairs in that Province. I believe, Sir, this is not a question of administration of Provincial affairs. Whether those affairs were badly or wrongly administered or not, has nothing to do with the foundation of the claim now before the House. Even if Quebec had to-day a surplus to its credit in the Provincial Treasury, she would still be entitled to the indemnity mentioned in the Railway Resolutions, for the simple reason that the road between Ottawa and Quebec is a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The claim, Sir, of the Province of Quebec is based on a public Statute of Canada. That Statute was passed in 1874, at the time when hon. gentlemen opposite were governing this country. That Statute says:

"The Governor in Council may also grant such bonus or bonuses, subsidy or subsidies, to any company or companies already incorporated or to be hereafter incorporated, not exceeding $12,000 per mile, as will secure the construction of branch lines extending from the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway to connect with existing lines of railway."

The Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, otherwise known as the Quebec Government Railway was not then in existence—I refer to the year 1874. It was then in contemplation, or was at the beginning of its construction; but it was more than a branch line. It was the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway—it was the most direct route to the summer seaports of this country; and unless Quebec is to be less considered than a private railway company, I do not see how we could refuse Quebec the $12,000 per mile for constructing a portion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when we see that same bonus granted by the laws of this country, in favour of a private company willing to build only the branch line. Is it not also a fact that in 1878 a further subsidy was granted to the Canada Central, from Lake Nipissing to Pembroke, as an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Did the Government at that time exact that the Canada Central should be sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway? No, Sir; the only thing exacted was that running powers should be reserved or stipulated in favour of the Government and the lessees of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And some others.

Mr. GIROUARD. What others?

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Kingston and Pembroke, and another which might be mentioned.

Mr. GIROUARD. What others?

Mr. MACKENZIE. There were others.

Mr. GIROUARD. No running powers except in favour of the Government and the lessee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; there were others.

Mr. GIROUARD. Whether there were or not would not make any difference to my position, which was that a certain amount was to be granted in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, what is the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day, with regard to what is known as the Quebec Government road? It has acquired the western section from Ottawa to Montreal, which is to-day its eastern extension. It has acquired traffic arrangements between Montreal and Quebec, which arrangements have been secured to the Canadian Pacific Railway under its deed of purchase of the western section. More than that; under its deed of purchase, no company, not even the Grand Trunk Railway Company to-day, can have any advantage over the Canadian Pacific Railway for the section between Montreal and Quebec. I believe these traffic arrangements which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have secured over the eastern section of the Quebec road are equivalent to running powers; and, as I said before, if the Canada Central was entitled to $12,000 a mile for extending the Canadian Pacific to Pembroke, I do not see why the Quebec Government is not entitled to $12,000 a mile for building the road from Montreal to Quebec, considering that traffic arrangements equivalent to running powers have been secured to the Canadian Pacific Railway. In a letter which has lately been addressed by Mr. Hickson to the hon. Minister of Public Works, which I find printed in the public press, and which I believe has been laid on the Table of this House, I read:

"You are, no doubt, aware that in the agreement for the sale of the western section of the Quebec line to the Pacific Company, it was stipulated that traffic should be carried over the North Shore line to and from the Pacific Railway, on terms which are mentioned in the deed. These conditions the North Shore Company have been and are quite willing to carry out, and I really do not see that there should be any difficulty in making such arrangements under this contract as would admit of the Pacific Company's traffic being transported satisfactorily over the North Shore Railway, that company, if they should desire to do so, performing their own terminal work in Montreal and Quebec. I would like also to add that in so far as the Grand Trunk Company are interested in the question, they are quite willing that running powers should be given to the Pacific Company for their through traffic over the North Shore line on terms which might mutually be agreed on, or in case of difficulty, settled by arbitration; there has been no desire on the part of the Grand Trunk Company to place difficulties in the way of the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Company reaching Quebec."

In answer to this letter, Mr. George Stephen, the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the 7th of April, instant, wrote:

"I shall be glad if in the future the terms of the agreement can be carried out. In that case, all through freight must be carried over both roads at rates to be fixed as established by the agreement, and arrangements must be made for the sale and for the shipment of freight at Quebec to points at or beyond Ottawa, exclusively *viâ* the Canadian Pacific. I quite agree with Mr. Hickson that if the arrangements are made and carried out in good faith the traffic of the company can be satisfactorily transported over the North Shore Railway to Quebec as its summer port. As regards Mr. Hickson's suggestion as to the running powers to Quebec, I must say that until our traffic is more fully developed, and connection is made at Quebec with the Intercolonial Railway so as to increase the value of the through traffic, such running powers would be of questionable value; indeed, I doubt if, without precipitation in the local traffic, any amount of competition in through traffic would make running powers desirable. If the provision of the existing contract, between the Government of Quebec and the company, relating to the interchange of the traffic, are carried out, the interests of the city of Quebec and of this company will be as well protected as by the concession of running powers."

Now, these traffic arrangements, great as they are, are under the immediate supervison and protection of the Minister of Railways; and if they are not used by the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day, it is certainly not the fault of the Province of Quebec, which has secured them to that road. The Province of Quebec should therefore get $12,000 a mile on the whole line. I hope that these traffic arrangements will be carried out in good faith between the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which owns the largest portion of the stock of the North Shore, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and if they are carried out, the $6,000 a mile which has been retained by the Government for the purpose of extending the Canadian Pacific from Montreal to Quebec, will be hereafter paid to the Province of Quebec, and thus will be completed the full indemnity to that Province for the construction of the Canadian Pacific from Ottawa to Quebec. In face of the Statute of 1874—in

face of the subsidy given to the Canada Central in 1878—in face of all these circumstances, we are told that the Province of Quebec has no special claim to the subsidy mentioned in the Resolution. The policy of this subsidy has been established, not only by the late Administration, but also by the present Administration. Did we not at this Session, and at a previous Session, grant to the Gravenhurst and Callander Railway Company a bonus of $12,000 a mile—$6,000 at the previous Session, and $6,000 at this Session—and for what purpose? Only to establish a branch line of the Canadian Pacific. For what purpose? For the purpose of putting the Province into direct communication with the Canadian Pacific Railroad and the West. Notwithstanding the great danger that exists that, through that branch line from Callander to Gravenhurst and Toronto, a considerable portion of the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be diverted to the ports of Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York, by way of the American lines which pass near the Suspension Bridge at a short distance from Toronto; and notwithstanding the fact that this line is less a national line than the line constructed by the Quebec Government from Ottawa to Quebec, it has received a bonus of $12,000 a mile; and yet we are told that the main line from Ottawa to Quebec deserves less consideration. A Bill came under the notice of this House at this very Session regarding the Northern and North-Western Railway Company—a company which I believe received in 1875 or 1876 the sum of $2,000,000, besides interest, from the Treasury of this Dominion, notwithstanding that at that time that railway could not be constituted even a branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, although to day it has become such. Have we not also provided at this very Session for the purchase of the Pictou Branch and of the Eastern Extension Railway in the Province of Nova Scotia at a cost of $1,250,000 for the purpose of extending the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway? The Resolution for the purchase of this Nova Scotia Government railway was laid on the Table of this House at the very time that the resolution on the Canadian Pacific Railway was being discussed. Did it occur to the mind of any hon. member that it was done in that way for the purpose of influencing the deputation from that Province. No; that did not occur even to the mind of the hon. member for Quebec East; he had to select the Province of Quebec as his point to make his insinuations of corruption. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in his speech on the amendment, has referred to the immense sacrifices which have been made by the various Provinces to promote railway interests, but the hon. gentleman forgot to state what everybody knows as having a great bearing on the consideration of the question before us—he forgot to mention that nearly 600 miles of railway have been built in the Province of Ontario by the Canadian Government; and with regard to these 600 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Arthur to Callander, I would ask is not Ontario going to benefit by the construction of that railway? Will it not open up a large territory of the Province of Ontario? Is not the construction of that railway going to open valuable timber limits belonging to that Province?—600 miles of railway entirely built by this Government, not only $12,000 a mile but the whole of it. In fact if Quebec were to get full justice, if she were to get that justice which has been given to Ontario, she should get the full cost of the construction of the Quebec road between Ottawa and Quebec. Looking to what has taken place in all the Provinces, I find that every railway expenditure, every local expenditure, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been or is about to be paid in whole or in part by this Government, and it is no doubt with the view that all the Provinces should be treated alike that the Government, by this very resolution, has granted a subsidy of $200,000 to build a short line between Montreal and the Maritime Provinces to secure an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Canadian winter ports. I think that all the Provinces have been equally treated; perhaps the one that has received the least is the Province of Quebec, but I hope that hereafter we shall have full justice. The other Provinces have no reason to be, and I am sure are not jealous of the Province of Quebec. As justice has been done to all, either before or during the present Session, if Quebec were left out as seems to be the wish of the hon. member for Quebec East, a gross injustice will be committed, an injustice condemned by the policy of the late Administration, as well as by the policy of the present one. The hon. member for Quebec East has referred to the motion made by his friends before the Legislative Assembly of Quebec in 1875, declaring that considering that the Government railway between Ottawa and Quebec was practically — the French expression is *virtuellement*—a portion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was but just that Federal aid should be asked. It would appear that the friends of my hon. friend for Quebec East were more patriotic than he was himself.

Mr. LAURIER. What were yours?

Mr. GIROUARD. I will come to that in a moment, and you, Mr. Speaker, will see the reason why they could not show their patriotism; but even in this case the friends of the hon. gentleman were not sincere, they were not serious. How did this motion come before the House? It came as an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, as a vote of non-confidence to defeat the Government. If the friends of my hon. friend were sincere, if they really desired that Quebec should receive aid from this Government, they would have made their motion at a more opportune time, but they did not do so; and in this respect they followed the policy of my hon friend and his political friends. My hon. friend was then not only a member of this House but a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. GIROUARD. If not, his political friends were in the Cabinet and he had as much power, as an influential member of that party, as had almost a Minister of the Crown. If the Liberals were so patriotic as they wanted to make it appear they were before the Quebec Assembly, why did not the hon. gentleman, who was not a member of the Cabinet and was therefore more free to act in the defence of his Province, not rise in Parliament to make the same motion his friends in Quebec had made? Why? Because he was no more patriotic than were his friends in Quebec. No, Sir, that satisfaction was not and could not be given by hon. gentlemen opposite to the Province of Quebec. Do hon. gentlemen want to know the reason why? The reason was because the Province of Quebec was Conservative, and we ought not to be surprised if it has become more Conservative, considering that Liberals like the hon. member for Quebec East have continued since that time to misrepresent that Province, and run it down. Do you want to have an idea of the tender feeling of the Government of those days towards the Province of Quebec, especially in connection with this railway? During the Session of 1878, at that very time when a subsidy of $12,000 a mile was granted to the Canada Central, the Hon. Mr. Tupper, now the Minister of Railways and Canals, moved, seconded by the hon. the then leader of the Opposition and now leader of this Government: "Whether any negotiation is pending as to the purchase of the Quebec Government road?" Here is the answer of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, then the leader of the Government: "All he had ever heard on the subject was a remark made by a Minister in the House of Assembly in Quebec. When the question was asked he gave as an answer that the Government of Quebec should make no

approach to the Federal Ministers until they were chased out of Parliament by whips and cords." Mr. Speaker, the General Elections took place about six months after that speech, and hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then on the Treasury Benches, were so badly whipped, and the cords were so strongly tied around them, that ever since they have not been able to leave their chairs on the other side of the House, they have not been able to cross the floor of the House. They were not only defeated, but they were chased out of Parliament by the voice of an indignant people. I will vote against the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and I will give the reasons why. I will vote against that motion because the question is not to consider the past local expenditure of the Provinces, but to consider whether the indemnity given to the Province of Quebec is connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the question was whether Quebec should be indemnified for her general expenditure on her local railways, which she has built or contributed to build in the Province, I could understand that the leader of the Opposition might have some reason to make that amendment; but the question is whether the Quebec Government road is a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I believe there cannot be two opinions upon that point. If the hon. gentleman or any of his friends beside him or behind him can quote a single instance of a railway, in any of the Provinces, built by the Provincial Government, which is to-day a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I for one, and I believe all the members from the Province of Quebec, and not only the Province of Quebec, but all the other Provinces—because we all wish to give fair play to everyone—will give a fair hearing to that case and give it a favourable decision. Now I may be permitted, in concluding, to make a few observations on what has been called the Provincial subsidy question. A change in the Provincial subsidy means a change in our Constitution. I for one am not willing to consider that question until all the Provinces ask for it. I hope, however, that the Legislature of Quebec especially—I am not referring to any other—will consider seriously the consequences of taking the course of asking for a change in the Provincial subsidy or in the Constitution. If the subsidy is changed, the door to changes of our Constitution is opened and remains widely open. To day that door may be open only to consider financial questions, but, when once it is open, you do not know whether it will not be open also for the purpose of touching upon rights more sacred than money. I hope that, with the aid which this Parliament is going to give to the Province of Quebec, there will be no necessity for that Province to ask for a change in the subsidy. But, even if it be found that that aid will be insufficient to meet the yearly financial deficit, I hope that other means will be adopted to come to the relief of that Province. Our people are not so much afraid of direct taxation as has been represented. Our people are in the habit, every year, of paying direct taxation in municipal affairs, and I believe we can educate our people to pay direct taxation to maintain Provincial institutions. Considering, also, that the Quebec Government has undertaken seriously the work of public retrenchment, I hope there will be no necessity for the Province to impose direct taxation or to come any more before this Parliament, except perhaps to get the $6,000 a mile which is kept to-day. But, if it is found necessary in the interests of Confederation that a change in Provincial subsidies should take place, I may tell hon. members of this House, no matter from what portion of the country they may come, no matter to what Province they belong, that the Province of Quebec will act in harmony with them in their common and joint interests, and also to the best advantage of the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. AUGER. I will not detain the House long, but I have a word to say, and that is in reference to what the hon.

the Secretary of State said the other day in speaking on this question and accusing this side of the House of being keyhole listeners. Now I deny the imputation. We are not spittoon scratchers; we are not men who sell the secrets of office for money, and we would have been foolish to listen through the keyholes, because all we had to do was to stand in our places and read what was going on in the faces of members on the other side of the House. I watched the countenances of the members of the Government at the time, and I could read there what was going on in Room No. 8. I never had much sympathy for the leader of the Government, I must confess, but on that memorable Tuesday I did feel for him; and I rather blamed his supporters for putting the screw on him so hard. I will not detain the House much longer. The question has been well discussed on both sides of the House. I rise to move, in amendment to the amendment, that the following words be added to those proposed by the amendment:—

And this House regrets that the Government has not seen fit to propose that, pending the expenditure of the sum of $960,000 reserved and provided for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, the interest thereon should be paid to the Government of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has accused me of having said in the House something which I did not say—or certainly never intended to say—namely, that members of this House on the other side have been listening at the keyholes of doors. I said that what had passed in that Committee might have been obtained through keyholes and telegraphed to some of the newspapers. I never intended alluding to the members of this House, but only to parties outside.

Mr. HOUDE. I suppose the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger) approves of the amendment offered by his leader, and makes his own amendment to complete the first one. It seems to me his sub-amendment is what we call in French a *comble*. What is the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition? It is, Sir, in effect, that we ought not to vote the amount which the Government propose to give to the Province of Quebec in connection with the construction of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HOUDE. Let me finish my sentence—unless the same compensation is given to other Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not the amendment.

Mr. HOUDE. That is the meaning it conveys, it amounts to the same thing; and the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford is that we ought not only to pay this subsidy, amounting in all to $3,354,000, but that we ought also to pay the interest on $960,000. Well, that is about what I suggested myself. I would not be opposed to that, only I find it rather inconsistent on the part of the hon. member for Shefford to propose that amendment, if he is going to vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. I would not have made any remark on this occasion, but that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has mentioned my name in connection with a paragraph in the *Canadien* which he read.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not mention your name; I read the paragraph.

Mr. HOUDE. It amounts to the same thing. I understood that the paragraph he read states that about ten or twelve days before the vote was taken on the Canadian Pacific Railway Resolutions, I went with the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), to interview the Minister of Public Works, and that we asked something of him—I do not remember exactly what the paper says it was—and that we threatened to oppose the Government if they did not com-

ply with our request. Sir, I did nothing of the kind on that day. When I believe that the Government is inclined to do injustice to any particular Province, I shall not take the trouble to go to the office of Ministers and threaten them with voting against the Government, I shall stand up in the House and tell them what I think. But if I do not remember exactly what the *Canadien* says we asked, I remember very well what we did ask. We did not ask anything, in reality; we only suggested that some members wanted to lay before the House on a certain day—I think it was on Thursday, according to the notice of motion given by the hon. member for Laval—the question of the readjustment of the Provincial subsidy, and that we would be glad if the leader of the Government would not press the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions to a vote until this question had been discussed in the House. At the same time we expressed a hope that considering there was a large surplus this year, the question of the indemnity to the Province of Quebec for the construction of the North Shore Railway would be taken into consideration this Session, and we further suggested that if the Government thought proper and were able to do so with the means at their disposal, they should subsidize colonization railways, and that we would prefer, as I briefly stated the other day, that they should subsidize a fewer number of railways but select the most important of them. That is what we said. About that time some one spoke to me of the article in the *Canadien*, and when I met the editor of that paper in the Russell House, I remarked to him that he had incorrectly reported what took place. The hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), and the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault) were present when I stated to the editor of the *Canadien* that he had incorrectly reported what took place. It has been asserted in the papers, and it has been hinted in this House, that the Quebec members had sold their votes on the Canadian Pacific Railway Resolutions. Well, Sir, we discussed those resolutions among ourselves, as we had a right to do, I suppose, and as the hon. members of the Opposition doubtless discussed them among themselves. For myself, I considered the reasons for and against the said resolutions, and I thought that those against them were the strongest, and I accordingly voted against them. But I must say that when the members from the Province of Quebec asked the opinion of the Government about certain questions affecting their Province, as has been done by members of almost all the other Provinces of the Dominion, I do not think that we ought to be accused of selling ourselves to the Government, as has been stated by certain hon. members and by certain newspapers. I was not bound at all to vote for the Government. I was not present when the hon. gentleman told us as far as he could, according to constitutional practice, what they proposed to do in connection with the question which interested the Province of Quebec. But the proof that the members from Quebec were not bound to vote for the resolutions is, that I for one voted against them, and in doing so I did not commit any breach of promise or honour, for if I had promised to vote for them, I would have kept my word. I did not bind myself, and I do not think any member bound himself—any member from the Province of Quebec. After the answer of the Government was known, it was understood that every man was left free to vote according to his convictions, and I suppose every hon. member so voted. It is known that members vote for measures to which they have objections, and even strong objections. I have voted several times in favour of measures against some of the details of which I had strong objections, but I so acted considering the whole measure, and not a part of them only. That is what was done in that case. I do not wish to appear to be ill-disposed towards the other Provinces. If the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Quebec East come here and state clearly the case of any Province of the Dominion which has not been treated with justice, I will unite with them in supporting a measure to treat that Province with justice. But to-day the leader of the Opposition—I do not mean to say that he denied the justice of the claims of the Province of Quebec, for I did not understand him to do so—having admitted, at least impliedly, the claim of the Province of Quebec in connection with this railway question—moved an amendment which sets forth that other Provinces will be treated with unfairness and injustice unless a money grant is paid them at the same time. The hon gentleman supported his argument by elaborate and cleverly prepared statistics, as he well knows how to do. But I must say that in my opinion at least, his statistics are not complete. He comes here and tells us that all the Provinces have paid about the same subsidies in aid of the construction of railways according to their population, and that Quebec has not paid more than other Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. I said Quebec had paid rather in excess.

Mr. HOUDE. The hon. gentleman stated, I think, that the excess was not great. I think the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Quebec East must also take into consideration what has been paid out of the Dominion Treasury to Provinces in connection with railway construction in the different Provinces. I have not had time to make my statistics as complete and accurate perhaps as are those of the leader of the Opposition; but they are at least approximately correct. And what do we find? It must be remembered that the money voted has not all been paid out, but I follow the same basis of argument in regard to all the Provinces. As early as 1874 we find that the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) proposed to subsidize the Canada Central Railway to the amount of $12,000 per mile. That resolution was ratified in 1878, if I remember rightly.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—and at the same time I may correct the hon. member for Jacques Cartier—I will say that on March 13th, 1875, the Government ratified an Order in Council granting a subsidy to the Canada Central Railway of $12,000 per mile for 120 miles, it being provided that the company should enter into an agreement to grant running powers on terms to be approved by the Governor in Council to the Northern Colonization Railway (that is the road from Montreal to Ottawa), the Kingston and Pembroke Railway and all such other companies as may be designated or approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. GIROUARD. I ask the hon. gentleman to read the Order in Council of 1878. That is the last one, and it is the one I have read. The grant was given in consequence of the Canadian Pacific Railway being extended eastward from Lake Nipissing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The route, according to this Order in Council, was defined generally as ascending the valley of the Bonnechère from the vicinity of the village of Douglas, *viâ* Golden Lake and Round Lake, thence by as direct a line as may be found to Burnt Lake, and thence to the proposed terminus of the Government railway at or about the 85th mile from the Georgian Bay. But it was deemed necessary to change the route in consequence of alleged difficulties met with in surveying the line, and the Order in Council of 1878 was passed in order to effect the change of route—not affecting, however, the original Order in Council in the least.

Mr. HOUDE. In 1880, under the present Government, that promise of a subsidy to the Canada Central was made good, and the Government undertook to pay that railway an amount of over $1,800,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. HOUDE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That was merely because the Government agreed to defer further payment for some time, the subsidy remaining the same, $1,440,000.

Mr. HOUDE. There is therefore an excess in my calculation of the difference between those sums. In 1881 we granted money to the Canadian Pacific Railway to build different sections, which were not under construction; and I may fairly assume that, if I state as a contribution by the Federal Treasury to the construction of the eastern section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has a length of over 600 miles in the Province of Ontario, north of Lake Superior from Callander to Port Arthur, at $3,500,000, it will be considered a very moderate amount. Before that time we had given to the Northern Railway over $1,800,000 beyond that. The hon. gentleman says it was not to help that railway, but it was the Government of his friends who gave that money to the Northern Railway Company to help them by affording them the means to continue to serve the local traffic in an important part of the Province of Ontario, and insuring to that Province competition against a monopoly by other roads. In 1882 we voted to the Gravenhurst and Callander line, $660,000. In 1883 we voted to the Napanee and Tamsworth line, $89,600. And in the same year to the Gravenhurst and Callander road a further sum of $660,000. By the resolutions before the House we propose to vote to the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, $160,000; to the Aylmer and Pembroke Railway, $272,000, of which amount, as that road runs between the two Provinces, I will assign one-third to Ontario and two-thirds to Quebec—making $90,000 more to Ontario. To the Napanee and Tamworth line we propose to vote another sum of $70,400; and to the Erie and Huron Railway, $96,000. To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company for their line from Cornwall to Perth, we propose to vote $262,400, and to the Kingston and Pembroke, $48,000. There is besides that the subsidy to the Canada Central Railway, which the hon. gentleman says amounts to $1,400,000. Now let us take the Province of Quebec, and as I have counted the balance remitted to the Northern Railway Company, I shall include for the Province of Quebec $1,500,000 which was paid for the purchase of the Grand Trunk Branch from Lévis to Rivière du Loup, though it did not add a mile of railway in the Province. In 1882 we voted $384,000 for the Lake St. John Railway, and to the Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, $240,000. As this railway is partly in New Brunswick, and partly in Quebec, I shall assign one half to each, making the amount for Quebec, $120,000; for the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, we voted in 1883, $320,000. I understand that this year the Government instead of that amount have decided to vote $300,000 for a part of the construction of that railway, and I take both amounts against the Province of Quebec. Then there has been voted to the Gatineau Valley Railway, $160,000; to the International Railway, $156,000; to the Montreal and Western Railway, $160,000; and in 1883 to the Lake St. John Railway, $80,000; and in 1884 to the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, from Quebec to Ottawa, in all $3,354,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that part of the Intercolonial from Rivière du Loup to Restigouche. He has counted the Northern Railway which was done long before Confederation; but he has not included this other road from Rivière du Loup to Restigouche, a distance of about 200 miles, I think.

Mr. HOUDE. I said I was only going to speak of railways for which money was voted after the basis of Confederation had been established, and the Intercolonial was taken charge of by the Government of Ottawa as being a basis of Confederation.

Mr. HOUDE.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But as the hon. gentleman has included the Northern Railway, he should include the other.

Mr. HOUDE. But the money was voted after Confederation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not a dollar; on the contrary we compelled the company to pay back one million of what they got.

Mr. HOUDE. The hon. gentleman says we did not pay the money properly, but the money was due to this Government and the Government remitted part of it, so it was given in that way.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What about the Grand Trunk?

Mr. HOUDE. I have counted the Grand Trunk against the Province of Quebec—though it was built before Confederation—from Lévis to Rivière du Loup. Then we have the Quebec Central, $211,200; the road from Aylmer to Pembroke, two-thirds of the subsidy we voted this year, $182,000; the Gatineau Railway, $160,000; the Montreal and Western Railway Company, a further sum of $160,000; to the Great Northern Railway, $32,000; the Jacques Cartier Union Railway, $200,000; to the line from St. Andrews to Lachute, $22,400; for the line from Rivière St. Maurice to Lake des Isles, $217,100, and to the road from Metapediac to Paspebiac, $300,000. I would like to enquire of the Government, with regard to this road, whether this sum of $300,000 is in addition to the amount voted last year to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The case stands in this way: The subsidy last year was $3,200 per mile for 100 miles. It is now proposed to leave that subsidy standing, with the exception of 20 miles, and instead of allowing so much per mile, to construct, as a branch of the Intercolonial, at a cost of $300,000, the first 20 miles, leaving the $3,200 a mile standing on the balance of the distance, 80 miles.

Mr. HOUDE. At any rate I was leaving the two items standing against the Province of Quebec. These sums will make for the Province of Quebec $7,719,000, deducting $64,000 for the twenty miles in question, and for the Province of Ontario, $8,836,000. Coming next to New Brunswick, I count half of the subsidy for the branch from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, $120,000; to the Caraquet Railway, in 1883, $115,000; to the Northern and Western Railway, in 1883, $102,000; to the line from Petitcodiac to Havelock Corner, 1883, $38,000; to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company——

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is a loan.

Mr. HOUDE. I saw by some Orders in Council that the Government undertook to make an advance of 80 per cent. of the cost.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was merely a loan.

Mr. HOUDE. Bearing interest payable to the Government?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. HOUDE. In 1884 we propose to grant a subsidy to the Short Line Railway, of which I charge half against New Brunswick and half against Nova Scotia. The subsidy is $170,000 a year for fifteen years, making $1,275,000 for each of the two Provinces. Again in 1884 we propose to subsidize the Northern and Western Railway for $26,000 which, added to the grant of last year, makes a total of $128,000; also the St. Louis and Richibucto Railway, for $22,400; the railway from Hopewell to Alma for $51,200; a branch of the Central Railway for $128,000; the railway from Caraquet to Shippigan, for $76,800; and the railway from Derby to Indian Town, for $140,000; making a total for New Brunswick of $2,094,400. Now, what

have we voted to Nova Scotia ? In 1877 we transferred 75 miles of the Intercolonial Railway, the Truro and Pictou Branch, to a company to insure the construction of the New Glasgow and Canso line; and in 1879 we transferred it to the Government of Nova Scotia. If I value that property at $750,000, I think it will be regarded as a moderate estimate, as it represents only $10,000 a mile.

Mr. VAIL. Only 54 miles of road was transferred. The other part was taken back by the Government.

Mr. HOUDE. In 1882, we granted for the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway $224,000 ; in the same year we transferred to the Government of Nova Scotia, the Windsor Branch of 32 miles——

Mr. VAIL. That is still owned by the Government.

Mr. HOUDE. It belongs to the Government of Nova Scotia as long as they take the means of using it and enjoying the benefit of it. The hon. member will notice that I am not calculating the amount of money or property represented by money, which has actually been expended, but what this House had the good will to vote to the several Provinces. That 32 miles of railway, I estimate as worth $10,000 a mile, making $320,000. In 1882 we also voted $150,000 per annum for 25 years for the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe it is abandoned.

Mr. HOUDE. Well, it is what Parliament had the good will to vote for the benefit of Nova Scotia, and it amounted to $3,750,000. In 1883, we voted for the Short Line Railway, from Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, a subsidy of $256,000; and in 1884, we propose to vote for the Short Line Railway again, $170,000 a year for fifteen years, half of which I charge to Nova Scotia, or $1,275,000. For the line from Oxford to Sydney or Louisburg, we propose to vote $450,000 ; we propose to transfer the railway from New Glasgow to Canso, for which we paid $1,200,000, half of which I charge, $600,000; and to the railway from Annapolis to Digby we propose to grant $64,000 ; making, in all, of money voted for the benefit of Nova Scotia, $7,689,000. Now, if we deduct this subsidy which the Government propose to vote to the Province of Quebec for the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, that is $3,354,000, from the total amount voted by this Parliament since Confederation in the interest of the Province of Quebec in connection with railway construction, there remains only $3,365,200, against $7,000,000 and more for Nova Scotia, $2,000,000 for New Brunswick, and $8,800,000 for Ontario. I have prepared these figures to show that the subsidy of $3,000,000 and something proposed to be voted by the Government to the Province of Quebec in connection with the Quebec, Montreal and Occidental Railway, taken with all the rest of the subsidies voted to the Province of Quebec or proposed to be voted this year, will not give proportionately more to the Province of Quebec than what has been already voted to the other Provinces.

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

After Recess.

Mr. HOUDE. Mr. Speaker, I have quoted these figures, but I do not pretend that they are exactly complete or perfectly accurate. As I said at the beginning, I believe them to be approximately correct. Of course if I had time to go over the same work again I would find, doubtless, that I had omitted some amounts either in Quebec or in the four Provinces of which I have spoken. But I have quoted enough to show that the representatives of Quebec in this Parliament, to whom the hon. member for Quebec East has thought proper to appeal for justice to the other Provinces, have not waited until to-day to manifest a spirit of justice to the other Provinces, and that on former occasions they have not hesitated to vote large sums of public money in order to assist in the progress of the other Provinces. That is my argument, and I will not insist any longer on this point at this stage of the Session, and when other hon. members wish to speak on the same question. But before resuming my seat, I desire to say a word in regard to the Short Line route question. In Committee of the Whole I proposed an amendment to the effect that the shortest route should be sought for on Canadian territory. I did not press the vote as there were not many members in the House, and perhaps the House would not desire to alter the Government's resolution in that way. But I would suggest a slight change which might be made in the wording of the Bill to be founded on these resolutions, that is, that instead of the shortest route, it should be the most advantageous route.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The words used are " shortest and best," which will no doubt cover what the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. HOUDE. That meets my objection, at least to a certain extent. I should also like the Government to insert a clause in the Bill to the effect that Parliament shall be consulted before the final choice of a route is made. The Government have the confidence of a great majority of this Parliament, and I think the Government must have some confidence too in Parliament itself, and I believe it is the right and it is the duty of Parliament to insist on being consulted before the choice of such route is finally determined, this not being the case of an ordinary railway route. When the Intercolonial was contemplated we all remember it was the policy of the Conservative party to have that railway built on Canadian territory although it lengthened the road very much, because we wanted our national railway to be entirely on Canadian soil. I do not pretend to say that we must sacrifice all other considerations to that one, but that consideration, to my mind, must have very great weight in the choice of a route for any national railway. When we contemplated the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that idea was again propounded by those in favour of that great national enterprise. I want to call the attention of the Government to an important fact. Article 29 of the Treaty of Washington, guarantees to Canada the advantage of the bonded system, but only from the ports of New York, Boston, Portland, or any American port. When, however, the privilege will operate so as to give an advantage to a Canadian Port and to the detriment of an American Port, are we sure the United States Government, which is essentially practical, and acts in the interests of its own people, will not adhere strictly to the letter of that article? It is true that just now, and for some time past, the United States Government have allowed our goods to go through American territory to Manitoba and back; but perhaps the Government have a less interest in preventing us from enjoying that bonded system through the western States than they would have to prevent the building of the Canadian seaports at the expense of their own eastern seaports. Besides, there is another important fact, that the United States Government have denounced the Washington Treaty. Are we sure they will not delay for several years the renewal of that Treaty; and even if they consent to renew it, are we sure they will insert in the new Treaty a clause to guarantee to us the privilege of the bonded system through the State of Maine in order to favour one of our seaports to the detriment of their own seaports? They expect from our railway system a share of the through traffic, and they will be only too glad to enjoy that traffic, as they are a practical nation and a selfish nation too, I dare say. This is another reason why, if we can find a route, although not quite as short but nearly as short, on Canadian territory, we should adopt it in preference to a route through the

State of Maine. I have spoken of through traffic by way of the State of Maine; I have spoken of difficulties which may eventually arise in regard to through traffic by a route a portion of which is through American territory; but there is also an important question in regard to passenger traffic, and that is the annoyance to which they would be subjected by being submitted to two examinations of baggage, namely, by the Custom house officers of the Dominion and the United States. Many of us would prefer to travel 40 or 50 miles further by a route on Canadian territory, than submit to such an annoyance. With respect to the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger), I do not think hon. members who accept the resolutions of the Government as a whole, can vote for that amendment. It is not offered in the place of the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition—it is an addition to that amendment; and to my mind the amendment of the leader of the Opposition expresses regret not well founded and blame not deserved.

Mr. GIROUARD. I rise, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the correction made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as to the subsidy granted to the Canada Central in 1874 and 1878. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he said that running powers were secured not only in favour of the Government or the lessees of their road, but also in favour of other railways, and he mentioned the Northern Colonization, the Kingston and Pembroke road, and perhaps also some railways connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I was under the impression that those running powers had been secured in favour of the Government or the lessees of their road; but I find I was mistaken even in that. The Order in Council of 1878 reads as follows, with respect to this particular measure:—

"That the company shall enter into an agreement to grant running powers, on terms to be approved by the Governor in Council, to the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway now in progress of construction from Montreal, on the northern side of the Ottawa river, or any railway in extension thereof, from any point of intersection west of the town of Renfrew, that many be approved of by the Governor in Council, and also to the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, from the point of intersection of their line, provided such point of intersection is at or west of Renfrew, and to such other companies as may have the termini of their systems on or towards Lake Huron, and which may be designated by the Governor in Council as entitled to such running powers; Provided that the terms of such running powers to any of the said companies or roads may be mutually agreed upon by the Canada Central Railway Company and the Quebec Government, and the other companies named, and in the event of disagreement, the conditions to be settled by arbitration, one arbitrator to be selected by each party and one by the Governor in Council.

"The Government of Canada and the lessees or future owners of the Government line, westward of the western terminus of the subsidized line, shall possess running powers on the said railway on similar terms to the companies designated."

What is the meaning of it? Nothing was secured by the Order in Council.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is very plain.

Mr. GIROUARD. Yes; but not in the sense of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Wholly so.

Mr. GIROUARD. Nothing was secured by the Order in Council. The Government did not even secure running powers over the Canada Central, but only such running powers as would be agreed to between the above named companies, and suppose the above companies never came to an agreement, as was the case? Where is the agreement which took place afterwards, setting down the terms under which these running powers were to be exercised? I say the agreement never was made, and until the agreement was made there was no power secured over the Canada Central. Those powers, moreover, were to be settled by mutual agreement or arbitration. Suppose these companies agreed to pay the Canada Central $6,000 a mile for running powers over their line, the Government would be obliged to pay the same amount, because the Order in Council says the Government shall have no powers over the said railway except on similar terms to the above named companies. This is the agreement the hon. gentleman mentioned as securing greater powers than those stipulated in the charter of the Gravenhurst line and the charters of other companies that have passed this Session, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe the hon. gentleman was mistaken.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was he mistaken in?

Mr. GIROUARD. I think I have explained the matter clearly enough.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wish you would explain your explanations.

Mr. GIROUARD. There is the Statute; it is very plain. You have secured nothing. The whole thing depended upon an agreement which was to be passed, but which was never passed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was passed.

Mr. GIROUARD. Will you produce it?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will, when I go there.

Mr. GIROUARD. It will take you a long time to go there.

Mr. VALIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few remarks in order to explain my vote on the Resolutions now before the House. I must say, in the first place, that I shall vote against the amendment and against the amendment to the amendment. For the last five or six days we, the members of this side of the House, have been receiving telegrams, and from what party did they come? They came mostly from our political opponents. For this reason, I thought absolutely strange the fact that the member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) was so much at variance, so little in harmony, with his party at Quebec. The hon. member who has the honour to represent me here, has stated that the Province of Quebec has no right to a subsidy. Mr. Speaker, he knows the contrary; he knows that since the last three or four weeks, a delegation from Quebec has come to Ottawa; the mayor of Quebec, the member for Quebec East in the local House, and all the Quebec councillors formed part of this delegation. On that occasion they have met the hon. member for East Quebec, and they have asked him to join the delegation. He answered them: What do you expect me to do there, what do you expect me to obtain? He was perhaps right in stating that he could not obtain anything. Then the Mayor of Quebec insisted on my joining the delegation. Before starting to go and wait on the Minister, they explained to us that the Province of Quebec had a deficit of at least $750,000; that this deficit would not be so large this year on account of the lumber trade being pretty good, and that a good deal of money had been taken in, but on account of this trade it was impossible to conceal the fact that the deficit was large. Well, Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I went with these gentlemen to see the Minister. I thought I should meet some of my colleagues there, but I found I was the only one from the Province of Quebec, at least on this side of the House. Perhaps the Opposition did the same thing as the member for East Quebec, who did not wish to save the interests of the Province of Quebec, since he stated that there was no use for him to go. I advocated the cause of the Province, and I asked for an increase of the subsidy for the railway, or for such other aid as would save the Province. Well, the friends of the member for East Quebec did the same thing. The Mayor of Quebec spoke at length, and so did the local member, to ask for assistance. Since that time we have been constantly worried to obtain this subsidy, and we have been asked to endeavour to obtain the terminus of the Pacific at Quebec. This is of the utmost importance

for us. The first thing which is needed at Quebec is the terminus of the Pacific Railway. Well, what are the Government doing? They are helping both; they can not do any more. I ask my hon. friend, the member for Quebec, if he has done anything to bring the Pacific to Quebec when he was one of the Government. I say he has not. When asked to do anything, he always said: "Why there is not only one side of politics to be looked at; we must bear heavily on the workingmen who are Conservative, they will expatriate themselves and we will get rid of that class." Now he does not want to give anything to the Province of Quebec; he would prefer, as the Mayor of Quebec said in my presence, to vote the imposition of direct taxation in order to drive the remaining Conservatives from the Province of Quebec. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another question which is being strongly agitated in Quebec at the present time; it is the question of the bridge which is to connect the Intercolonial with the Pacific. The Mayor of Quebec and many other influential citizens have telegraphed to us lately, and even to-day I received dispatches asking why the Federal Government had not mentioned this bridge in their Resolutions. We know that an Act of incorporation for that bridge has been passed during the present Session. The company is not yet organized, but a day will come when it will be organized, and then an appeal will be made to all those who are asking to-day for the construction of this bridge; but perhaps nobody will be found to take stock in that company. In fact, it is usual for these gentlemen to clamour. Well, I hope that when the company shall ask for aid, I am even certain that the Government will be well disposed towards that company and that they will do their duty. As to the subsidy to the North Shore Railway, between Quebec and Montreal, for which the Provincial Government wishes to get $12,000 per mile, I think, myself, that the railway, as it is, forms no part whatever of the Pacific Railway. It belongs to a private company, and it is an act of generosity on the part of the Dominion Government to grant a subsidy of $6,000 per mile to that part of the road. I am glad to see them in this mood, because this will help the finances of the Province of Quebec. Besides, I know that the Dominion Government has kept a reserve of $6,000 per mile to aid the Pacific Railway to prolong itself to Quebec, and this strikes me as being very natural. Some members are asking, by amendment to the Resolutions, that the interest on these $960,000 be given to the Quebec Government. Well, I say that it would not be fair to give us the interest on the subsidy granted to that part of the road, for it would be paying us interest on a thing which we have not got. We have nothing which concerns the Pacific between Quebec and Montreal. I must say that I am satisfied with these Resolutions, such as they are; for my part, I shall vote for these Resolutions, and let me repeat it, it is because we have nothing of the Pacific Railway between Quebec and Montreal. If we take these Resolutions as a whole, for my part, I would certainly wish to see them altered or modified, but as a whole, if, at all events they contain anything which is not absolutely as we should wish, they are good, and we must not reject them, for they are a protection for the Province of Quebec, by giving it a subsidy which will enable it to straighten its finances without having recourse to direct taxation, as the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) would wish. Then we will have no need of the version of the Mayor of Quebec, that we must have direct taxation. This will enable the members of the Province of Quebec to avoid this taxation, for either the electors or the members elected by them would have to act in bad faith to bring it on. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that on this point the Government have done their duty as they ought, under the present circumstances, and that they have not been remiss in aiding the Provinces which form part of the Dominion; and whenever they will need the help of the Province of Quebec in favour of the other Provinces, for my part, I will be ready to give them my support.

Mr. BOSSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the electoral division of Quebec Centre, I think I ought to add my protest to the numerous protests which have been brought forth by the expression of opinion which fell from the lips of the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier). Both as his elector and as his colleague in this House, I cannot help regretting, and regretting very deeply, the position which he has taken, as the representative of one of the most important electoral divisions in the Province of Quebec, as a French Canadian, and above all, as the representative of East Quebec. I shall not undertake, Mr. Speaker, to do anything besides qualifying the position which he has taken, and when I have qualified it, I shall leave him with the regret of having said it, and with the remorse of having thought such a thing. I shall vote against the amendment and against the amendment to the amendment. Against the sub-amendment, because it allows the amendment to remain as a whole, and the theory expounded by the leader of the Opposition, and unfortunately by the seconder of the motion. I must say at once that the amendments which have been made by the Ministers themselves to the Resolutions, as originally worded, have greatly facilitated the hearty support which we are asked to give them. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I must say that especially the amendment which promises us a complete and entire survey of the line which is to connect Montreal with the [illegible] ports, has reference to one of the most important of the Resolutions, perhaps for all the Provinces, but certainly for the Province to which I belong. From the origin of the idea of the construction of the Pacific Railway, we have been accustomed to consider this gigantic work as being a thoroughly Canadian enterprise; we have been accustomed to say, and we are glad to believe, that the railway which we are building will connect all the Provinces together, and will go through our own territory, without interruption, from ocean to ocean. Truly, if there is anything which is flattering to our national pride, it is this idea, and above all the carrying out of this idea. But at the same time, we have understood that, flattering though it may be, it must be set alongside of another idea, that of the commercial results for the enterprise itself, and of the commercial result for the greater prosperity of the Provinces. So it happens, Mr. Speaker, that the road commenced in the western part of the country has now got as far east as Montreal, from where it seeks an outlet to the Atlantic coast. We have also to consider that the idea of the road is connected with the interest of both our soil and of the property of the company, and of the country, by reason of the railway itself. And we have now to ask ourselves whether it is not proper to prolong the road from Montreal to the Atlantic coast entirely on Canadian soil. Still, we have here a danger to run and a great difficulty to avoid We have the proximity of Portland, which is hardly 300 miles distant from Montreal. We know that trade seeks its level; we know that traffic will take the shortest, the most advantageous line, the line which will afford the best conditions for cheap transport. We know equally well that the access to our ports is comparatively more difficult; but still, if we can escape the dangers which are in store for us in the American ports, and if it is possible, while constructing our railway on our own soil, to give to the company and to our trade, as profitable an outlet, and as practicable an outlet, as that which exists between Montreal and Portland, we must not hesitate for a moment to adopt it. I will say even more. Even if the route on our own soil should be, as to its length and practicability, less advantageous than that between Montreal and Portland, it may still be possible that

there should be an advantage in keeping the road for ourselves, and we must strive, by all means in our power, to attain this end. If, on the other hand, however, it was shown that the great idea of which I have spoken a moment ago, and of which we all feel proud, cannot be realized by reason of difficulties of locality and of navigation; if it was clearly proved, that in order to be able to keep the trade of the Pacific; in order to make of this company a prosperous company; in order to secure to our country all the advantages which may arise from the prosperous condition of that company, it is necessary that that part of the line should pass through American territory, and I should still say: Well, we must let it pass through American territory, but only on condition of seeing it clearly shown, without circumlocution and without restriction, that this sacrifice is necessary—is absolutely necessary—to ensure the two conditions of which I have just spoken. A few miles more or a few miles less would not be any object, Mr. Speaker. A few miles more or a few miles less will not count much in the enormous length of the whole line; the difference in length is still lessened by reason of the difficulties, of the annoyance, of the embarrassment of a Customs system to which we would be submitted if the line was built partly on our own soil and partly on the territory of the State of Maine. I say then, that unless there is an utter impossibility of doing so, we must keep our enterprise such as we intended it to be from the beginning, such as I, for one, still believe it to be practicable. But, Mr. Speaker, on this point we are obliged to take the judgment of other persons, to have recourse to the experience and to the observations of men of science, to find out what are in reality all the routes among which we are to choose, in order to decide properly on the question submitted to us, viz.: which is the most practicable route from Montreal to St. John or Halifax, by going through by Sherbrooke on the one side, and by Quebec on the other? The question which we have to decide has reference to the choice of the most advantageous line. This problem must be solved by us, whatever may be the responsibility we assume in solving it. The only question we have to examine is: which is the most advantageous, the cheapest and the shortest route between Montreal and a Canadian port on the Atlantic. As I said before, in order to decide this question, we must have recourse to men of science; surveys must be made, but these surveys must be made with a view to the immense results which are to grow out of the decision we are to take. We must have them complete, entire, without any hidden thought, without any preconceived object, without any fixed idea. We must have them complete in the general interest of the country, as well as in the interest of the Province and city of Quebec, which are interested in having the shortest and the most advantageous route, and I ask, and we shall ask, on behalf of our Province, that it be represented by engineers. We will ask that on account of the special interests of our Province, and also for all the Dominion. We shall ask that these surveys be made by the most able and competent of men, by those in whom the public have confidence. This being the case, the geographical position may be advantageous to some and disadvantageous to others. If it is advantageous to us, we shall adopt it, and the others will have to submit. And I say, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the discussions which have taken place so far, that if it is ever shown to me, but clearly shown, as I said a moment ago, after operations shall have been made and conducted with all possible care, that the shortest line, that the most advantageous line, not only a little shorter, or a little more advantageous, but that the only practicable line to make of the Pacific Railway, such a work as it was intended to be, is a line which must not pass through the Province, of which I am one of the representatives, I shall be obliged to give way in favour of a line which would in reality be a benefit to the country. But until that has been shown to me, I shall insist, and we shall insist together, on the greatest care being taken to obtain a clear and conclusive result. Such is, besides, and I am fully covinced of that, the idea which predominated in the Council of the Ministers when these Resolution were drawn up. And if until now, they have acted with the wisdom we have remarked in all that pertained to the construction of the Pacific Railway; if, up to this time they have shown in the Resolutions which we are now discussing, the discernment which we now observe, we are equally certain that the same discernment and the same wisdom will preside to the carrying out of the idea which they have always carried out till now, namely, the combinations of the two ideas, and a railway on our own territory if possible, and if practicable, a railway which will be the true realization of the great Pacific Railway line. Again. Mr. Speaker, let nobody think that what I ask here is from a sectional standpoint, from a local point of view. Oh, no; it is in the interest of all the Provinces; their interest is the same. The Maritime Provinces, the district of Montreal, the Province of Ontario, and all these Provinces and all these places, are interested in the same measure to have the line, if possible, on Canadian territory. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to add a word on this subject. We have the Intercolonial, to the south of Quebec; we have the Quebec Central, the building of which, owing to the Resolutions now submitted to us, will be pushed rapidly and which will soon reach the boundary; we have also the Grand Trunk, in the same direction, on the north side; we have the North Shore Railway, which will soon become the terminus the Pacific Railway. We have the Lake St. John Railway, of which, I am sorry to say, has not received the subsidy to which it is entitled, but will recive it in a very near future, and will develop, above all, the immense territory north of Quebec, a territory, Mr. Speaker, to which very little attention is paid and which is deserving of all the care bestowed on other parts of the country, a territory which has been called the Manitoba of Quebec, and which will eventually be the Manitoba of Quebec, and the future granary not only of the city, but also of the district and Province of Quebec; all of these lines bring us to the desired end, which is to connect them at or near Quebec, not only to serve private interest, but to serve also public interests by making the Pacific Railway an independent line to the Atlantic ports. I think we can, I think we ought, to hope to have a statement of what the intentions of the Government are to be in that respect. The company to which we have granted a charter is not yet organized, but when it shall be, or even independently from that company, through other means, we may attain the end to which I have just referred. I repeat it once more, I think we are entitled to a statement which will inform us of what we may expect from the Government in this respect. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to vote for the Resolutions and against the motion in amendment, and the motion in amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BÉCHARD. (Translation.) Before recording my vote on the question now discussed before the House, I desire to say a word, in order to explain the position I intend to take with regard to the Resolutions submitted by the Government. I declare that I am in favour of these Resolutions. I shall vote in in favour of the Resolutions which have been submitted by the Government, because I believe them to be eminently just and fair. In making such a statement, Mr. Speaker, I refer to that part of the Resolutions which concern the railway built in the Province of Quebec, and which is called the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway. But while saying that I am in favour of these Resolutions, that I believe them to be eminently just and fair, I must say, at the same time, that I see no reason why the amendment proposed by the hon. member of the Opposition should be rejected. If I have rightly understood the amendment, it does not propose to take out anything from the

Resolutions; it only proposes the affirmation of a principle which appears to me to be just and reasonable; that all the Provinces should be put on an equal footing, and it is only through the application of this principle that we can maintain the Federal union of all the Provinces in the Confederation. Now, as to the sub-amendment, moved by my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Auger), I see nothing in that amendment which should make it appear objectionable to the members from Quebec. On the contrary, it appears to me that it adds something to the Resolutions of the Government which are considered by all members from that Province as an act of simple justice. My hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) said a moment ago, that this amendment contained what he had suggested the other day. I do know whether or not I have rightly understood my hon. friend.

Mr. HOUDE. (Translation.) I suggested, in Committee of the Whole, that if the amount was not expended, the interest should be paid to the Province, and the hon. Minister of Public Works has stated that the amount would certainly be expended.

Mr. BÉCHARD. (Translation.) The amendment of my hon. friend does not contain anything else. At any rate, the suggestion has been made by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) If I have well understood his remarks the other day, and I am satisfied that the hon. member has not made this suggestion without believing it to be to the advantage of the Province of Quebec. This amendment, or what is contained in this amendment, has been suggested by some of the hon. members from the Province of Quebec who are sitting opposite. It must necessarily meet their views, and I have no doubt that they will vote for the amendment, as I intend to do myself.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend, at this advanced stage of the discussion, to prolong the debate on this question. However, I cannot refrain from offering a few remarks on the important question now before the House. I desire, especially, to take exception to certain more or less wonderful statements made by the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) in support of the no less wonderful motion made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. In order to be excused from referring to certain points dealt with in the speech made by the hon. Secretary of State, the hon. member for East Quebec has told us that it is better to wash our dirty linen at home. Well, I wonder when my hon. friend has commenced to be troubled with such scruples and reluctance. Why, not very long ago that hon. gentleman, without the least provocation, without any proof, without any form of trial, was denouncing, on the floor of this House, a man who has played an important part in politics, and who had just been elevated to one of the highest positions in the country, to the Judiciary Bench. Indeed, the hon. member was arraigning this man for trial, without any formality, without any vouchers, and now he declares that it is better to wash our dirty linen at home. *Medice cura te ipsum!* No doubt it was to show his patriotism, that, not satisfied with giving the support of his vote to the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, he has thought fit to make an exceedingly wonderful speech in favour of this motion. He has dared to uphold a proposition which virtually states that the Province of Quebec gets too much from the Government, while the Liberal papers are clamouring for all they are worth, and stating that the Province of Quebec is being shamefully sacrificed. Let my hon. friend explain as he may this amazing contradiction. We have seen such men as Joseph Howe, inveighing in this House against the wrongs done to their Province; we have seen the members from British Columbia, from Manitoba and from the Maritime Provinces, raising their voices, one after another, in support of the claims of their Provinces, but I think it is the first time that a member of this House ever declared that his Province was receiving too much. Most assuredly the hon. gentleman cannot be taxed with exclusiveness. We are told that the Province of Quebec is being exceptionally well treated. I say that if an exception is made, as to the construction of the Pacific Railway, Quebec is that exception. In the other Provinces through which the Pacific Railway passes, the road has been either built or subsidized by the Government, while Quebec has not received one cent from the Dominion Government to compensate it for the cost of the construction of the Pacific Railway. Under the Act of 1872, the terminus of the Pacific Railway has been fixed on the shores of Lake Nipissing; under the Act of 1874, this place was maintained as the terminus. Well, who were the first to insert in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874, a clause stating that a subsidy of $12,000 per mile might be granted to any railway company who would establish railway communication, either through the Province of Ontario or the Province of Quebec, with the terminus of the Pacific Railway on the shores of Lake Nipissing? It was the Government of which my hon. friend has been a member. The then First Minister, the member for Lambton, said, in his speech made at Sarnia, and in which he explained his policy as to his plan for connecting Georgian Bay with the south shore of Lake Nipissing:

"This will involve the construction of a short line of railway from the mouth of French River and Georgian Bay to the south-east shore of Lake Nipissing, and a grant in aid of the extension of the existing and projected lines in Quebec and Ontario."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that my hon. friend, I say that hon gentlemen opposite are at variance with their policy, with their Act of 1874, when they refuse to day to grant to the Province of Quebec what has been granted to the Canada Central.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) They have not refused it at all.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) The hon. member says that they have not refused it at all. But what are they doing with respect to the Resolutions now before the House? They pretend that the Province is receiving too much.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) The logical, the necessary conclusion which may be drawn from the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition is, that Quebec is being treated exceptionally well. If the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition does not signify that, then it is of no use whatever. The hon. member for East Quebec has not always been as scrupulous as that, when he was a member of the Mackenzie Administration. At that time he never hesitated to vote large amounts for other Provinces, and I fail to see why he is so reluctant to accept a subsidy for his own Province. I am astonished to see that he does not want to accept a piece of the Ministerial pie. When he was on the Treasury Benches, some years ago—and it may be some few years yet before he has a chance to sit there again—he not only voted in favour of a law granting $12,000 per mile to railways intended to open out communications with Lake Nipissing, but he also voted, at the same time, $2,890,000 to build the Georgian Bay branch. He voted $3,000,000 in favour of the Northern Railway, which is intended to connect with the Pacific at Gravenhurst. Last year he voted $12,000 per mile for the railway between Callander and Gravenhurst, which makes in all $3,500,000, and he now says that Ontario is unfairly treated as regards the Pacific Railway. But is it not an acknowledged fact that 650 miles of the Pacific happens to be in Ontario, while not a mile of it is in the Province of Quebec, and the hon. gentleman would have us believe that the Province of Ontario is unfairly treated. As the hon. Minister of Railways said the other day, there has been expended, or there will be expended, in the Province of Ontario, $20,000,000 for the

construction of the Pacific Railway, and we are told that the Province of Ontario is treated unfairly. Moreover, should the Province of Ontario gain its point against the Dominion Government, as regards the settlement of the boundary question, and succeed in extending its limits, we would have to pay $10,000,000 for the benefit of that Province; and still, in order to prevent us from giving justice to the Province of Quebec, it is asserted that the interests of other Provinces are being sacrificed. The hon. member for East York has himself admitted, in 1878, in a speech which he made on the Canada Central question, that much had been already done in the past for the great Province of Ontario. Here are his words:

"He noticed that the Quebec members thought the arrangement was not fair to Quebec, while those from Ontario thought it would militate against Ontario. Under these circumstances, he thought the Government might assume that they had found the golden mean. He did not deny for a moment that this road was intended as a short and rapid connection between the east and the west. That was the sole purpose of building it. He had pointed out that the Government had abundantly aided enterprises going through Ontario in former years, and that this was intended to connect the valley of Ottawa with what would be a great trans-continental line of railway when completed, though under existing circumstances it would be partly by railway and partly by water communication."

The other day we voted $1,250,000 to buy a railway, not in the west this time, but in the extreme east, in the Province of Nova Scotia—the railway between Truro and Pictou and the railway known as the "Eastern Extension." This line is intended to become the eastern extension of the Pacific Railway. This is a new proof that the policy of the Government is based on broad principles and that it is intended to deal as fairly and as equitably as possible with all the Provinces with all parts of Confederation. As a last shift, the member for East Quebec has tried to convince this House, the other day, that the North Shore Railway, built by the Quebec Government, was only a provincial railway, which could not be considered as a part of the Pacific line. I think that was what my hon. friend said.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) No.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) You have not said that?

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) No; I said that it had been built as a purely provincial road, on the proposition of the Quebec Government.

Mr. TASSÉ (Translation.) I thought that my hon. friend was more conversant with what takes place in the Province of Quebec. If he is not already aware of that fact, I may inform him that even before the North Shore Railway was built, that line was considered as the first link of the great Pacific chain. And if my hon. friend wants to hear the proof of this, I am in a position to give it to him. On the 17th of February, 1872—it is a long while ago, as will be seen; it is twelve years ago—there was not a rail laid along the shore of the St. Lawrence or along the shore of the Ottawa river, where the North Shore Railway was to be constructed. Well, on that day a great public dinner was given at St. Jerôme and Sir Hugh Allan, Mr. Chapleau, Mr. Thomas White and several other distinguished politicians were present. Even at that time the Northern Colonization Railway was spoken of as the first link of the great Pacific line. Here is an extract from a speech which Mr. Chapleau, with his wonted eloquence, delivered on that occasion:

"Among these works the Northern Colonization Railway ranks with the first, I might say, by reason of the importance which it derives from the prospect of the construction of the Pacific Railway, of which it will be the first link. The colonization of the immense valley of the Ottawa also depends, for its future, on the construction of this road. And what an immense field for agriculture, trade and industry, will be offered in this valley, where millions of men might live and prosper."

Now, here is what was said by my hon. friend, the member for Cardwell, who was then Mr. Thomas White.

MR. TASSÉ.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) He is still Mr. Thomas White.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) He is still Mr. Thomas White, but he is not in parliamentary language. He said:

"This work is entitled to a great deal of confidence as a means to develop the country between Montreal and the mountains in rear of St. Jérôme. But I admit it is specially entitled to the confidence of the population of Montreal for purposes of the highest importance. In fact this railway is intended to connect, by a direct and independent route, the Ottawa region with the Lake Huron and Lake Superior country, with the fertile valleys of the North-West and of British Columbia beyond the Rocky Mountains, with the great sea-port of Montreal, the commercial metropolis of the Dominion."

Rev. Mr. Labelle used still more forcible language:

"Three years ago people laughed at me, when I declared I was strongly in favour of wooden railways, but I always answered to those who thus spoke with scorn to me: "Whoever shall laugh the last shall laugh the most." What has been the result? Not only shall we have a road between Montreal and St. Jérôme, but a great trunk line starting from Quebec on the north shore of the St. Lawrence will pass through the whole country which extends away off to Ottawa, and away beyond to the Pacific ocean. Even at that time, however, I was thinking about the Pacific Railway, and I wrote to Sir George E. Cartier, who promised to take my notes into account. I have always had the ambition of seeing a Grand Trunk in the north, which would be the first link of the great international route, and which would go far in developing trade, industry, agriculture and colonization.

* * * * * * * *

"The Dominion Government cannot do otherwise than to aid our railways, for Sir George E. Cartier, at a great meeting held in Montreal, stated that he considered the Northern Colonization Railway as the first link of the great chain which is to bind together the whole country between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. To pretend that he is opposed to that would be an insult to his character. Every true statesman must adopt a national policy; if he does not, he is unworthy of managing the affairs of the country. And it might be said of any man that would be opposed to this work, that his stars have paled."

To use the language which I have just quoted, I may say that the stars of the hon. member for East Quebec have paled on this occasion. In endeavouring to explain—I will not say to justify, for it is impossible, from his standpoint—in endeavouring to explain the course he has taken, and to put the Conservative party in contradiction with the Resolutions, he has quoted the debates which took place in the Quebec House in 1875. A resolution moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Joly) said:

"He regretted that Government had not taken its proper stand with regard to the claims of the Province, the North Shore and Northern Colonization Railways being links in the Pacific Railway chain * * *"

And yet this proposition is opposed to-day by the hon. member for East Quebec—

* * * "And as such should have been taken hold off by the Dominion authorities in the same manner as the Georgian Bay Branch of the Canada Central Railway. He moved, seconded by Mr. Marchand: "That this House is of opinion that after the great sacrifice the Province of Quebec has made in aiding these two enterprises, this Dominion of Canada should come to their aid, inasmuch as the North Shore and Montreal, Ottawa and Western Railroads formed part of the great Pacific line."

Well, that is just what we are saying to-day. We perfectly agree with the member for Lobinière, while he and the hon. member for East Quebec, who belong to the same party, seem to be utterly at variance on this question.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) There is that difference, that at that time you did not want anything, and now you want all.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Nothing is more incorrect. The Conservative party opposed this motion for the best of reasons, as my hon. friend, the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), has said. They did not wish to vote for this motion, first, because it was proposed as a motion of non-confidence in the Government. The hon. member has been very careful not to give the second reason, but he should have given it, if he wanted to make impartial history. What was that reason? The year before, the Quebec Legislature

had unanimously adopted a petition to the Dominion Government, praying that the Pacific Railway terminus should be located on the shores of Lake Nipissing, and that the extension of the Pacific from Lake Nipissing to Ottawa should not be located before an exploration should be first made in order to determine whether the north shore or the south shore of the Ottawa was best suited to the purpose. It might be thought that a petition adopted by so important a body, unanimously adopted by both Houses, should have received from the Ottawa Government that consideration to which it was entitled, but instead of that, the petition might have been forgotten in the pigeon-hole of the Secretary of State, had not Mr. Masson, who was then one of the leaders of the Opposition, asked what had become of it. The hon. member for East York answered that he did not even know that such a petition had been received. Here is an extract from the *Hansard* of the 5th March, 1875, to prove the truth of my statement:

"Mr. MASSON. Has not the Government received a petition from the Local Legislature?

"Mr. MACKENZIE. We have received none.

"Mr. MASSON. Does not the hon. gentleman know that there is such a petition?

"Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not not know that there is.

"Mr. MASSON. I regret to see that the hon. gentleman does not follow public events any better."

Indeed it was a notorious fact that the Legislature of the Province of Quebec had unanimously adopted a petition, praying that the Province of Quebec should be equitably treated with regard to the railway extension from Lake Nipissing to Ottawa. Neither has my hon. friend stated that this petition was treated with the greatest contempt by one of the leading Liberals, the late Hon. Mr. Holton, who declared that that document was not worth the paper on which it was written, and came from "a dying and dishonoured Parliament." Neither has he stated that the member for East Quebec, instead of defending the honour of the Province, gave to this shameless insult all the authority of his own name. It would be useless for him to deny that fact, for his words are recorded in the *Hansard* And that is the reason why I said at the beginning of these remarks that he had no right to boast that he washes his dirty linen at home. However, the hon. member for East Quebec did not think it would be prudent for him to quote the remarks of the Conservative leaders who opposed Mr. Joly's motion. This would not have been of any use for him, as may be inferred from the following extracts. In the first place, here is an extract of a speech delivered by Mr. Angers, who was then leader of the House of Representatives, and who explained why he refused to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Lotbinière. I take it from the report of the *Montreal Gazette:*

"He referred to the petition of the Assembly, sent to the Federal Parliament, and said he believed it had scarcely been read. Hon. Mr. Holton had said it should not be taken up, as it came from a dying Parliament. The member for Terrebonne, in the House of Commons, had pressed the subject as far as possible, but the hon. Mr. Mackenzie had refused it. He went on to argue that, from the acts of the Federal Government the province of Quebec must not expect to obtain any justice from Ottawa till they had upset the Government there."

That is just what took place since. The Conservatives have driven away the Liberals from power and the Province of Quebec is now on an equal footing with the other Provinces. Now, let us see what was said by Mr. Taillon, the present leader of the Legislative Assembly:

"He declared their demand last year upon the Federal Government was not for money but for their rights; the demand was just and deserved to be treated in a far different manner than with the contempt it received. He continued to speak on the subject, following the line taken by the previous speaker on the Treasury side; he advocated the right of the House to criticise the action of the Ottawa House, and added that, it being unaltered, there was no better chance of receiving justice now than they had given in the past. He had no objection to receiving money from the Federal Government, and if they offered it he thought it would be unwise to refuse it."

And the Hon. Mr. Church, who was then treasurer of the Province, denounced the action of the Dominion Government in still more forcible terms:

"He did not pretend to know much about railroads, but there was something that struck him in the action of the Ottawa Government in connection with the Pacific Railway,—it seemed to him to be the custom to construct all great lines between two great termini, and what better terminus could be found than their city of Quebec? The Ottawa Government treated the Canada Central Railroad with the utmost generosity, but had treated the Northern Colonisation Railroad with the spirit they treated all enterprises in the Province of Quebec."

Not only were the members of the Province of Quebec not adverse to a subsidy from the Dominion Government, which would have been absurd and detrimental to the best interest of the Province, but when my hon. friend the Secretary of State, became first Minister of the Province of Quebec, he memorialized the Federal Government, asking them precisely for a compensation equal to that which had been granted to the Canada Central.

Mr. BLAKE. In what year was this memorandum presented?

Mr. TASSÉ. In 1880. Here is what the first Minister said in this memorandum:

"I think it is my duty to inform you that an offer of $6,550,000 has been made to me for our Provincial railway, such as it will be after the completion of the Chaudière bridge. Under these circumstances, I hope you will allow me to ask you: 1st. Whether your Government would be willing to secure to our Province, as the price of our road, a fixed amount, which would allow you to transfer it to the Syndicate as a portion of the great Canadian Pacific Railway?"

This extract shows that the Quebec Government has always been willing to sell the North Shore Railway to the Pacific through the Dominion Government. But let us keep on:

2nd. Whether you think that the Syndicate would be willing to offer a better price than that to which I have just referred for the sale, or more advantageous terms for the lease of our Provincial railway.

3rd. Whether, in case that the Government of Quebec should keep their railway (the Q.M.O. & O.) you would be willing to recommend to the Ottawa Government the granting of a bonus equal to that which has been granted to the Canada Central, on condition that running arrangements would be the same in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as those which have been made with the Canada Central."

We have in this document the proof that this aid of $12,000 per mile, in favour of the North Shore Railway, has not been asked to-day for the first time by the Conservatives. They have not waited until this Session to submit their claim to the Government, for, as far back as 1880, the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, who was then leader of the Provincial Government, asked for this same compensation, which we are called upon to vote to-day. Another argument of the hon. member for East Quebec, against the indemnity to Quebec, is that that Province has already received or is to receive from the Pacific, the sale price for the section between Montreal and Ottawa. This statement, in order to be sustained, should at least be based on the fact that the Dominion Government should have given to the Pacific the necessary funds to buy this road. We know that the Federal Government has not furnished one cent of the sale price of the railway section between Montreal and Ottawa, and that for a very good reason; the road is sold for the sum of $3,600,000; during six years the sum of $100,000 a year, with interest at 5 per cent., must be paid to the Provincial Government, and twenty years may elapse, before the balance of $3,000,000 shall be recovered from the Pacific Railway. Hence it is quite evident that the Federal Government has not yet given one cent to the Canadian Pacific, to enable them to buy the road or part of the North Shore Railway. I noticed that the hon. leader of the Opposition and his lieutenant the member for East Quebec, have tried to make fun of the firmness shown by the Conservative members of the Province of Quebec on this same question. Evidently, our hon. friends are not accustomed to as much independance as that

on the part of the little rouge plëiad which surrounds them. My hon. friend has quoted an article from *La Minerve*, in which the Conservative contingent is congratulated on the energy which they have shown on this occasion. I do not know that there is one single word that ought to be struck out of this article. As to himself, I regret that his organs have not had many occasions to congratulate him on his patriotism or his independence. Besides, there is a newspaper in Montreal, which my hon. friend forgot to quote, on the independence which members ought to show once in a while, whatever may be the political party to which they belong. This paper, in which I believe he has been writing, is named *La Patrie*.

Mr. LAURIER. I never wrote a line in *La Patrie*.

Mr. TASSÉ. At all events *La Patrie* is your organ, is it not?

Mr. LAURIER. No; I do not mean to say that.

Mr. TASSÉ. I would like to see here Mr. Beaugrand, the director of that newspaper, hearing the statement of the hon. member.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. member pretends that *La Patrie* is my personal organ, I shall tell him that it is not so, but I do not mean to say that it is not the organ of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. TASSÉ. I did not say that *La Patrie* was your personal organ, but I supposed that my hon. friend was more or less identified with the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. I thought that he was the leader of the Liberal party in the Province. If he is not, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) must be the leader. It must be one or the other, or perhaps both; two are not too many for such an important task. Since my hon. friend is so fond of quoting newspapers in this House, he might have quoted an extract from *La Patrie*, of Montreal, bearing date the 28th of November, 1880. It was as follows:—

"Mr Dorion although serving under the direction of Mr. Mackenzie, was really the leader of the party. His withdrawal from the Cabinet was soon followed by that of Messrs. Fournier and Letellier. It is useless to recall the events which followed; the power being in the hands of Messrs. Mackenzie and Cartwright, without any control."

Such is the opinion of the organ of my hon. friend, on the independent and patriotic part which he played as a member of the Mackenzie Administration. But this is not all. In this City of Ottawa there is a grit journal, the *Free Press*, in whose columns my name is mentioned from time to time, and not always mentioned in a flattering manner. On the 12th of October, 1878, that paper said:

"The Montreal *Gazette* says that the liberal party of Quebec has added neither strength nor brillancy to the party in the Federal Parliament for the last five years. This assertion is somewhat exaggerated, for there are but few who will deny that Mr. Dorion has brought an increase of both strength and brilliancy to the party."

This assertion is somewhat exaggerated—

"The remarks of the *Gazette* might apply to the situation of these two last years during which the new Ministers which have entered the Cabinet have not always brought to it both strength and respectability."

I will with great pleasure take exception as regards the respectability of my hon. friend, but I beg to be allowed not to carry my exception any further. Such was the opinion of the friends of the hon. gentleman on the part he played as a Minister of the Mackenzie administration. The hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking of a small Parliament—to use his own word—which was pretended to have been held in another part of the building, has thought it very improper, that a certain number of conservative members should have met to discuss what was best to be done in the interest of their Province. I see nothing improper in that. They may have lost a few bursts of liberal eloquence, but such a loss is not irretrievable. They have met, and for what? The Government had just submitted to the House a proposal asking that a vote of $30,000,000 be granted to settle once for all the Pacific Railway question. As they were convinced that they had just claims, the representatives of the Province of Quebec asked that such claims should be taken into consideration, as they were connected with this great work.

Mr. BLAKE. Were you one of them?

Mr. TASSÉ. Although I am not obliged to satisfy the hon. gentleman's curiosity, I have not the least objection to say that I was one of them.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought he was a member of Ontario—not of Quebec.

Mr. TASSÉ. According to that, my hon. friend and the other members from Ontario are very wrong when they take an interest in the affairs of other Provinces. But the part which is assigned to us is much wider. We are here, not to deal with sectional interests, but to deal with Dominion interests. I regret to say my hon. friend, who has such a high reputation, looks at this subject from a purely provincial point of view, from a sectional point of view, although he always denies this.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. TASSÉ. You reproach me with having attended to meetings where representations were made by my friends from the Province of Quebec. I do not look at this question as a Quebec question only. True, the interests of that Province are more especially involved, but if the claims of the Quebec members are just, because I am a member of Ontario, am I to refuse to hear them and to give them justice? It is in the interest of Confederation that no injustice be done to any of the Provinces.

Mr. LAURIER. You should vote for the amendment in order to do justice to all.

Mr. TASSÉ. Not at all, for everybody has received justice except the Quebecers. And you? I suppose you will vote for the amendment?

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. TASSÉ. And you will also vote for the proposition made by your hon. leader?

Mr. LAURIER. That is the amendment.

Mr. TASSÉ. The amendment and the sub-amendment are so contradictory that my hon. friend will, on the one hand, declare that the Province of Quebec is receiving too much, and on the other hand, that it is not receiving enough. What a logical reasoning. But to revert to the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition has reproached the French Conservative members with being absent from the House during the debate. I think he had somewhat forgotten his own history when he made that statement. If that was a fault, it must have been far more serious in his own case. I had not the honour of sitting in this House when the hon. member for East York was ruling the country, but I know that at that time the member for West Durham was not content with conspiring against his own chief, if I may use such language; it may not be parliamentary, but if it is not, I will withdraw it with pleasure.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not true.

Mr. TASSÉ. If my language is not parliamentary, I would like to know if the language of the hon. member is parliamentary. An old parliamentarian, as he is, does not generally forget himself to that extent. My hon. friend was not content with undermining his leader, but if I remember aright, on more than one occasion, when a vote was about to be taken, he was seen, with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr.

Mills), who gravitates within his orbit; these two gentlemen and two or three of their colleagues were seen to disappear as if by enchantment. Am I unjust towards the hon. leader of the Opposition when I say that at a given moment, on the eve of an important vote which, I think, concerned the Nanaimo Railway, he declined to give his vote?

Mr. BLAKE. I voted on the question of the Nanaimo Railway, but abstained from voting on two or three other occasions.

Mr. TASSE. I could not ask for a better witness than the hon. gentleman himself. He has been good enough to prove my assertion, that is to say, on one or two important occasions, he declined to record his vote. It matters very little whether it was the Nanaimo Railway or another question. If my colleagues of the Province of Quebec were wrong in defending the interests which were confided to their trust, it is a fault which will be easily forgiven; it is a happy fault, and I do wish that my hon. friend from East Quebec had his conscience loaded with such crimes, but, unfortunately, he has not many to his credit. If he had had more nerve when he was in the Mackenzie Administration, if he had not violated several of the principles which he had advocated during his public career, especially protection to manufactures; if he had floated higher and held more firmly the flag of his nationality, the political storm which, at a given moment, passed over the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska would not, perhaps, have forced him to seek shelter in the harbour of refuge at Quebec. Indeed, if my hon. friend had been more anxious to protect the interests committed to his care, he himself and his friends would not have been decimated, as they have been, on the 17th of September, 1878, which has been the forerunner of their disaster of 1882. I think I have proved that the Province of Quebec asks no favour and that it only wishes to be treated with the same justice and the same consideration as other parts of the country. It has been proved that its debt has been incurred in order to build railways, and particularly an important part of the Pacific line. Therefore, it is perfectly just that the Dominion Government should come to its aid. If we refer to official statistics, we find that up to last year the Quebec Government had expended $14,429,326 on railways, while the subsidies given by the Ontario Government only amounted to $4,478,749. It is also found that all the deficits which occured in the financial administration of Quebec, began with the railways, since the great North Shore Railway was built. Until then the Province had had yearly surpluses which amounted in all to $2,250,000. The compensation which the Province of Quebec now claims is intended to indemnify that Province for the enormous sacrifices with which its people have saddled themselves in order to construct a link of the Pacific. Shall this request be refused or granted by this Parliament? If we should vote in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition we would certainly be refusing to give it justice. But if we vote in favour of these Resolutions, and I am convinced that they will be supported by the great majority of the House, the Province of Quebec may hope to have order restored in its finances. That Province now finds itself between two alternatives, either it must adopt direct taxation or obtain an indemnity from the Dominion Government. Without stopping to discuss the merits of direct taxation, I am opposed to it, because public opinion is not prepared for it. It is true that the Liberal party seems to be intent on imposing it in the Province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TASSÉ. Who says no?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Where do you take that?

Mr. TASSÉ. My hon. friend wants the proof of this.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes.

Mr. TASSÉ. I am ready to give it to him. My hon. friend knows that Mr. George W. Stephen is one of the leaders of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec and that he will probably be Treasurer in the future Cabinet of Mr. Mercier, if ever such a Cabinet is formed.

An hon. MEMBER. It will take some time.

Mr. TASSÉ. I believe so. Meanwhile, here is what Mr. George W. Stephens said on the 31st of March, 1882, at a sitting of the Quebec House:

"This country will never be anything as long as people will not consent to tax themselves after the fashion of municipalities, and to take the necessary means to carry out the enterprises which they need. The time is fast coming when municipal and direct taxation will become necessary here."

And what did Hon. Mr. Irvine, another Liberal leader, say in the Quebec House the other day? He declared that he was in favour of direct taxation, and that if he could have his own way he would impose it on the people. It will be remembered that when the hon. member for West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), was Minister of Finance, and when he was accumulating deficit upon deficit, he himself declared he was in favour of direct taxation. He said:

"Under these circumstances, it might naturally enough be asked of me, if it would not be proper, seeing that we have had large deficits for the last two years, to adopt such measures as would naturally make it impossible to have another deficit. Well, my answer is that if we had in Canada a tax which would be equivalent to the income tax in England, it is probable that I should not hesitate to recommend to this House to have recourse to this means of increasing the revenue."

I may add that the late Hon. Mr. Holton also advocated direct taxation when he was Minister of Finance. All these evidences are sufficient to prove that the Liberal party, or at least, several of its leading men, are in favour of direct taxation. I am thankful to the hon. member for l'Islet for interrupting me and giving me occasion to show what the tendency of the Liberal party has been, with regard to that question. Before concluding, let me state that the Province of Quebec deserves to be treated not only with justice, but also with sympathy. Whenever the other Provinces have asked Parliament for a legitimate remedy to their grievances, Quebec has generously come to their assistance. It has never shown indifference towards anything that could tend to promote the progress or development of the country, anything that could be done to consolidate our political institutions. Quebec is rightly considered as the pivot of Confederation. It has been made the basis of our system of representation. It is of the highest importance that it should continue to prosper, to increase and to develop its resources. Its fate is intimately bound with that of the Federal system. Let us to-day extend to it a helping hand, and it will ever remember the generous support received from us under trying circumstances, and will work with more energy than ever to promote the prosperity and advancement of the Dominion at large.

Mr. FISHER. If I would search for reasons to explain the position of hon. gentlemen opposite who have opposed the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Shefford, I could perhaps find them in some of the assertions of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. When the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) alluded to the proposition of the hon. the leader of the Opposition from the Province of Quebec, in the Legislative Assembly of that Province, that this project to obtain assistance to the North Shore roads was a legitimate subject for Federal aid, what reason did they give for their friends, the Conservative majority in that House, voting down that proposition? The only reason they could give was that the proposition had been advanced by a member of the Opposition, by a member of the party

which they opposed. In that, they showed that they were imbued with that spirit of placing party before country which influenced them in not voting for what was right and proper for their Province, so now they oppose simply because the proposition to do what was right and proper to the other Provinces was proposed by a gentleman who was opposed politically to themselves. Is that the principle on which these hon. gentlemen oppose the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford? If it is, it shows but a very poor regard for that Province of which they boast to be the special champions in this House. I maintain that hon. gentlemen on this side who represent the Province of Quebec are just as much in favour of the advantages that Province will obtain by these Resolutions as any hon. member opposite representing that Province. We demand justice for Quebec. We believe that in these Resolutions, in this advance to Quebec, the Government of the day are granting justice to that Province. I suppose the Government are of the opinion that what they are granting is only just; if they are not, why do they give the grant? But I find in the general Resolutions which are before this House, that while the Government agree that justice to the Province of Quebec demands that $12,000 a mile should be given to it for the railway from Ottawa to Quebec, they have not given this grant to the Province of Quebec. On the contrary, instead of that they give only $12,000 a mile on the railway from Ottawa to Montreal, and on the road from Montreal to Quebec they are only giving $6,000 a mile; while, for reasons best known to themselves and to their supporters, they retain, to be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway at some future day, $6,000 a mile, for the purpose of obtaining a link between that road and the city of Quebec. The proposition of the hon. member for Shefford is that, in the meantime, until this advantageous arrangement may be completed, the Province of Quebec shall obtain the immediate advantage of this $6,000 a mile in addition to the other grants on the part of the Federal Government. If it is just, and I say it is just, that the Province of Quebec should obtain this $12,000 a mile for the whole road from Ottawa to Quebec, it is just that, in the meantime, until this amount of $12,000 per mile for the road from Quebec is paid over to a company, the Government of Quebec should obtain immediately that advantage. This is, in sum and substance, what the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford proposes, in addition to the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham. The hon. member for Maskinongé shows by his assertions that these two amendments are inconsistent with one another, and he shows also, by several other remarks in his speech, that he has entirely misconceived the original amendment of the hon. member for West Durham. I understood him to say that this amendment of the hon. member for West Durham, this advantage which we, from the Province of Quebec, hope to obtain from the Federal Government, is opposed by the hon. member for West Durham. If the hon. member for Maskinongé would simply read this amendment, he would not attach that significance to it. In this amendment the hon. member for West Durham, while acknowledging the justice of this grant to the Province of Quebec, on the part of the Government, and if accepting the justice of this principle laid down clearly and distinctly in these Resolutions, says, since this is a new principle which is to be adopted in the arrangements between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments, it must be carried out with regard to all the Provinces alike; and I am convinced that the members from the Province of Quebec in this Parliament are not disposed to deny to the other Provinces that justice they demand for their own. I have not so understood the intention of the hon. member for Maskinongé, or other members of this House, but that is simply what the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham asserts and wishes to carry out. The hon member for Maskinongé, the other night, interrupted the hon. member for Quebec East, by declaring that the other Provinces had already received justice. If the carrying out of this principle, which is now adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by which the Federal Government is called upon to recoup the Provincial Governments for their past aid to provincial railways which are not now taken, be in the interests of the general development of Canada, if, when the other Provinces make their demands, the Government here can show that these demands have already been fulfilled, that these demands have already, in part or in whole, been complied with, it stands to reason that these Provincial Governments cannot then make the demand which the Province of Quebec has now made, and which is being complied with. If the other Provinces fail to make the same proof of the justice of their demand, I take it that it would be the duty of the Dominion Government to then refuse the demand they would make. I understand the hon. members on the opposite side of the House to say that in this case Quebec has proved the justice of her demand. I take it, from the action of the Government, that the Government believes that Quebec has proved the justice of her demand. I, myself, and I believe other members from the Province of Quebec on this side of the House, believe in the justice of that demand, but when this demand was made, I do not suppose that the Government took it for a matter of course that the demand was just. I take it for granted that they enquired into the facts and premises, that they enquired into the justice of it, and that, when that justice was clearly shown to them, they complied with the demand. If, in the event my hon. friend from West Durham has proposed to the House, the Government continue the same policy in reference to the other Provinces, it would be the duty of the Government to enquire into the justice of their demands, and only when the Provinces proved the justice of those demands would the Government be asked to comply with them. This being the case, I think it is very clear that the amendment and the sub-amendment are in no sense antagonistic. The amendment, accepting the principle, simply wishes it to be applied to all other Provinces; the sub-amendment, accepting the principle, simply wishes that that principle should be carried out in its entirety, and that this just advance to the Province of Quebec should accrue to the benefit of the Province of Quebec immediately. If any member from the Province of Quebec, in this House, votes against that, he says distinctly and clearly that, although that demand is just, although this advance to the Province is just, he is quite willing, for the sake of his party, because it happens to be proposed from this side of the House, to vote against it although his Province will suffer thereby. I conclude, by simply appealing to the House to vote on this amendment and on this sub-amendment according to the true reading of their meaning, and not to allow any misconstruction or misconception of their meaning to interfere with their decision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid I must postpone the natural anxiety of the House for a division for a few minutes, in consequence of the Resolution in amendment, moved by the hon. member for West Durham and the speech which went before it. I do not think that I need trouble the House with many remarks about what is called the sub-amendment, the amendment to the amendment. The hon. gentleman who spoke last, and spoke well, as he always does, on the matter, I think had not weighed well the effect of the sub-amendment, and had not, I think, weighed well the speech of his leader and the Resolution after it. The hon. gentleman's speech, if it means anything, is a complaint that Quebec has not got enough; the speech of his leader was a complaint that it had got too much. The speech of the hon. gentleman is that justice is denied to

Quebec, and he appeals to the House that justice should be done to Quebec; his hon. leader stated, in his elaborate and able speech, that more than justice was done, that Quebec had no right, they had built the road, and in the category of the three classes into which the hon. gentleman divided the roads, the last was where the Government went to recoup an enterprise which had already been commenced, which had already been finished, which had already been built. But the hon. gentleman ought to know very well that this Resolution states that this House regrets that the Government have not seen fit. What is the meaning of a regret that the Government have not seen fit to propose the granting of the interest? It means simply a censure on the Government for not granting it, and we know that a censure means a vote of want of confidence; it means, if this motion is carried, that the Government must retire, or must appeal from the majority of the House who carried the censure, to the people, to see if they will sustain the censure. That is the inevitable consequence of this motion; and, if that motion carried, then I think for this Session there would not be very many railway grants voted to any railway. But it is rather odd that the hon. gentleman should regret that the Government had not proposed a thing that had never been proposed before. It had not been proposed by the Quebec Government, it had not been proposed to the Government in any way, and the hon. gentleman says he regrets, that the Government is censurable, that they ought to receive the condemnation of this House, because they have not granted what nobody has asked for until the discussion took place within a day or two. That is the consequence of this Resolution. However, that, I think, may rest quietly. I rose to speak on the style of language that has been used with reference to the conduct of the Government in granting this aid to the Province of Quebec, for their expenditure on the North Shore Railway, and with respect to the conduct of the hon. members from Quebec who usually support the Government with reference to these votes. Sir, although it was done in parliamentary phrase—the hon. gentleman always, I must say, greatly to his praise and greatly to his credit, because we do not always observe those proprieties, observes parliamentary phrase—to reduce it to plain English, the hon. gentleman has stated to this House that the Government was compelled, by the pressure from their friends from the Province of Quebec, to grant this vote willy-nilly; that they were compelled to do it; that it was a case of putting the pistol to their breast, and that the Pacific Railway Resolutions depended upon this aid being granted to the Province of Quebec. I take occasion to deny that assertion altogether. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) asserted it again and again. He stated that it was well known that, when the debate went on, none of these gentlemen were in the House, they were in No. 8. He stated that it was well understood that there were negotiations going on. I knew of no negotiations; did the hon. gentleman know of any? The hon. gentleman denied that he had communication with my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet); but there were negotiations going on, he heard communications; I do not know that he was open to them, but he heard them; the rumour reached him. Did not the rumour reach him?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No rumour reached him?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then he is as deaf as the deaf adder. Everybody else in the House, everybody in the country heard it, every newspaper heard it, every newspaper correspondent heard it. The hon. gentleman, wrapped up in his cloak, wrapped up in his shell, deaf, the only deaf man in this House, never heard there was a chance of propositions being made for a coalition between himself and the Conservative Bleus of Lower Canada. I would like to ask my hon. friends from Lower Canada if they were deaf to it, if they did not hear this little rumour running round the House, if they did not know that these rumours were running round the House. But, I tell the hon. gentleman that these rumours and these little coquettings met with no response from the large majority of the Conservative gentlemen who represent Lower Canada in this House. I say more, Sir; it was not that the Government of which I am the responsible and, perhaps, unworthily the First Minister and the chief exponent, was forced to the measure, it was not from any pressure, direct or indirect, from the members of this House, that the Government came to the conclusion which they have asked this House to sanction by these Resolutions. If we look back for some years to the time when the original project of building the Canadian Pacific Railway was initiated, we find that Callander was selected as the most easterly point of that railway. It was chosen so long ago as 1872. It was then understood—because our ideas were not so large, and our means were not so great, and the prospect of the development of this country was not so assured then as it is now—it was understood that under the terms of the arrangement with British Columbia the railway should start from British Columbia and come east until it joined the Canadian system of railways; and it was held that if the eastern terminus was fixed at Callander that would be a convenient point, where Toronto, which represents the great commercial portion of Ontario, could join it, and that the eastern portion of Ontario and the Province of Quebec could work westward as fast as they could and all join at Callander. But, Sir, afterwards, by the action, I do not say injudicious action, of the Mackenzie Government, that scheme was enlarged, and instead of Callander being the point where Ontario and Quebec could both, by their own unassisted efforts, as far as the Government was concerned, join the Canadian system of railways with the great Canadian Pacific Railway, it was extended down to Pembroke, and in fact to Ottawa. Then, Sir, from that moment I saw, and everybody of common sense must have seen, that Quebec had, with unwonted energy, pushed a railway from the city of Quebec, which everybody admitted must be eventually the Atlantic terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway; that Quebec, taking time by the forelock, in order to give to their Province an immediate connection with the far North-West, pledging their fortunes and pledging their credit to complete the road, I foresaw and every man of common sense foresaw that the road they had been constructing must form a portion of the great national highway, and be aided like the rest, Oh, but, says the hon. member for West Durham, if it were just, why did we not do it before? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion had heavy weight enough; it was time enough when the Province of Quebec came and asked for aid, asked for justice to be done to her, it was time enough for the Government of the Dominion to entertain that matter. I take it that when the Central Railway got that assistance it was not a suggestion of the Mackenzie Government; I take it that those persons forming the corporation of the Central road went to Mr. Mackenzie and made that arrangement. And when the Quebec Government came and presented their case—not as a matter of relief, as the hon. gentleman's amendment states, not as a matter of grace, but as a matter of justice—they said: "You have built the road from Callander to Red River; you have built that road from one end of Ontario to the other; you have subsidized it down to Pembroke, and the consequence is, that it has now come through Ontario to Ottawa; therefore, as we join you at Ontario, and as we have built that road, we have a right to the same measure of justice, to the same aid, as the whole Canadian Pacific Railway had from Pembroke to the far North-West." I do not think it necessary, in fact it is a small business to dis-

cuss the comparative advantages of one Province to the other, but we cannot forget that all the advantages hitherto have been to the Province of Ontario, to my own Province. Why, Sir, the whole of the railway from Ottawa to the far North-West, until it strikes Manitoba, runs through Ontario; and besides the subsidies that have been given, the railway running round the north shore of Lake Superior has opened up a country magnificent in its future; magnificent forests have been found to exist there, and its mineral wealth is enormous; and, Sir, that whole country has been developed; the $12,000 a mile granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as Ontario is concerned, will pour an enormous wealth into her Treasury by the opening up of that country; good, as we know, for its forests; good, as we believe, for its agricultural capabilities; good, as we believe also, in its mineral resources; therefore, we are only granting justice to the Province of Quebec in paying them the same amount that we have done to the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, since I am on my feet, I may as well say a few words with respect to the motion of the hon. member for West Durham. Everybody heard his patriotic speech; everybody heard his condemnation of the degradation and the demoralization that was going to come to all Canada by this subsidizing of roads. In parliamentary phrase, he stated that we were bribing the different Provinces; in parliamentary phrase, he says it is unwholesome that different Provinces and different interests should come to the Government and ask for aid; and he suggested, Mr. Speaker, a change in the Constitution, so that giving subsidies should be wrong. We must have no subsidies; grants to railways were wrong, and we must have a change in the Constitution. The various sections, the various Provinces, the various interests come to Parliament and ask for bread, and the hon. gentleman gives them a stone. He says: "You cannot, you ought not to get aid"—that is his speech—"you ought not to do it, because it is degrading, it is demoralizing, it is unconstitutional; we must have the whole thing altered." And yet we do not find a word of that in the amendment the hon. gentleman has moved. When I, taking the common sense view—which the hon. gentleman says was a very low point of view—that we had better give a small reasonable grant of $3,200 a mile to roads and help them, that if they were good for anything they would take the money, and if they were not good for anything they would not take the money, the hon. gentleman said we ought not to do that; that it is a wrong system; that we ought to have appealed to the country; we ought to have said no; we ought to take a few large lines of railway and appeal to the patriotism of the country, and set aside their little roads; that they would give up their small interests; that the members would patriotically give up all their constituents wanted, all the chief sections of the country wanted, for the sake of one, or two, or three, or four lines of railway. That was the line of the hon. gentleman's argument. Then, what was he bound to do? He was bound to follow it up by a Resolution, by a direct negative to our unconstitutional system, a direct negative to the system he declared is degrading and demoralizing, and to have moved a direct censure of the whole railway policy as developed in the Resolutions now in your hands. Did he do that, Sir? Oh, no, he did not do that; he swallowed the whole thing. And why didn't he do it? Why, Sir, Shakespeare tells us, in Henry IV, "that when mine ancient Pistol insulted the Welshman, Fluellen went with a club or sword in one hand and a leek in the other and said to mine ancient Pistol, eat that leek. No, says Pistol, I will not. Then, said Fluellen, here is my sword. Then Pistol, drawing himself up, said, I eat the leek in earnest of my revenge." The hon. gentleman is eating the leek, he is bringing in these Resolutions, and what was the club? Why, Sir, the corporal's guard from Lower Canada were against him; the whole of the Maritime Provinces—gentlemen who usually supported him in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were against him; he ate the leek, and he is going to do it in earnest of revenge. Twenty years hence, when he is Minister—and I am bound to say that his speech on Saturday rather postponed that day—twenty years hence, he will quote that speech and say: I warned you; here is my speech delivered on a certain day of April, 1884, showing that you should not have done it. He spoke brave words like Pistol, but all the same he ate the leek. We know, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this same relief, as this Resolution calls it—other men call it justice—with respect to this relief, I will tell the hon. gentleman that before there was any meeting for conference, so far as I could learn, of my Quebec friends in Parliament—the Quebec supporters of the Government—there was a deputation came from the Government of Quebec, consisting of a certain number of the members of that Government. Dr. Ross, my old friend and supporter, was in too frail health to come, but this deputation came, and they laid a case before us. The Government made up their minds that the case those gentlemen had laid before us could not be resisted, and they made up their minds that this relief, this justice, this contribution, should be given to the Province of Quebec. And, Sir, it is said, O, but there was a good deal of hanging back about it. Sir, the Government had made up their minds before it was suggested, before the rumour which the hon. gentleman alone did not hear, the rumour that went abroad that there was going to be force put upon the Government; and so long as that force was threatened, so long we resisted. And my hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), with that candour and fairness which has always characterized him, at once took the course that every Ministerial and every Opposition supporter, every member of a party should take—he did not take me by surprise; he wrote me a note, telling me he could not support the Pacific Railway Resolutions. He, at all events, did not put a pistol to my breast. And so these gentlemen, the Ministerial supporters, the main body of them, almost all of them, one after another, came to me and assured me they would not allow the two questions to be commingled. They would not allow the one to hang to the other. I appeal to hon. members from the Province of Quebec if that is not so; if they did not indignantly repudiate the idea that one set of Resolutions would depend on the other; and they assured me, and they assured us, that they would support the Canadian Pacific Railway Resolutions; and then, and not till then did I feel myself at liberty to go to their meeting and state to them, which I did, what we had already determined—not upon their action, but, Sir, upon the appeal to the Government by the Provincial Government of Quebec. That, Sir, is the true, unvarnished story of the rumours which have been made, rumours injurious to the honour of the Government, and injurious alike to the honour of the vast majority of the representatives from Quebec—this is the answer to all such untrue, such unjust charges. Now, Sir, this Resolution says that it was a false principle to grant any of these subsidies. The Resolution is this:

"And this House feels bound to express the opinion that Canada, when (as proposed by the said Resolution), recouping one of the Provinces, or part of the past local expenditure—"

Sir, it was not local expenditure—

"local expenditure on railways, should have regard to the past local expenditure in other Provinces on railways, almost all of which have been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada; and this House regrets that the Government, while proposing a measure of relief to one Province, has not taken steps with a view to a fair and proportionate measure of relief, in respect of local expenditure in the other Provinces."

The hon. gentleman had just declared that these subsidies were degrading and demoralizing, that they were corrupt from their inception, corrupt in spirit; and yet he says: Ah, since you are going to do a corrupt thing, you had better

go a little further. In the western islands of Scotland, in days of old, the wreck of a ship was considered a better crop than the usual crop of oats, and they used to pray sometimes for a good season, and plenty of wrecks. It is said that on one occasion, on a Sunday, while a clergyman was giving a good Calvinistic sermon, a person rushed into the church and evident uneasiness came over the congregation. The parson twigged at once that there was a ship in distress in the offing, so he said, my friends keep your seats; listen to the words of wisdom, do not be carried away by feelings of love for filthy lucre. But he unbuttoned the door of the pulpit, and making a dash towards the door said: but let us have a fair start at all events. So it is with the hon. member for the West Riding of Durham. Oh! this is demoralizing, it is ruinous, it is unconstitutional; we must put it down, we must even have a conference and alter the very basis of the Constitution rather than have this corruption. But, meantime, since you are going in for a wreck, see if you cannot do something for Ontario, for Prince Edward Island, for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and British Columbia. That is the whole style of this Resolution. Well, Sir, it is like other resolutions the hon. gentleman has moved. In 1871, he moved them in Ontario—exactly the same kind of resolutions—and I am sorry to say with more success than the hon. gentleman is likely to get here. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman in his speech argued very strongly against the short line. Well, I am not going to discuss that short line much, except to say that the hon. gentleman is very anxious that he should get his friends in the Maritime Provinces to help. Sir, the whole policy of this Government, from the time that the Canadian Pacific Railway was taken up, was to make a railway from sea to sea. That was the whole policy. And we are carrying it out, notwithstanding persistent opposition from the beginning till now. Not a single proposition has been made for this great work, not a single resolution proposed by the Government, not a single measure has been submitted, but it has met the steady, consistent—I was going to say factious, but that would be unparliamentary—but the persistent opposition of the hon. gentleman. Well, Sir, I have had that all my life. I have been in Governments and I have carried a great many measures, from 1854 to now, and never one great question for the development of the country has ever been proposed by the party of which I have been a member—and no other other party has ever proposed any great measure for the development of the country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I say that no great question that will be read or remembered in history, that will last over the present generation, has ever been introduced except by the Governments of which I have been a member. I state so, and we have not only had to fight these questions through on their merits, but we have had to fight against the party—I won't say factious—the consistent party opposition of the hon. gentleman opposite. And what has been the consequence? The country has recognized that we are the party of progress, that we are the party of development, that the future destinies of Canada, if prosperous, must rest with the members who sit on this side of the House. By what malignant power, by what divinity, or semi-divinity—whether it arises from the inferior or the supernal deities—by what malignant power is it that the Opposition, like the Democratic party of the United States, have persistently attached themselves to the losing cause? They have opposed every measure for the development of Canada, every measure for its progress; but they have always failed, and Canada has always progressed, and Canada is what it is to-day. Look at what was the condition of the country in 1854; look at its condition now; and look at the period during which the Conservative party has had the guidance of its affairs. What would be the consequence if, in a fit of temporary insanity, the country should drive us from office? But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen are blinded—judicially blinded—on every subject that comes, and that has come before Parliament. A Republican was asked the other day how it happened that the Democratic party, consisting, like the Liberal party in this country, of so many able men, should yet be so uniformly unsuccessful—why it made so very many blunders—why it seemed to be in constant Opposition. "Well," said the Republican, "I don't know, but I think the Democratic party took out a patent for folly, and no one has tried to infringe the patent." Now, Sir, what does this Resolution say? It says that the Province of Quebec is asking relief. Well, relief sounds very much like a poor-house; and my hon. friends from Quebec have already in their speeches, resented that phrase being applied to their claim for justice. This Resolution also says that if the Province of Quebec gets relief, this House regrets that the Government, while proposing a measure of relief to one Province, has not taken steps with a view to a fair and proportionate measure of relief for the other Provinces. Well, how can there be a fair and proportionate measure of relief, if it is all degrading, if it is all unconstitutional, if it is all demoralizing? Sir, it is just as I say—the hon. gentleman says: Well, I do not like to rob that house, but if that house is to be robbed, give me some of the swag, give me some of the plunder. That is really, Mr. Speaker, the argument of this Resolution. Well, I will simply say to the House, do you want the railways or not? Do you approve of these Resolutions or not? If you do, you must meet both of the amendments with a direct negative. The hon. gentleman's Resolution declares that he regrets—actually regrets—that we do not go further than we have done—regrets that we do not spend more money—regrets that we do not go around to all the Provinces and say: Now, we are going to give Quebec so much money; they have built the North Shore Railway; they have built the last link of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and therefore you will grumble unless you have some too; and now, how much do you want? That is the Resolution of the hon. gentleman; he says he regrets that we did not go around and get from the different Provinces, in dollars and cents, how much claim on the Treasury they would have if we granted to Quebec this measure of justice. That is the Resolution. It is a hypocritical Resolution; it is a factious Resolution. The motives of the hon. gentleman are parliamentary; but while his motives are unexceptionable, the motion is hypocritical, and more than that, it is very bad-hearted. It is an attempt—a fruitless attempt, because the country will see through it—to set Province against Province, to arouse jealousy, to call upon the other Provinces to send in their little bills, and by constitutional pressure, by meeting him—not in No. 8, but in the different chambers allotted to the different Provinces—to come and make their demands. Sir, outside of this House, this resolution will be characterized as it deserves. It is a factious Resolution, an unpatriotic Resolution; it is a Resolution introduced for the purpose of setting man against man and Province against Province; and the country will meet it—notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman's motives may be, notwithstanding what high and holy principles may have actuated him in proposing this Resolution—the country will meet it with condign condemnation, as a Resolution to set man against man and Province against Province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentlemen may say hear, hear; but they feel it in their hearts. Not the greatest Democratic leader in the United States could have made such a grave mistake as the hon. gentleman has made

in moving that Resolution, and in making a speech, in which he denounced all such advances—in which he denounced, as corrupt and unconstitutional, and as requiring a change in the Constitution, all such advances by a Government, as being made for the purpose of demoralizing and buying up the different Provinces; and yet he comes down and says in this Resolution that the Government, since they have committed a crime, must commit more crime, must go deeper into degradation and demoralization; and instead of granting these three or four millions, must grant twice, or thrice or four times the amount; and he pronounces a censure on the Government because they have not adopted a course which he says is dishonest, corrupt, unconstitutional, and degrading.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is strong, so he should be merciful. The hon. gentleman should remember that common men are not of his measure or up to his standard; and when he talks of other men as hypocritical or bad-hearted, he should remember that few of us can approach to that strict uprightness and sincerity of purpose, to that whiteness of heart, to that angelic purity of motive and conduct, which have characterized him, during a long course of public life, in which, whatever other inconsistencies we may have observed, I admit that these have been constantly present. I say therefore, that as he is strong, so he should be merciful, and from that elevated sphere of conduct, of character, of heart, and of intellect, from which he looks down upon us who move with motives so much baser and more hypocritical, with hearts so bad and corrupt, he ought to remember that we are not able to attain to his measure, that we cannot rise to his standard; and if he must place himself so far above us, he ought at least, to be merciful to our weakness. Sir, the hon. gentleman has made some slight errors in the discussion of this question. In the first place, I will say a word or two only with reference to the amendment to the amendment. The hon. gentleman says that my amendment is one indicating that the Province of Quebec is getting too much, and that the sub amendment is one indicating that she is getting too little; and he says the sub-amendment is one of censure, for it is one of regret and want of confidence, and must be voted down, because if it should be acceded to, that terrible consequence, which we all dread so much, would follow—the consequence of the defeat of the Government. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that both these motions are almost necessarily framed in the one way, for the reason that we cannot propose, without the assent of the Crown, any addition to the public charge, and we are driven, constitutionally, to particular forms of expression in which these motions are made, when we desire to indicate another course of action as the fitting course of action with reference to the public charge. It is the only mode practicable in which we can say what we think ought to be done in this connection, and if it should be carried, if it is to produce these terrible consequences, there is always a way, which the hon. gentleman has learned on former occasions, of averting such results. That way is to accept the proposals, and then the difficulties are obviated. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the proposal of the hon. member for Shefford was never made before. But how could it be made earlier than the proposal the hon. gentleman has made? It is a proposal which has its growth out of the particular terms and details of this measure of the hon. gentleman, and unless and until it were known that the proposal of the hon. gentleman was to take this particular form, as to the $6,000 a mile, which is reserved, no one, of course, could make that suggestion; and very shortly after the proposals were put on the Table, the suggestion was made. Now, what I have to say with reference to that particular proposal of my hon. friend is this, that

disguise it as you may, we know, and we have it from the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Valin), to-night, that this is a measure of relief for Quebec. We know that it was so asked and we know that it is needed. It may be a measure of justice, but it is none the less a measure of relief, and we know that in the mode in which it is now proposed, without some arrangement of this kind, as proposed by the hon. member for Shefford, in case there should be long delays in making the arrangements for the extension of the Canada Central, that measure of relief, neither directly nor indirectly, will flow to the Province to the extent of the $960,000—not indirectly, because they will not get the connection at Quebec with the national highway for the time it is delayed; and not directly, for they will not get that addition to their annual resources which the interest of this sum will give. As I stated, when I made my motion, the Treasurer of the Province of Quebec has pointed out that there is an annual deficit in the finances of that Province of from $300,000 to $400,000 a year, and I pointed out that whatever he would do in the way of retrenchment or otherwise would, without Federal assistance, be inadequate; and I believe this portion of assistance suggested by the hon. member for Shefford would be an important element in bringing to an equilibrium the finances of that Province. The hon. gentleman began by a statement with reference to the mode in which this particular measure obtained its position on the Order Paper, and he said it was not correct that the Government was forced, by the pressure of Quebec, to make the proposal. He said that a rumour had reached him of a proposition made to me for a coalition with the Bleus of Quebec. Well, I told the hon. gentleman that that rumour had not reached me. He said I might have seen it in the papers; I did not understand him to refer to that. It is quite true I did see, in the Toronto *Mail* and the Montreal *Gazette*, a statement of that description; if that is what he means, I acknowledge that I saw untrue statements in both those papers on that subject, but I did not understand that was the mode in which he suggested the rumour had reached me. But if there had been any such proposal made to me, I call, inside and out of this House, for the person who made it. I remove all seal of confidence, if any there was, and I call for the person who intimated to me any such suggestion, to come forward and to speak now or for ever hereafter hold his peace. Now the hon. gentleman said there was no pressure on the Government whatever, and he proceeded to give the history of the transaction. He pointed out that originally the proposal of the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be Nipissing or, as he called it, at Callander, though Callander was not invented at that early day. He said my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had made proposals which extended practically the terminus to Ottawa. Not so. The proposal of my hon. friend was to subsidize the Canada Central until it would reach a point near Renfrew, in the first instance; when the route was altered, it was to reach Pembroke. Neither of these was Ottawa. The old proposal was, as I stated the other night, and proved by the reading of the speeches of the hon. Minister of Railways, in 1882, and again in 1883, when he was moving the votes for a subsidy for a line from Gravenhurst to Callander; and the hon. gentleman expressly stated that as that proposal had been made and carried in order to facilitate Quebec connection, justice for Ontario demanded something should be done for her; justice for Ontario demanded that a line should be made from Gravenhurst to Callander, in order that she might have the same facilities for connection which my hon. friend had given to Quebec, by extending the connection further eastward towards Montreal. That was the state of things, but the hon. gentleman was a prophet; he foresaw the result. No, not a prophet, because a prophet does not merely foreknow, but tells what he foreknows. In his secret soul the hon. gen-

tleman, from the moment the hon. member for East York proposed that, in order to help the connection with Quebec, there should be the same assistance given to run the road a little further eastward towards Quebec —from that moment, in his secret soul, he foreknew the road to Quebec would have to be assisted. It is a great number of years ago since that proposal was made to Parliament and assented to by Parliament. It was made in 1875, now nine years ago; so for nine years the hon. gentleman has been conscious of the fact that the roads which even then were being constructed in the Province of Quebec would, in consequence of that facility being given, have to be aided by the Federal Government. Then, he says, in answer to the question, why did he not do it before? Why, because Quebec did not ask for it before, because Quebec never asked it until the 12th of February last, when Dr. Ross sent in the memorial of the Quebec Government. Well, if it were just to have taken this up as an isolated proposition, and if it followed as a matter of justice, from the extension to which I have referred, that these roads should be exceptionally treated, I do not think it was necessary for the hon. gentleman to have waited until Quebec should ask before he would do Quebec justice. I think it follows, from the hon. gentleman's own statment, that he has been guilty of injustice, for "justice delayed," says the old proverb, "is justice denied," and one of those things which the King of England was solemnly sworn not to do in the great charter was not to delay justice. But the hon. gentleman has acknowledged that for nine long years he has been conscious that justice to Quebec demanded this special aid. For many of those years he was in Opposition, not embarrassed by the responsibilities of power, and not particularly careful for the interests and convenience of those who were in power, and quite disposed, in the legitimate exercise of his functions, as leader of the parliamentary Opposition, to bring forward any proposition which might be difficult for them and suitable for himself. But his voice was never raised, here or elsewhere, during those years of opposition, in favour of a proposition that these roads in Quebec should be aided. Well, to a period of opposition succeeded a period of power, five years of power, and that at the head of a great majority, and that for the last four years of it with an abounding surplus in the Treasury, and that, during a period in which the hon. gentleman was pressing great schemes of railway extension, great schemes of assisting other railways; but he still kept in his secret soul, unmentioned to any man, not discussed in Council, not propounded to Parliament, this feeling: The Province of Quebec is suffering an injustice, she ought to be aided; I see her resources diminishing, I see a large yearly deficit, I know it is the interest on this money she has expended on this railway and which I ought to pay her, that is causing it, but I keep it to myself, I have no word to say of it; my word is all-powerful; all I have to do is to bring down the measure and it will pass; and I will say nothing about it—why? Because she does not ask it. Then the hon. gentleman says that during the present Session it was asked, and they did it as soon as it was asked. Now, the hon. the Secretary of State, when he was First Minister, as was proved the other night by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), made a proposition which indicated the then views of himself and of his Government, and that was a proposition that the Government should arrange to take or, should themselves take over, these roads at a price of $7,000,000, the cost of them then to the Government being over $11,000,000, which would have made a difference of over $4,000,000, which the hon. gentleman said he was willing Quebec should bear as her portion of those advantages; and the practical result of the hon. gentleman's operations have been, in the sale of the railway not long afterwards for $7,600,000, as I proved the other night, by the figures, to produce just about those results. So that, while the hon. the First Minister of Canada, in his secret soul thought he ought to have helped to make up that difference, the First Minister of Quebec, now his colleague, was thinking that Quebec herself ought to bear that difference. He obviously, at that time, did not think that justice to Quebec called for a contribution of that difference specially for her in this respect. That is perfectly plain, for, if he had thought so, instead of saying: The sum in excess of $4,000,000, which will have to be borne by the Province, I take as her share, he would have called upon the Federal Government to divide, in some such proportions as are now suggested, or in some other proportions, that difference. Then the hon. gentleman says that all the advantages have been in Ontario heretofore. Now, I did not, in the discussion in which I engaged, with reference to the construction of the national railways, enter into any investigation of the comparative local benefits to the Provinces. I understood, and have always understood that, in contructing the national railways, we constructed them on national principles, and that the question was whether, between the termini which were proposed, geographically situated as they were, locally arranged as they were, it was to the interest of the Dominion at large that they should be built with the resources of the Dominion at large; and I pointed out that the national railways, which are two—the Intercolonial and the Pacific—had been constructed upon these grounds. And here I may pause for an instant, to deal with the arguments of my hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houle), in which he endeavoured to state an account between the Provinces, taking into account, though partially only, the question of the national railways. My hon. friend began by saying: I will not take any account of the Intercolonial, because that is one of the bases of Confederation. Why, it was the money of Confederate Canada that built the Intercolonial. It was out of the resources, not of the old Provinces, but of this Dominion of Canada that the Intercolonial was built.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was matter of bargain, though.

Mr. BLAKE. It was matter of bargain, it is quite true; but whose bargain? A bargain for Quebec? It was a bargain in the interest of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was a bargain in the interest of every Province.

Mr. BLAKE. There the hon. gentleman goes on just the ground I put it on. I say it is immaterial where the national railway is geographically situated; you agree that it is in the interest of the Confederation that it should be built out of the joint resources, and that ends the question. I deal with it in that way, and I am ready to deal with the Intercolonial in that way, but I am not ready to apply one measure to one national railway and not to apply the same measure to another national railway; and I would remind my hon. from Maskinongé that, if the Intercolonial was part of the bargain of the original Confederation, the Pacific was part of the bargain of the altered Confederation, which introduced British Columbia; that it was part of the bargain of the new Confederation into which British Columbia entered, and therefore, on that ground as well as on the other grounds, it falls within the same rule. But I put it on no such grounds; only I say, if you take into consideration the local advantages of the Canadian Pacific Railway, one of the national railways, you must surely also take into account the local advantages of the other, the Intercolonial; and, if you take the number of miles of the Intercolonial in the Province of Quebec, 290 miles, you will find my hon. friend's statement of account very considerably altered. I alter it for him in two other particulars. I remind him of the St. Charles Branch, just being completed at a cost of $1,000,000, which my hon. friend forgot; and I remind him of the fact that the Rivière du Loup Branch

when bought, was bought in a worn-out condition, that the cost of putting it into a state to run was estimated by engineers, and that the price paid to the Grand Trunk was based upon the proposition: When put in a proper state the road will be worth so much, it will cost so much to put it in a proper state, we give you the difference—a million and a-half. I do not remember the exact figures, but I believe it was about a million and a-quarter that it cost to put it in a proper state, which you have to add to the cost to the Dominion. I have now got two and a quarter millions, in addition to 290 miles of the Intercolonial, to be added to the state of account of the Province of Quebec, if you adopt that state of account, which I do not at all adopt. As to the Northern Railway in Ontario, my hon. friend is mistaken entirely if he supposes that it was of the slighest advantage to the Province of Ontario that a remission of the debt the Northern Railway owed and could not pay was made—entirely mistaken. The Northern Railway was in this position. It was a built road, running in the Province of Ontario; it owed the Government of Canada, before Confederation, a large sum of money, which became an asset of the Confederation, and every shilling that was given up of that debt was a shilling towards which Ontario contributed, without getting anything whatever in return. All the Provinces contributed to the loss on that joint asset, whatever it was. We got nothing whatever as a Province by the remission of any portion of the debt of the Northern Railway. I will go further, and tell him there was, in the sense in which he would put it, no remission, because hon. gentlemen opposite had proposed, with reference to the Northern Railway, that that whole Government claim should be remitted for a very small sum—I think £50,000—upon the report of the Auditor-General that that was all the debt was worth, and all the railway could pay. They, went out without having closed it. There was a subsequent investigation and enquiry, and a decision on the part of my hon. friend from East York and his Government, that the railway could afford to pay a larger sum, that the asset was worth more, and that the amount which was fixed was the extreme amount it was possible to obtain for that debt as I believe it was; and it was proposed, on those grounds, and I myself opposed the proposal, that it should go for a smaller sum, because I believed more could be realized. I knew of no Provincial interest which was to be served by giving one shilling to the Northern Railway. I know of none now. All was got that could be realized, and if any thing was lost Ontario lost her share of it, because she had nothing to gain by giving up anything for it. Therefore, without going further into that question, I say that if the account were to be stated on the principles on which the hon. gentleman proposed to state it, it would require a very different set of figures from those he presented to the House and which he fairly stated were without any pretention to exact accuracy. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says all the advantages, or the main advantages, have been to Ontario. I disclaim the argument, because, as I have said, you must treat your national railways as national railways, without reference to local advantages. But I said what has not been replied to, that the advantage to the country of a national railway as a means of development in the highest sense, is an advantage to that part of it in which its terminal port is situated. It is there that trade will flourish, it is there that manufactures will flourish, it is there that commerce will flourish, it is there that growth and development will take place; and while I do not at all deny the importance to any portion of country which possesses a capacity for local development of a railway running through it, I say that that is not the main advantage of a national highway. I have always stated my opinion where our national highway would go, and have never begrudged it—because it ought to go where nature has indicated it, and nature has indicated, at any rate, for the summer ports—the port to which so much allusion has been made, that one in the Province of Quebec. Then the hon. gentleman says, that because I spoke of the demoralizing system of subsidizing railways and suggested a change in the Constitution, I was bound to follow it up by a negative. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman's motion is an omnibus motion. It deals with a great number of subjects; it deals as I pointed out, with the question of a national railway; it deals with the question of local railways; it deals with the question of the payment proposed to be made to railways; it deals with three distinct classes of subjects, and the hon. gentleman says, that because I found objection to the principle of part of these grants I was bound to follow it up by an amendment directed to that particular part. I pointed out to the House, that with reference to the question of bonuses, it is the principle of aid to local railways that I objected to, but I stated that Parliament had adopted it, they had acted on the hon. gentleman's suggestion and were merely going on in the same path, and I only reiterated my objections. But I contended that the other new question was the question which mainly deserved our attention, for practical purposes, on this occasion. The hon. gentleman says that my speech has postponed my being made a Minister for a great many years—I think he said twenty. Well, personally, I am pleased at the long postponement of the period when I am to exchange, for the cares and responsibilities of office, the comparative ease and comfort of Opposition in this House. The hon. gentleman compared the attitude of myself and party to the attitude of the Democratic party in the United States, but the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that the Democrats were in a majority in the United States Congress to-day. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the Government made up their minds to act before ever the hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec spoke to them about it. I asked, why did you delay, then, until this hour of the Session? Well, we delayed, he said, because there was a rumour which, more fortunate than myself, the hon. gentleman had heard somehow or other—I suppose through the newspapers. I did see one stated, with great circumstantiality, in the newspapers, a rumour of a difficulty in the matter, and so long as there was that rumor, he would not bring down the proposition. Well, the time came when it was understood that the attitude of the Quebec members had changed, and then for the first time, magnanimous man that he was, the hon. gentleman felt himself at liberty to disclose those beneficent intentions of the Government which had existed in his own breast for nine years, which he had kept carefully concealed all that time, because he was not asked, forsooth; which, on the 12th of February, even after a demand from the Government of Quebec, he had still abstained from communicating his acquiescence in; which, so long as there was any danger, any danger that he might suffer in consequence from resistance, he refused to disclose; but the moment that that danger was dissipated, that the friends of whom there was a rumour that they might become enemies, had announced the restoration of their allegiance and friendly feelings, he felt himself quite free to go into the Committee Room and declare to them, not merely that he was going to do it, but, I suppose, that he had always intended to do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. In point of fact I dare say he told them something like what he has said there to-night. I dare say he said to them: "Gentlemen, you see now how you have misconceived me; 'Short's your friend, not Codlin;' I always intended to do this; for years, for nine long years, I have kept it in my breast, because you did not do your duty, because you did not come foward and claim it; and when your Provincial Ministers came forward and claimed it, and when you yourselves came forward and claimed it, I didn't

do it, because you did claim it; but now that I understand, that having claimed it, you have desisted from your demand, now that I understand your claim has become a disclaimer, I am relieved from all difficulty; I announce to you the concession I am about to make; I relieve my pent-up bosom from those feelings of emotion for Quebec under which it has been labouring for nine long years; now I am able to announce that during all those nine years, while none of you proposed it, while not a man of you said in Parliament that justice to Quebec demands this, I knew it all the time, and I have only waited till now to be able to announce it to you on the floor of Parliament." And then it was not to us it was told. Oh, no; the Parliament of Canada was not the recipient of the hon. gentleman's confidences; we could not hear anything about it here; the deputation from the Province of Quebec were told what the Government was going to do, but the Parliament of Canada was not to be told. They were told before the vote was taken on this Resolution what was to be done. Parliament was not given that information; hon. members were not told what the intentions of the Government were. They were the members from Quebec to whom the hon. gentleman communicated his intention. Now, the hon. gentleman says that I stated the proposition was corrupt, and yet I go further. Not so. As I have pointed out, we are dealing here with three different classes of propositions; and with respect to this particular class of proposal, I dealt with the House and with the question with the greatest frankness. I pointed out to the House what for a season of years had been the condition of the Province of Quebec, and I said it was not in the interests of Confederation that it should continue in that financial condition in which it was; and I declared my readiness to join in any reasonable and fair measure of relief for the readjustment of that condition; and I declared my readiness to look at this measure as being one in which the Government proposed to bring forward that relief, and in that sense I acquiesced in it to such an extent as I could. And I did not take the responsibility—so grave was the responsibility in view of the attempt to restore at an early period the finances of Quebec—of moving a motion which, if it were carried, would have the effect of intercepting the proposition of the Government. I might have made a motion very much more popular in other Provinces if had I been hunting for votes. If I had chosen, I might have said: No; I would not agree to anything of this kind. But I felt the interests of this country required that we should consider what the financial condition of the Province of Quebec was; and considering it, I could not reconcile it to my duty to make a motion which, if it were to carry, would have the effect of intercepting the aid proposed to be given to that Province. I proposed a motion, therefore, in form and in substance not having that effect, but which really suggested, if it were to carry, what the opinion of the House was, as to what further steps should be taken, without interfering with the steps which were being taken —consequential steps, as I believe them to be, and which I believe follow as natural consequences from the steps so taken. So much I asserted then, so much I assert now, and by that I will abide. I am prepared to contend in this Dominion for the soundness and justness of this proposal with respect to all the Provinces; but I say that I did not state that this proposal was a corrupt proposal. I pointed out the tendency of the hon. gentleman's proposal, with respect to advances to the small local railways; I pointed out its tendency with respect to our Constitution, and its demoralizing effect on the people; but as to this particular proposal, I dealt with it on the principle to which I have referred. Then, the hon. gentleman said I argued most strongly against the short line. I appeal to the House whether the hon. gentleman could have heard me when he made that statement. I did not argue against the hon. gentleman's proposal for a short line. That statement shows how very ill the hon. gentleman conceives my argument. The hon. gentleman is very acute and quick of perception as to what hon. members are driving at, but he cannot have heard my speech.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman simply stated that if the terminus was in Canada he did not see much objection to a road through a foreign country; but he did see an objection to any money being granted to it.

Mr. BLAKE. No; on the contrary, I stated I was for the shortest objective line, and that I was prepared to support it, even if it passed through a foreign country. I pointed out how much opposed that was to the course which the hon. gentleman had taken before, and I conceived myself avenged by his present attitude, in regard to a matter respecting which I have been accused of something approaching high treason, because I suggested a road, part of which would pass through a foreign country. I said that the proposition of the hon. gentleman, which involved the expenditure of money on a line through a foreign country, was a fact which made it all the more necessary that we should ensure, before we proceeded to expend money on the local development of the foreign country, that the short line to which we grant a subsidy should be one which would enable us to keep the business. I said I regarded it as a primary object that we should subsidize such a short line; but that if we could obtain the same results by having a line through our own country, I should prefer it, not for patriotism, but because we would be developing our own country instead of a foreign country—not because of sentiment, but because of a tangible fact. I said the hon. gentleman had shown that the Intercolonial was not going to serve the purpose, and that he was now going to place in competition with it a short line; but I did not speak against the principle of a short line; on the contrary, I told the hon. gentleman that, irrespective of the question of the trans-continental trade having its ocean terminus at an Atlantic port within Canada, I can see that we have an important duty to perform with respect to our own interprovincial trade, and that is to reduce the distance between the Provinces by the shortest line possible. I really thought I was giving not a great opposition, but a somewhat plain and generous support to the hon. gentleman's proposal for a short line, so far as I could, in ignorance of his route, in ignorance of the cost, in ignorance of his financial scheme. In respect of these, I pointed out that we had nothing before us—that we had not what the Government proposed to expend on the route, and no assurance that the expenditure would accomplish the object. Thus, I could not do more than commit myself to the principle of the short line. The hon. gentleman has said the Conservative party have done all the good that ever was done in Canada, and he asked us to look at Canada to-day and consider what it would have been if it had not been for the Conservative party. Well, I would have been very glad, at some earlier period of the Session, and some more convenient season, to consider what Canada would have been to-day it had not been for the misdeeds of the Conservative party. But I will not detain the House by a *résumé* of these matters just now. I can only say that I do not conceive the occasion was a fortunate one for the hon. gentleman to challenge comparisons; that I do not conceive that the future of this country, under his rule, under his auspices, by virtue of his policy and deeds, has been made so bright or so assuring that this night and this year he should challenge such a comparison as that; and that I believe, just as we have seen those clouds which I told him were in the sky, at the opening of last Session, though he would not recognize them, lowering during this year and becoming heavier and approaching nearer—just as we

now see the difficulties of a reckless financial and fiscal policy more and more enveloping the country, the hon. gentleman was rasher even than he ordinarily is, when taking this as his occasion to say that to the Conservative party this country was indebted for its prosperity and its advancement. I believe, Sir, the hon. gentleman's general policy is one which will result in disaster to this country. I hope its recuperative force will be such as to overcome that disaster; but its measure of permanent, enduring prosperity will be achieved, not because of, but in spite of, the policy of the Conservative party.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a very few words on the Resolutions now before the House, representing, as I do, a district of the country deeply interested in this particular matter. While I would be willing to vote for and support any grant towards building a railway or any other public work that I should consider of national importance, there are one or two other questions contained in those Resolutions to which I wish to refer for a few moments. With reference to the granting of aid to local railways, and the recoupment of other Provinces for railways already built, I wish to point out the condition in which my district is situated in that respect, and to ask the House whether or not it is just and fair—in view of this policy being adopted—to ask that some share of justice be meted out to us. When I say that that district has, by provincial aid, and by aid granted by bonuses from municipalities, built its local railway, I think I am entitled to ask that consideration; I think I may go that far after an hon. gentleman who addressed this House went so far as to state that if any member could point out any part of the great national railway which has been built by provincial and municipal aid, he would be willing to give the same assistance as was asked for railways running through his own Province. I wish to point out that the Credit Valley Railway, running from the city of Toronto through the western peninsula of Ontario and connecting with the great system of American railways, was built by provincial and municipal aid. I wish to state that the different municipalities through which it runs have assumed heavy burthens of indebtedness for the construction of that road; that a great many private individuals, business men and others, have contributed of their means in their anxiety to build up those roads in the interest of that Province. When I state to the House that this Government have not only declared this railway to be for the general advantage of Canada, but have taken it out of the jurisdiction of the Local Government, and when I state that the grants and bonuses given by the different municipalities were often given on certain conditions, and that by the legislation of this House in taking that railway out of the jurisdiction of the Local Government, they have legislated away the right of the municipalities to have those conditions fulfilled, and when I point out further to the House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have considered that railway so much in their interest, so necessary to them, that they have purchased it or in some other way become possessors of it, I think I have the right to say that if one Province or any section of the country has a right to be recouped for railways it has built, I think we have the right to come here, and in full justice, ask that some consideration should be given to those interested in that road. While I must say that I would be opposed to this Parliament adopting the policy of granting aid to local railways, I say if such a policy is adopted, and if we are called upon, after having built our own local railways, after assuming heavy responsibilities, heavy liabilities which we have to pay, if we are called upon to contribute —because that section of the country does largely contribute towards the revenue, towards the surplus which is being spent on these railways— if we are called upon to contribute towards the building of what are purely local railways in different sections of the country, no matter in what Province, then, I say, we should have some recoupment from this Parliament. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I felt it my duty to make these few remarks, even at this late stage of the Session. I, for one member representing that district, could not possibly support the Resolutions before the House, unless on some understanding that the policy would be carried out in the way I have indicated.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Auger) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	De St. Georges,	Mulock,
Allison (Lennox),	Fairbank,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong,	Fisher,	Platt,
Auger,	Fleming,	Ray,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Kinfret,
Béchard,	Geoffrion,	Scriver,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Somerville (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bourassa,	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Thompson,
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Trow,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Watson,
Catudal,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Charlton,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
Cockburn,	McIsaac,	Wilson,
Cook,	McMullen,	Yeo.—56.
Davies,	Mills,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dugas,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Dundas,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Foster,	O'Brien,
Belleau,	Gault,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bolduc,	Haggart,	Royal,
Bossé,	Hall,	Scott,
Bourbeau,	Hay,	Small,
Brecken,	Hickey,	Sproule,
Bryson,	Homer,	Stairs,
Burns,	Houde,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Cameron (Victoria),	Ives,	Taylor,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Temple,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper (Pictou),
Cochrane,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Coursol,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	McDonald (CapeBreton),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams,
Dawson,	McMullan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	McCallum,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desjardins,	McCarthy,	Woodworth,
Dickinson,	McDougald,	Wright.—110.
Dodd,	McGreevy,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Messieurs	
Robertson (Hamilton),	Cameron (Huron),
Kranz,	Livingstone,
Vanasse,	Jackson,
Hesson,	King,
Gagné,	Lister,
Ferguson (Welland),	Wells,
Macmaster,	Robertson (Shelburne).

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Platt,
Auger,	Forbes,	Ray,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Rinfret,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Scriver,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Somerville (Brant),
Blake,	Harley,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Catudal,	McCraney,	Watson,
Charlton,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McIsaac,	Wheler,
Cook,	McMullen,	Wilson,
Davies,	Mills,	Yeo.—55.
De St. Georges,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dodd,	McDougald,
Amyot,	Dugas,	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dundas,	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dupont,	Massue,
Bell,	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Belleau,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gault,	O'Brien,
Benson,	Gigault,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Ouimet,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Paint,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourassa,	Haggart,	Royal,
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Scott,
Brecken,	Hay,	Small,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Sproule,
Burns,	Homer,	Stairs,
Cameron (Inverness),	Houde,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Campbell (Victoria),	Ives,	Taylor,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper (Pictou),
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Valin,
Coursol,	Lessage,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Macdonald (Kings),	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	McDonald (CapeBreton),	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desjardins,	McCallum,	Woodworth,
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Wright.—111.

On the main motion,

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, before these Resolutions are finally adopted, I desire to call the attention of the Government to the question of the short line, upon which my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé), when he spoke some time ago, requested a declaration of policy from the Government—a declaration which we have not had, but which we ought to have. By the third paragraph of the Resolutions, it is provided that a subsidy of $170,000 a year shall be allowed for fifteen years, for the building of a short line between Quebec and the harbours of St. John and Halifax. It is a well-known fact that the line contemplated by these Resolutions is a line which is to run for a large part of its course over foreign territory. While everybody will admit that it is desirable that the eastern and western Provinces of the Dominion should be connected by the most direct line possible, at the same time, everyone, I am sure, will regard it as a great calamity if no such line can be found through our own territory. Of course, if a private company—actuated by the opinion that the present communications between the east and the west, by means of the Intercolonial Railway, are not adequate—were to seek to establish a short line, without asking any public aid, such a company would have a right to locate its line wherever it thought best, whether on domestic or on foreign territory. But when a company proposes to build a line across a foreign territory, and comes and asks this Parliament to constitute it a Dominion undertaking, I am sure every one will agree that this company should not receive a single cent of Canadian money until it has been fully established that no line, or the largest part of a line, cannot be secured on our own territory. Now, it is not certain that the short line proposed to be built through the State of Maine, is the shortest line between Halifax and Montreal. It is the opinion of competent engineers that a line as short, or almost as short, can be found by way of Quebec—that a line built *viâ* Quebec, Rivière du Loup and Edmonston, would be almost as short as the American line. By this line the distance between Montreal and Halifax would be 784 miles, whereas the distance by the line through Maine would be 753 miles, a difference in favour of the American line of only 31 miles. Well, I am sure, Sir, that the most strenuous advocates of the short line in this House must be ready to say that such a difference of 31 miles in the whole distance of 784 miles is absolutely insignificant, and that if we can secure a line through our own territory which is only 31 miles longer than the American line, it is not worth while giving the subsidy for the completion of the American line, but that it should be given for the line upon our own territory. There are, I am informed, in addition, many advantages which militate in favour of the Canadian line. In the first place, as has already been pointed out, if we have a line upon our own territory we avoid the bonding system, which will become unavoidable if we adopt the American line, and which is a very serious annoyance to shippers of freight. In the next place, it appears that the American line is subject to heavy grades and to excessive curvature; and this fact will not be surprising to anybody who remembers that that line will run through a lengthy chain of mountains. I understand that the line upon our own soil *viâ* Quebec, Rivière du Loup and Edmonston, would be practically free from all these blemishes. So that, in point of fact, though the American line would be shorter by 31 miles, our own line would be practically shorter, in point of time and of hauling power. Well, Sir, these are important considerations, which ought to be investigated and reported upon before this vote is finally passed upon. There is another consideration. It is is the common consent of the whole population of this Dominion, as well as the settled policy of this Government, that the city of Quebec should be the summer port of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that its terminus should be in the Maritime Provinces, and provision is made in these Resolutions for carrying out that policy. Now, it is manifest that if these Resolutions are carried, they practically take away the summer port from the city of Quebec. It is manifest, if this line is carried over American territory, as soon as the freight reaches Montreal, not a pound of it will find its way to the city of Quebec, but all of it will go over the American line. This is not in accordance with the policy we have adopted. Moreover, I question very much whether, once the freight has gone upon the American line, it will ever reach the ports of the Maritime Provinces. There is reason to believe that when it has reached Maine, it will be diverted to Bangor and to the other ports of that State, which would then be nearer to the Canadian Pacific Railway than any port in the Maritime Provinces. These, as I have said, are important considerations, and they ought to be investigated and reported upon before we finally pass upon this vote. They are considerations that have impressed themselves on the minds of the people of the city of Quebec. I am informed that the president of the Board of Trade, a few days ago, sent the following telegram to the hon. Minister of Railways:

"QUEBEC, 8th April, 1884.

"Referring to the annual subsidy of $170,000 mentioned, in the railway resolutions, I would respectfully represent that the shortest and most practicable line between Montreal, Halifax and St John can be obtained *viâ* Quebec, and I would suggest that the disposal of this subsidy be not decided until this can be proved.

"JOSEPH SHEHYN,
"*President Quebec Board of Trade.*

"HON. SIR CHARLES TUPPER,
"Minister of Railways, Ottawa."

It seems to me that this proposition is a reasonable one; it asks nothing but that which must commend itself to the sense of this House. Of course, I quite agree that, if the shortest line cannot be found on our territory, the subsidy should go where it is intended by these Resolutions to go; but, at the same time, everybody must be of the opinion that if a line equally good can be found on our territory, the subsidy should go to it; and when it is asserted such a line can be found on our territory, it is only just that before we dispose of our money in favour of a line through a foreign country, we should take every means to have the matter fully investigated and a report laid before Parliament before we finally dispose of it. For these reasons, not wishing to delay the House longer, I beg to move:

That the said Resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with power to amend the same by providing that the route for the line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax, for which a subsidy of $170,000 a year, for fifteen years, is provided, should be subject to the approval of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend who has just moved this amendment is wrong in saying that no Ministerial response was made to the appeal from the hon. member for Maskinongé, on this point.

Mr. LAURIER. I said the hon. member for Quebec Centre.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. When my hon. friend for Maskinongé referred to this matter, I drew his attention to the fact, and he appeared to be entirely satisfied with it, that the Resolution itself provided that this short line should be located by the Governor in Council, not only after the shortest line had been obtained, but the shortest and best line, and this throws the entire responsibility of selecting, not only the shortest, but the best line. If, therefore, the line suggested by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, should prove to be a little longer, but be found to be a line with better grades, it would come within the purview of this Resolution, because it would be the shortest and best. It is intended, before any line is adopted, that the shortest and best route shall be ascertained by competent engineers, and the Government shall locate the line upon the report of competent engineers, upon what they find, after careful examination, to be both the shortest and best line. There is a fatal objection to the proposition of my hon. friend to have that submitted to Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows that Parliament has made an arrangement, during the present Session, for the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the summer of 1886, and every hon. gentleman knows how important it is we should have this line of communication to the ports of the Maritime Provinces open and ready to receive the traffic and direct it into the proper channel. The hon. gentleman knows that if we lose a single year, and compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to make arrangements for an outlet of that great inter-oceanic line of railway at an American port, it is much easier to get traffic diverted into a channel of that kind than to take it out of that groove and place it in another groove after the lapse of a year. I hope hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, who take a deep interest in this construction of a short line of railway to give a terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway in our own country, will not support the Resolution the hon. gentleman has moved, because, so far as the location and determination of the shortest and best route is concerned, it is provided for in the Resolution, it will be provided for in the law, and the law will oblige the Government to adopt that course; and I am quite certain that our hon. friends on this side, at all events, will feel that they can place confidence in the declaration of the Government that this matter will be fairly and candidly examined in the light of the best information that can be obtained, and the principle embodied in the Resolution carried out, of having the shortest and best practicable route.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I desire to say a few words relative to a quotation made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, from a letter addressed by the hon. members from Cape Breton to the hon. the Minister of Railways, on the 10th instant. When referring to this short line, the hon. leader of the Opposition said:

"There is also important information as to the views of others in this matter, to be found in the papers to be found on the Table. Several gentlemen, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Paint, have signed a memorandum in which they say:—"

He then quoted several extracts from that letter, in one of which he says:

"A larger subsidy would be required to induce the same company to undertake the Cape Breton section, concurrently with other sections of the short line from Montreal to Louisburg."

I admit it was not his intention to misrepresent the letter referred to, but there is no such sentence in the letter and there is no sentence in that letter which intended to convey the idea expressed in the sentence quoted. On the contrary, the aim was to show that no company would undertake to build any section of that line on as easy terms as they would undertake to build it in connection with the whole line. As this quotation so misrepresents the letter, I desire to read it in its entirety, and as it is not long, I hope the House will bear with me patiently while I read it:

"OTTAWA, 5th March, 1884.

"HON. SIR CHARLES TUPPER,
"Minister of Railways, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—As it was found necessary to give the Pictou Branch, which cost over $2,400,000—£600,000 in cash and 150,000 acres of Crown lands, in order to induce a company to construct a railway from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso: And as the said Company, and the Local Government of Nova Scotia, successively, sold their interest in the said Pictou Branch and Eastern Extension from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso for $1,200,000, which is only half the original cost of the Pictou Branch alone, we consider that a subvention, consisting of Eastern Extension alone and $3,200 per mile, is totally inadequate for the construction of a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, in view of the facts (1) that the Pictou Branch pays each year about $60,000, as repeatedly estimated by both political parties in Nova Scotia, over running expenses, and (2) that the Eastern Extension actually earned $9,000 less than running expenses last year. A railway from New Glasgow to Louisburg would prove a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial from New Glasgow to Halifax, to which the trade of that section of the Province of Nova Scotia will naturally flow. The railway east of New Glasgow must be treated simply as a feeder to railways west of New Glasgow. That section from New Glasgow eastward will never carry as much traffic eastward as it will westward. It will therefore be a valuable subvention to railways west of New Glasgow, whether run by the Government or by a company.

"The short line from Montreal to New Glasgow would not have as much interest in extension eastward of New Glasgow as the Intercolonial, from New Glasgow to Halifax. As soon as the short line from Montreal will be finished eastward to New Glasgow, it will cease to have much interest in a line east of New Glasgow that will contribute its traffic principally to the Intercolonial, between New Glasgow and Halifax. The company constructing the short line from Montreal to New Glasgow will, therefore, naturally decline to build east of the Strait of Canso without a much larger subsidy than would suffice to enable a company to build from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, and will require a larger subsidy than would now suffice to induce the same company to undertake the Cape Breton section, concurrently with other sections of the short line from Montreal to Louisburg. Any railway scheme, therefore, such as agreed upon by the Maritime members supporting the Government, having in view the shortest practicable route between Montreal and St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax, and Louisburg, unless it provides that the Cape Breton section of that line shall be commenced, prosecuted, and finished concurrently with the other sections of the short line, either by the same company or by the Dominion Government, will unfairly discriminate in favour of the new con-

structed sections of the line west of New Glasgow, and render it more difficult to secure extension from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, after the short line will be finished to New Glasgow, than at present.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servants,

(Signed) "C. J. CAMPBELL,
"H. CAMERON,
"MURRY DODD,
"W. McDONALD,
"H. N. PAINT."

My only object was to prevent any false impression which might be made by the quotation from that letter. Before sitting down, I may say that I entirely concur in the policy of the Government, in reference to the subsidizing of the Pacific Railway, from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic. I would even go further and authorize the restoration to the several Provinces of the money expended by each Province on the main line from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic. I believe that, if the Province of Quebec expended money on the main line of the Pacific Railway, they have a right to the restoration of all the moneys. That is my view, and although it may seem strange to some hon. gentlemen in this House, that nine years ago the idea occurred to the leader of the present Government that such a restoration would have to be made in the near future, it may seem still stranger to them that a similar idea occurred to myself nine years ago, and that being the fact, I can hardly forbear to read a letter which I addressed to the *Morning Chronicle*, on the 12th April, 1875, shortly after the Nova Scotia Government adopted the insane policy of subsidizing railways, east and west, in Nova Scotia. That insane policy was inaugurated in that Province in the year 1872, and having opposed it privately for several years, I gave public expression to that private opinion on the 12th April, 1875, in the columns of the *Morning Chronicle*. In that letter I stated as follows:—

"The people of this Island desire to make Louisburg the eastern terminus of the inter-oceanic railroad. The Dominion Government assumed the obligation of the Western Extension, not only to a central position in British Columbia, but also across that Province of the Dominion to the Pacific side of Vancouver's Island. For similar reasons the Dominion Government should assume the responsibility of Eastern Extension across Nova Scotia to a good winter port—Louisburg—on the Atlantic side of this Province. The very idea of making Louisburg the terminus of the eastern end of that grand chain of road from the Pacific coast, implies that the obligation of building the Eastern Extension, from Pictou to Lonisburg, devolves on the Dominion Government. The obligation to build the Eastern Extension is equally as binding on the honour of the Dominion as the admitted obligation of Western Extension through British Columbia and across Vancouver Island, although not specified by an Act of Parliament, or by any injunction from the Colonial Office. Justice to western Nova Scotia as well as to eastern Nova Scotia, demand that the Dominion Government should assume its legitimate responsibility in this matter, not by the partial subsidy of that branch of the Intercolonial railroad, from Truro to Pictou, towards this national undertaking, but by adequately subsidizing the Eastern Extension, from Pictou, at the exclusive expense of the whole Dominion of Canada. The very fact that the Premier of the Dominion admits the justice of giving the Pictou Branch as a subsidy in aid of Eastern Extension to Louisburg, is sufficient evidence of an implied obligation on the Dominion to extend the Intercolonial railroad to Louisburg. If any company can be found willing and competent to build, equip and maintain a railroad from Pictou to Louisburg, on the condition of obtaining the Pictou Branch as a subsidy, then the Dominion Premier, by considering this subsidy, did justice to Cape Breton, whose interest he so cautiously professes to uphold. But if the subsidy of the Pictou Branch be only sufficient to induce any company to undertake the eastward extension of the Intercolonial Railroad further than Antigonish, then it is the duty of the Premier of the Dominion to furnish a sufficient subsidy to extend the road from that point to Louisburg. And I have no doubt, if proper representations were made in the Dominion Parliament, in view of obligations assumed westward, the Dominion Premier would grant so reasonable a demand.

"My convictions are:

"1st. That the Dominion Government should subsidize the Eastern Extension of the Intercolonial railroad, from Pictou to Louisburg, without the aid of any local subsidies.

"2nd. That the Crown lands and mineral rights of Nova Scotia should only be given as subsidies to branch lines, east and west, through the sections in which such lands and minerals existed, with the view of developing the local resources of this Province.

"Now Sir, holding these views, you can easily imagine my astonishment at the manner in which the Local Legislature, with such unanimity, assume responsibilities which are unquestionably of a national and not of a local character. All the available resources of Nova Scotia will be required to sustain her own legitimate responsibilities. As a resident of Cape Breton, interested in the development of her immense resources, I protest against giving hundreds of thousands of acres of Crown lands on this Island, hundreds of thousands of acres of mineral rights on this Island, and hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money, as a subsidy to the Eastern Extension of the Intercolonial railroad. I have no objection to giving the Pictou Branch to any company competent to undertake a part, or the whole, of the Eastern Extension, as that is Dominion property by an Act of Parliament, and is therefore a legitimate subsidy towards the Louisburg Extension. As more will evidently be required, let the Dominion Government do justice to the east as well as the west, by granting the necessary subsidy to the Louisburg road."

Before sitting down, I desire to say a few words with reference to the very large amount which the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) has stated had been expended in Nova Scotia.

Mr. HOUDE. Not expended, but only voted.

Mr. CAMERON. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I beg to thank the House for their patience in listening to me at this late hour.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to say, with reference to the quotation to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, that I read from the original documents at the Table, and at the request of the reporters I sent the documents to them. If there has been any mistake in the report, it has been by some curious accident. They did not take the report from my lips, but from the papers.

Mr. BELLEAU. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if the Government is disposed to admit the principle, that besides the engineer who is to be appointed by the Government to make the exploration, other engineers, who may be suggested by the Provinces interested, could be admitted as parties to the explorations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will be only too glad to receive any suggestion of that kind, in regard to any able engineer, and to avail ourselves of the services of the engineer suggested by any Province of the Dominion which may wish to have the fullest information in regard to any of the proposed railways.

Mr. PAINT. I desire to express my hearty thanks to the hon. Minister of Railways and to the other members of the Government for the wise provision they have made for the extension of a railway into Cape Breton. In moving the Resolutions the other day, the hon. Minister made use of the word "Sydney." But all the memorials that were presented to the Minister in reference to the extension of railways into Cape Breton, referred to Louisburg. The consequence of this statement by the Minister was, that some parties who desired to have the road go by the northern way, or by what is mis-called the central route, telegraphed to the papers at Sydney, that that road was adopted, and the electors from my county telegraphed up here to know if that was the case. I supposed that expression was used in error, because it implies a doubt, as the Resolution says "Sydney or Louisburg." As this is to be a short line, I trust the shortest line only will be selected, and that care will be taken that no mistake is made in this matter. The shortest line, I maintain, of course, is through the county of Richmond, directly to Louisburg, and is eight miles shorter than any other route that can be selected, as is shown by the result of the survey. It has besides the further advantage of avoiding the construction of a drawbridge of a total length of 2,000 feet, over deep water, and obviating any interference with the traffic through the St. Peter's Canal. Though not strictly my place, I would also heartily thank the Minister of Railways for the wise provision he has made for filling up the gap between Digby and Annapolis. I notice that the member for Yarmouth is not in the House, but I need not add anything more, because I see the member for Digby is in his seat.

Mr. GRANDBOIS. (Translation.) After the very explicit statements made by the hon. Minister of Railways, it will be readily understood that it is my duty to vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for East Quebec; otherwise I would have hesitated a great deal, as the county which I have the honour to represent, is one of the counties the most interested in having the short line built exclusively on Canadian territory. The Resolution states that the shortest and the best line will be chosen, which enables me to hope, Mr. Speaker, that the line will really be built on Canadian soil, and will go through Rivière du Loup as the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) has said. Consequently I have no objection in voting against the motion in amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Laurier) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Davies,	Mulock,
Allison (Lennox)	De St. Georges,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong	Fairbank,	Platt,
Auger,	Fisher,	Ray,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	Renfret,
Béchard,	Forbes,	Scriver,
Bernier,	Geoffrin,	Somerville (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bourassa,	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Houde,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Thompson,
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Trow,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Watson,
Catudal,	McCraney,	Wheler,
Charlton,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Cockburn,	McMullen,	Yeo.—52.
Cook,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dugas,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Dundas,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Baker (Missi-quoi),	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Gault,	O'Brien,
Beaty,	Geoffrion,	Orton,
Belleau,	Gillmor,	Ouimet,
Benoit,	Girouard,	Paint,
Benson,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Bergin,	Guilbault,	Riopel,
Billy,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Scott,
Bolduc,	Hall,	Small,
Bossé,	Hay,	Sproule,
Bourbeau,	Hickey,	Stairs,
Brecken	Homer,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Burns,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Ives,	Taylor,
Cameron (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Temple,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Caron,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper (Pictou),
Chapleau,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Cochrane,	Langevin,	Valin,
Costigan,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Kings),	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Weldon,
Curran,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Williams,
Dawson,	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	McCarthy,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desjardins,	McDougald,	Woodworth,
Dickinson,	McGreevy,	Wright.—109.
Dodd,		

Main motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Desaulniers,	McDougald,
Allison (Lennox),	Desjardins,	McGreevy,
Amyot,	Dickinson,	McIsaac,
Auger,	Dodd,	McLelan,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dugas,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dundas,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Fisher,	O'Brien,
Béchard,	Forbes,	Orton,
Bell,	Foster,	Ouimet,
Belleau,	Gault,	Paint,
Benoit,	Geoffrion,	Pinsonneault,
Benson,	Gigault,	Ray,
Bergeron,	Gillmor,	Reid,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Gordon,	Riopel,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Scott,
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Small,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Sproule,
Bourassa,	Hall,	Stairs,
Bourbeau,	Hay,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Brecken,	Hickey,	Tassé,
Bryson,	Homer,	Taylor,
Burns,	Houde,	Temple,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Tilley,
Cameron (Victoria),	Ives,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Tupper (Pictou),
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Tyrwhitt,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Catudal,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (Albert),
Chapleau,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Cochrane,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Costigan,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),
Coughlin,	Macdonald (King's)	White (Hastings),
Coursol,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Curran,	McDonald (CapeBreton)	Williams,
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth,
Dawson,	McCallum,	Wright.—128.
De St. Georges,	McCarthy,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	Scriver,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Somerville (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Blake,	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex)	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Cartwright,	McCraney,	Trow,
Casey,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Charlton,	McMullen,	Wheler,
Cockburn,	Mulock,	Wilson,
Cook,	Paterson (Brant),	Yeo.—35.
Davies,	Platt,	

Resolution read the second time and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 147) to authorize certain subsidies and grants for and in respect of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Bill read the first time.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1885, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 4th April, 1884.

Ordered, that the said Message, and additional Supplementary Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and the Acts amending it. He said: Mr. Speaker, as I propose to make some further alterations in the Bill, as printed, I think it is desirable that I should state, in general

terms, what those alterations are, before we go into Committee. It is proposed in the Bill to enact in the second clause the following:—

"The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and all Acts in amendment thereof, shall hereafter apply to all railways (except Government railways) and railway companies, subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada."

I find, on examination, that the effect of passing that clause would be to cause a great deal of difficulty and doubt with respect to some of the lines of railway not now brought within the provisions of the Consolidated Railway Act. I propose to have a very careful revision of those railway Acts made, and a consolidation of them prepared, previous to next Session, and also a further amendment of the Consolidated Railway Act made, so that they may be brought into harmony, as otherwise confusion would probably result. As that is the case, in order to carry out the pledges given to Parliament last Session in regard to making applicable railway funds to all lines of railway, I propose to introduce, as the first clause of this Bill, the following:—

"The several sections and sub-sections shall apply to all railway companies and all railways, except Government railways, within the legislative authority of Canada."

I make what is now the first section the second section, and I omit the second section. That is the principal alteration. I propose when we come to the clause in regard to the employment of the funds of any railway, to strike out the words "or may become competitive to the railway of the company so acquiring such bonds or other securities." As the clause reads now, it provides:

"No railway company shall hereafter, either directly or indirectly, employ any of its funds in the purchase of its own stock or in the acquisition of any shares, bonds or other securities issued by another railway company in Canada, whose line competes with, or may become competitive to the railway of the company so acquiring such bonds or other securities." * * *

As this clause might be attended with doubt and difficulty, I propose to strike out the words I have mentioned. I propose, in the second section of the seventh clause, to strike out the words, "in the summary manner under the Act last aforesaid," and to insert, "in any court of competent jurisdiction;" and at the end of that clause to add, "or for which the company is responsible." In the eighth clause, I propose to strike out "in the summary manner under the Act last aforesaid," and insert, "in any court of competent jurisdiction." In section nine I propose to add:

"And for railways under construction or railways already constructed, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council shall determine the proportion in which the cost of such fencing shall be borne by the railway company and the municipality interested."

I propose, also, to add to the end of the sub-section of clause seven, the words:

"Provided always, that if such alleged contravention shall, in the opinion of the presiding magistrate or magistrates, be excusable, such case may be dismissed without costs."

I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not been able to examine this and a number of other Bills, and therefore I cannot express any opinion on it.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the 46th line I propose to strike out the words "or may become competitive," because they introduce an element of doubt.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he pledged himself to place the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the same footing as every other railway company in the country. Now, by the General Railways Act of 1879, and by the amended Act of 1883, the policy was laid down by the Government which the Minister of Railways is now, to some extent, going back upon. It was laid down distinctly by those Acts that the policy of the country should be that no railway should have the right to deal in the bonds or stocks of another railway. Exception was made in favour of the Government railway, in favour of railways having already a right to deal in those stocks and bonds. I find that that principle is only partially taken away, although I understood the Minister to give a distinct pledge that he would take away that right and place the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the same footing as the others. I do not object to the provision that the Bill shall not prevent any railway from holding the securities of American companies, but I do object, having laid down a policy in 1879, and extended that policy in 1883, having declared it to be the policy of the Government, and having, in reply to the hon. member for West Durham, the other day, declared that he had stated last year that it was his intention to take up that question and to place all railways on the same footing, it does appear to me that the limitation which he has laid down in this Bill does not at all meet the case. This only interferes with competitive railways. Now, what are competitive railways? Who can define exactly what a competitive railway is? What I claim is, that the great injury this country has suffered from the privileges that a railway company has, is that a certain railway company has been able to buy up and absorb all the railways running east, west, north and south, and this restriction only applies to those roads which compete with it. It does not comply with the pledge the hon. Minister gave to this House, and I think he ought to carry out the principle that he established in 1879, that he persisted in in 1883, and that he promised would be extended this Session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite appreciate what my hon. friend has said, and there is some reason for complaining, from his point of view. It is quite true, I did undertake to bring in a Bill that would place the Grand Trunk and all other lines of railway under the operation of the Consolidated Railway Act; and this Bill does so. It places all lines of railway on the same footing; but I found, on looking into the subject, that it would be attended with some inconvenience, and with no benefit that I could see, to adopt the stringent measure my hon. friend insists upon. The object Parliament had in restricting the operation of any railway company in becoming interested in any other lines of railway, was to prevent it destroying competition. It was said that railways had been built in different parts of the country, and largely assisted by municipalities, under the impression that they would form competitive lines, and they found them swallowed up and absorbed by the very railways with which it was expected they would compete. We amended the Consolidated Railway Act last year, to prevent that being done; and this first clause declares that all railways shall be subject to this Act, and to the amended Act of last Session. We put them all on the same footing, but we do not make the Act quite so stringent as it was. It is such as to enable a small branch, that cannot be operated at all, unless in connection with a cross line, to be operated in that way, and we thus avoid difficulties that might arise from a too stringent provision. I do not think any objection can be taken to that. This is simply a tentative provision, and if it should be found that it ought to be more stringent, it will be easy to change it. I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion, but will be content to try this clause, as I have submitted it to the Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. There is another class of railways that are not quite reached by these words, which only restrict the purchasing company from buying the stock of the rail-

way that competes with it. But supposing there are several branch lines competing with each other, under this clause you are impliedly giving power to a railway company to buy up any number of competing lines so long as those competing lines do not compete with the purchasing line. I may illustrate this, by referring to the railways that centre in Toronto. I suppose they will be embraced in the term "branch lines." We have the Nipissing Railway, the Northern and North-Western Railway, and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, all of which compete with each other for the carrying trade from the northern waters to the city of Toronto. Under this clause, it will be quite lawful for the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, which do not compete with these lines, to buy up the stock of these competing lines, so that if it is intended to prevent the destruction of competition, I think the clause should read: "whose lines compete with the purchasing line or with each other." People who have undertaken to build competitive branch lines are as much entitled to protection as people who have been building lines to compete with through trunk lines. Moreover, I think the provision in this Bill is an unwise one. It is giving power to a railway company to buy the control of another railway company; in fact, to destroy the independent franchise granted by Parliament, without our being able fully to anticipate the result of such destruction. My opinion is, that after Parliament incorporates a railway company, nothing should be allowed to take place that would interfere with the independent character of that company, without the express sanction of Parliament to any changes that are proposed. If it is proper to allow a railway company to sell out, Parliament will assent to it——

Mr. McCARTHY. Or to amalgamate.

Mr. MULOCK. Or in any way to lose its independent character. Let it come to Parliament, that created it, and get a change in its constitution. But we cannot anticipate what use will be made of such a power as this. It is wholly unnecessary, I think, in the interest of any railway, and therefore extremely unwise and dangerous legislation.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). There is a great deal of force, I think, in the observations the hon. member for North York has just made. The ordinary rule of law is that no railway company or other corporation shall use its funds for the purpose of buying the stock of any other corporation, unless the express consent of Parliament is obtained for that purpose; and if this House should re-enact that provision, it would be simply re-enacting common law. If a railway company wishes to buy the stock of another company, let it come to Parliament for permission to do so. An exception, an erroneous exception, was made in the Act of 1878, in regard to the Grand Trunk, which was allowed to buy the stock of any other railway company in Canada or the United States. That was a most improper provision, of which we have since seen the results. The Grand Trunk Railway, under that provision, has bought up competing lines in every direction. Then, as to buying up branch lines. Let me illustrate what has been done, by referring to the section of the country I have the honour to represent. Formerly, running through the county of Victoria there were the Midland Railway proper, the Victoria Railway, the Whitby and Port Perry Railway, and the Nipissing Railway—all competitive lines. Now, all of those lines, together with the Grand Junction and the Belleville and North Hastings roads, have been consolidated into one line, and are parts of the Grand Trunk. And how did the Grand Trunk obtain possession of them? It did so, first of all, by means of that Act of 1878, by using its money to buy the Grand Junction Railway and the Belleville and North Hastings Railways, then the Nipissing Railway, then the Whitby and Port Perry Railway, and then the Victoria Railway; and when it had done that, it had the Midland by the throat, so that railway could not do anything but consolidate with those other roads which the Grand Trunk had bought; and the Grand Trunk, having a majority of the stock and bonds of the Midland system, is running it as part and parcel of the Grand Trunk. So that this policy of allowing one railway company to buy stock in another, may be injurious to the railways as well as to the public. I fail to see why a railway company should have permission to buy the stock of another company, unless it comes to this Parliament and gets that permission with its eyes open.

Mr. McCARTHY. This seems to be a repeal of the section that Parliament introduced last year. Last year these words were put in the Railway Act: "That unless specially authorized so to do, it shall not be lawful for any railway company, directly or indirectly, to apply any of its funds to the acquisition of any bonds or stocks of other companies." The amendment is: "Shall apply any of its funds in the acquisition of shares, &c., issued by another railway company in Canada, whose line competes with or may become competitive to the railway of the company so acquiring such bonds or other securities," so that unless the lines are competitive there is ample power to deal in the stocks of other companies. Great injustice may be done by giving power to a large railway company to deal in the stocks of other companies, though they may not be competitors. We know there was a struggle between the companies to acquire the Hamilton and North-Western line, and that the Grand Trunk Railway owns a third or perhaps more of the stock of that road. That was acquired with the purpose of forcing the Hamilton and North-Western into terms with the Grand Trunk Railway, which were believed to be injurious to the public interest. I hope the House will insist on the Minister carrying out the pledge given last Session, and that this clause be struck out: "unless specially authorized, &c."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is out.

Mr. McCARTHY. But you put it in in a worse shape.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The arrangement last Session was, that this year these first words should be struck out: "unless specially authorized so to do."

Mr. McCARTHY. This clause will give power to any railway to buy all railway stock, provided the object is not competitive. It was the hon. member for West Durham who suggested the Grand Trunk Railway might have negotiations on hand, under its power to purchase stock and so on, and in view of that it was not thought fair to deprive them of one of the powers Parliament had given them. I shall move that these words be eliminated, and substitute section (*b*) for the other clause, leaving out the first words.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion, which will be attended with great inconvenience and injustice. I can understand an hon. gentleman pressing, as the hon. member for Northumberland does, that we shall strike out the words "whose line competes with railways that may become competitive," but I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist upon striking out the provision that will enable a railway company to purchase stock, or shares, or bonds in railways in the United States. No reason has been given why they should not, and the motion of my hon. friend will have the effect of preventing their doing so. When we purchased the Rivière du Loup Branch, it was stated to Parliament that one of the objects we had in purchasing that branch was to enable the Grand Trunk Railway to reach Chicago, and we made a provision that the money we paid for it should only be expended in such a way as would receive the sanction of the Governor in Council; and the Grand Trunk Railway were obliged to show they had expended the money they received in obtaining a controlling interest in such lines as would enable them to get to Chicago. It was supposed

to be in the interests of the country to get all the traffic we possibly could through the country, and that policy having been adopted, it would be unfair to turn around now and take the opposite course.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am willing to accept that, so long as you leave it out of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I yield most unwillingly to the combined forces arrayed against me, and will allow these two lines to be struck out, "whose line competes with or may become competitive to the railway of the company so acquiring such bonds or other securities."

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I hardly like the idea of allowing any Canadian company, incorporated for the purpose of building railways in Canada, to spend their money acquiring railways in the United States. It was allowed, under exceptional circumstances, in the case of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I do not think it advisable that power should be continued.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad there is some one less liberal to the Grand Trunk Railway than I am. The hon. member for Victoria will not give them the privilege of buying up American roads. While I disapprove of that policy, and if I were a stockholder I should strongly disapprove of it, yet if the directorate desire to do so, I have no objection, provided it is not done at the public expense.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. BEATY. There is no provision to enable the Government to enforce any action under this section.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no necessity for that provision.

Mr. BEATY. What action can the Governor in Council take on the mere report of the Commissioner?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would be evidence that could be used against the company by any of the parties interested. It is not proposed to interfere with the rights the public now have against a railway company for an accident, or for the destruction of life or property. That is provided for by law now, but the object here is, leaving it to the courts of law to enforce the penalties, as under the existing law, to provide for an independent, thorough, technical examination, by experts and persons qualified to make it, in order to show where the error or mismanagement has been.

Mr. BEATY. The reports show a defect in the road, or some deficiency of that character. The Government ought to be in a position to make the company repair it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There would be no difficulty in that. They would be obliged to do that.

On section 7,

Mr. MULOCK. I do not quite agree with the Minister of Railways as to the way the 7th clause is proposed to us. I understand the Minister proposes to leave in the words "wilfully or unnecessarily," in the first sub-section?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is new and very stringent legislation, and I am afraid it will hardly do, in the first instance, to draw the cord too tightly. If you do not leave in "wilfully or unnecessarily," I think you will expose the railway companies to great persecution at the hands of, very often, very irresponsible persons, and I would like, at all events, to test the effect of the clause in this way, and if it should not be sufficiently stringent, we can amend it in another Session.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot agree to its going in this way. As I understand the law at the present time, railway companies are simply permitted to cross the highways. They have no right to stand upon the highways with their trains and obstruct the traffic. Nevertheless, we have seen them doing it, and they have done so simply because there was no convenient machinery for preventing their doing so. It was proposed by this Bill, as originally submitted to the House and to the Railway Committee, to provide a convenient machinery to prevent this evil being continued. If the words "wilfully or unnecessarily" are left in the Bill, I think that, when the matter comes to be discussed before a magistrate—is the matter left in the hands of the Magistrates?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to strike out "in a summary manner," and insert "in any court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. MULOCK. Then the matter is left worse than it is at present, because at present a railway company could be indicted in any court of competent jurisdiction for creating a nuisance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This provides for a fine of $50.

Mr. MULOCK. That is a limit. At present the corporation could be indicted before a court of competent jurisdiction without the assistance of this Act, and by this Act you are limiting the jurisdiction of the court to deal with the corporation, as it may in its discretion think fit. At present, the court could fine the corporation as much as the court felt justified in doing, but in limiting it in this way you make the position of the public far worse than it is to-day. Moreover, by introducing the words "willfully or unnecessarily," you are authorizing the railway companies to obstruct the highway, which they have not the power to do at present. They obstruct to-day by force, not by force of law, but by introducing the words you have, you are impliedly saying that railway companies may obstruct the highways, so long as they do not do it wilfully or unnecessarily.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Your own Bill provided that they might do it for five minutes.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; I thought it was better to give them a legal right for a certain length of time, and limit that right, but here they are having time given to them, and are practically allowed to remain on the highway as long as they like, provided their remaining there after the time named is not considered by the court wilfully or unnecessarily lingering there. Suppose a railway company is brought before this court of competent jurisdiction for having allowed a train to remain for an hour on the crossing, their defence is one or other of the defences provided here, that the obstruction was not a wilful obstruction, or that it was not an unnecessary obstruction. What makes an obstruction, in the sense of this Act, necessary or unnecessary? I suppose the court would hold that, if evidence were given by the train men that they were there as long and no longer than was necessary for the discharge of their local trade, they were lawfully on the highway. This clause is making the position of the public worse than it is to-day. It is in no way a benefit to the public, nor is it carrying out the understanding arrived at in the Railway Committee, when the Bill was withdrawn and the matter left in the hands of the Minister of Railways. To-day, we have all the right we have under this Act, and far more. We can indict a railway company; that is all that is proposed to be given to us. The court can fine the railway company as much as it sees fit; here it is limited. The court to-day would not accept it as a justification for obstruction that they had a reason for being there; they would say you are trespassers, and this proposes to give them that right. This clause goes in the very opposite direction to the legislation which was proposed. I will move to leave out the words "wilfully or unnecessarily," unless the Minister accepts the suggestion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We may compromise. Strike out "unnecessarily," and leave in "wilfully."

Mr. MULOCK. I am afraid that will whittle it away.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is a reasonable compromise.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The word "wilfully" will not hurt.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If you leave in the word "wilfully," how are the public going to get at the intention as to whether it is wilful or not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose the engine will not move, and it is impossible to move the train, that would not be wilful. We will strike out only the words, "or unnecessarily."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK. In the last three lines, I think the words "to cross or pass another," cut down the generality of the preceding words, and if a freight train is standing on the highway for another purpose than to pass another train, it can stay there. I think we should strike out the words "to cross or pass another." We have already provided that no train, engine, car or portion thereof, shall be on the highway for longer than five minutes.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to add an amendment which my hon. friend from North York has been kind enough to give me, viz.: "Provided always, that if such alleged contravention shall, in the opinion of the court, be excusable, such case may be dismissed without costs."

Mr. CAMERON. That clause ought not to go in, because everybody will be afraid to sue. They will not know what kind of an excuse the company may bring forward, and the whole thing may become a dead letter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the court thinks there is no ground for a suit, why should they not be allowed to dismiss it without costs?

Mr. McCARTHY. The suit could not be maintained unless the train stays longer than five minutes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose an accident had occurred: that the train had broken down, that any person had been killed and it was impossible to move. Then the court would have the power to say there was no grounds for bringing this case, and to dismiss it without costs.

Mr. McCARTHY. In that case there would be no offence, because it would not be done wilfully.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8, the blank as to amount of penalty was filled in, by inserting the words "twenty dollars."

On section 10, the words "two clear days," were amended by inserting the words "six clear days."

Mr. WELLS. I am sorry the Minister of Railways has not changed the present system of conducting arbitrations, with respect to right of way. It has been found most unsatisfactory and most expensive. The method adopted is, that the farmer chooses some friend to act as arbitrator, and the company selects some one in whom they can rely to represent them as arbitrator, and these men really go into the arbitration as advocates, and the question is practically decided by the third arbitrator chosen. I saw the results of five or six cases not long ago, in which my friends were engaged, and I find that the average cost is about $400. The costs on each side are about the same, so that the cost of every arbitration pretty nearly reaches the sum of $1,000. The fact is, that after the arbitrators have been engaged for several days, they feel that to throw the costs on a man whose land is being taken, is practically to deprive him of the land, and the result is that they generally throw it on the company. I would suggest to the Minister of Railways that a far better way would be to have a single arbitrator, appointed by a judge of the Superior Court, on the application of either party, or that the Government should appoint an official railway arbitrator in each Province, and that one of the arbitrators should be chosen either by the parties or one of the Superior Court judges. This plan would be less expensive, and I am sure it would be of great practical benefit both to railway companies and to the owners of land. In some of the United States, when a railway company begins the work of construction, the court appoints three men to arbitrate in all cases, say within a county, and these men go to farm after farm, along the railway, and place a value upon them. The expense is very trifling and the plan has, I believe, been found to work very satisfactorily.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the very unsatisfactory results of the present mode of arbitration, and that some more economical, practical and impartial plan should be adopted. The substitution of a County Court judge for a Superior Court judge is, I think, a disadvantage. I think it is better that a third arbitrator should be appointed by the Minister of Railways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The trouble in that case is, that, say, in British Columbia, the distance is so great that delay occurs, and besides, the Minister does not know the people to appoint.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If a judge is to make the appointment, I certainly think it ought to be a Superior Court judge.

Mr. WELDON. The difficulty with the clause, in its present shape, would be, that one party might appoint a Superior Court judge and another a County Court judge.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why should not these matters be transferred to the ordinary tribunals, where these case might be tried either with or without a jury. I find this difficulty in these cases, that both the railway company and the owner go on in the most foolish and insane manner, calling witnesses, after the arbitrators stating that they do not want more evidence; and the result is, that the costs increase until the amount is something fearful. The judge could, of course, stop that sort of thing, and he could determine the matter as well as the arbitrators.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we will have to let the matter stand now, and perhaps take it up next Session.

Mr. HALL. There is one amendment which I wish to suggest, with regard to an abuse created, when private crossings are used by the public. In one case that I know of, a private crossing has been opened up by the connivance of the proprietor, and it is used by the public. Of course the railway company are not obliged to keep up guards or signs, and as there is a dangerous curve and the grade is objectionable, and as it is used to such an extent that 100 teams a day sometimes cross, crossing is an exceedingly dangerous one. I have no doubt that the railway company would be liable for any injury to persons crossing, but the company themselves are running great risk to their property as well as to the lives of passengers, and I would suggest that at the end of clause eight the following words should be added: "shall not be used for any other purposes than those of the farm property on which they are situate."

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Would not that prevent a neighbour from using a crossing?

Mr. HALL. Perhaps it would, but certainly its present use is a great abuse.

Mr. TROW. In many cases, in winter, there are snow drifts, so that some farmers have to drive through their neighbours' farms.

Mr. HALL. You might say, for public purposes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid you could not enforce it.

Mr. HALL. A case was brought up to test it, and it was held that the law did not cover it.

Mr. WELLS. I would move that the word "county," in this clause, be struck out.

On section 10,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Under the 10th sub-section of section 9 of the Act, the company can take no proceeding for the appointment of an arbitrator until a month after the plans have been fyled with the Minister of Railways. This is a wholly unnecessary length of time, and I would move that the words "ten days" be substituted for the word "month."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest two amendments—to add to sub-section 2 of section 27, the words suggested already, "or court of competent jurisdiction;" and to provide, in sub-section 3 of section 27, that the fines should be paid to the persons suing for the same, instead of their being divided, as at present, between the persons suing and the Crown.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The Act provides that the height of bridges shall be seven feet above the top of the car, and as the new cars are being constantly made of various heights, it is difficult to comply with this regulation. The refrigerator and furniture cars of recent introduction are much higher than others, so that in using these cars railway companies may have to alter their bridges, and the effect of this is to drive from our Canadian roads a great many of the improved cars. In the States, there is a fixed height to the bridges, of eighteen feet; we might make it twenty feet if necessary, but should not leave this uncertain height of seven feet above the car. There is not a railway to-day which is not liable to the penalty of $50 per day on half its bridges, under the Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Better let that amendment stand over.

Mr. McCARTHY. I beg to move that the following clause be added: "No person shall, at any time, be compelled to sell or convey, or give possession, to any railway company, of part of any house or other building or manufactory, if such person be willing and able to sell, convey or give possession of the whole thereof." This is taken from the English Statute.

Mr. WELLS. That clause has had frightful results in increasing the expense of railway building. Under that, where they might take the sheds of a large manufactory, they may be compelled to take the whole.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK. In the twenty-eighth section and the sixth sub-section, it is provided that if a railway is not begun and finished within the time limited by the special Act, the corporate existence and powers of the company shall cease. There is, to my mind, great risk in having such a sweeping clause. In the case of the Cobourg Railway, under a clause that preceded this, in the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, although it was partially constructed, it ceased to exist as a railway, because it had not fully completed its powers in the time limited,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is an important amendment, and my hon. friend had better defer it until the third reading of the Bill.

Bill reported.

QUEBEC TIDAL DOCK.

The House resolved itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed Resolution (page 1516) respecting an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners of $300,000 to enable them to complete their Tidal Dock.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN introduced Bill (No 148) to authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of their Tidal Dock.

Bill read the first time.

LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK.

The House resolved itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed Resolution (page 1516) respecting an advance of $150,000 to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of the Lévis Graving Dock.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN introduced Bill (No 149) to authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of the Lévis Graving Dock.

Bill read the first time

CRIMINAL LAWS (BRITISH COLUMBIA) EXTENSION BILL.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend An Act to extend to the Province of British Columbia certain of the criminal laws now in force in other Provinces of the Dominion, said: The provisions of this Bill are contained in 37 Vic., chap. 42. This Bill is introduced at the request of the Attorney-General of the Province of British Columbia, who has represented that, as the provisions are in the schedule and not in the body of the Act, the courts decline to give effect to them.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and reported.

SPEEDY TRIALS (MANITOBA) EXTENSION BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No 153) to amend An Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba the Act for the more speedy trial in certain cases of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanours in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, said: Since the Act 38 Vic., chap. 54, was passed, County Courts have been established in Manitoba, and provision has been made for a County Court Judges Criminal Court. It is necessary to make further provision in reference to speedy trials and to remove doubts. The Attorney-General of Manitoba and the County Court Judges of that Province ask for this amendment.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. ORTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to the report in *Hansard* of a speech delivered by an hon. member of this House in which a mis-statement occurs. The hon. member said that a Mr. Sykes wrote as follows to the Regina *Leader* :—

"'*To the Editor of the Regina Leader:*

"'SIR,—I am discouraged on account of the high duties which the Dominion Government are charging on agricultural machinery, and I really cannot see any possibility of the country prospering. I calculate that what with the protection duties and the charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a capitalist is at a disadvantage of 50 per cent. as compared with Iowa, Minnesota and Eastern Dakota. Again, labour is much higher in the Canadian North-West, and produce is much lower. The Canadian North-West is an agricultural country and labours at many disadvantages, as compared with the United States. It would have been a wise policy to have admitted all agricultural machinery and stock duty free. If any class of persons in Canada require protection it is the farmer in the new North-West, as he has to compete with heavy railroad carriage, and he gets very little return from his land for a couple of years. If the present Tariff is to be maintained, a bonus of 50 per cent. should be granted by the Government on each $,000 expended in the North-West. This bonus would not even suffice to place the farmer on an equality with his brother farmer on the south side of the International line.

"'I am a loyal subject of Her Majesty, and a staunch Conservative, but I cannot support the policy of the Dominion Government, and should be a Liberal in Canada.

"'R. SYKES.

"'STOCKPORT, England, Sept. 8.'"

"The *Leader* goes on to say:

"'Mr. Sykes is a large English capitalist and the owner of 20,000 acres of lands (purchased from the C. P. R.) in the vicinity of Troy. He has imported one of John Fowler & Sons' steam ploughs, at an enormous expense, on which he was charged 35 per cent. *ad valorem* duty by the Dominion Government, and enormous excess freights (over enormous schedule rates) by the Canadian Pacific Railway. He has had a large gang of men at work on his lands since April, thereby necessitating large monthly expenditure, the greater portion of such expenditure being for supplies, which consisted largely (of course) of canned goods and coal (for running the plough engines). Imagine the idiocy of a king a man in this country to pay fifty cents per ton duty on coal.

"'Mr. Sykes' letter speaks for itself, and any intelligent man can judge whether the asinine policy of the present Government is calculated to recommend the Canadian North-West as a field for investment to English (or any other) capitalists.'"

The hon. member, commenting on this letter, went on to say:—

"I do not know whether these statements are true; I do not give them to the House as my statements, but as the statements of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and of their organs."

Now, Sir, I have examined the Regina *Leader* of the date of September 27th, 1883, in which this letter, signed by R. Sykes, appears, and I find the letter, but not a single word of comment.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. This does not appear to be a correction of the report of *Hansard*, but a commentary upon an hon. gentleman's speech with the view of showing that certain statements made in that speech were incorrect.

Mr. ORTON. I refer to a newspaper report of a speech delivered in this House, not to the *Hansard*, and I think I am in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know really what the point of order is. The hon. gentleman is going to show that some statements of an hon. member in *Hansard* are not accurately reported, and, I think, he is in order. If he merely wishes to show that some hon. member has made a mis-statement in the House, I think he would be employed all the time in correcting mis-statements.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to show that the report is incorrect, so far as the facts are concerned, and as this is a matter of privilege, I think I have a right to refer to that report in the newspaper.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I understand that what the hon. gentleman is doing—for it is important that what is meted out to one man must be meted out to others—is showing that some hon. member of this House, not now present, some time ago made a speech in the House in which he quoted, or purported to quote, an article in a newspaper, and a letter; and the hon. gentleman is proceeding to say that he examined the newspaper from which the quotation was professed to be made, and that he did not find such a statement there as the hon. member represented was there. He is, in point of fact, discussing the accuracy of an hon. member's speech, not the report of the speech, and he is referring to a past debate. It seems to me that he is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think, if he is going to point out simply that an hon. member has made a mistake and has misquoted a statement, he is in order. This was done last night by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who pointed out that a letter of his had been incorrectly read.

Mr. BLAKE. That was an incorrect report in the *Hansard*. What I understand the hon. gentleman to be doing is this: He is proposing to prove that an hon. member who addressed the House did not give a correct statement of facts.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that he is going to say that this letter as reported in the *Hansard* is not what appeared in the Regina *Leader*, from which it purports to have been taken.

Mr. MILLS. Ought not that to be done during that particular debate? Can it be brought up now when the debate is past, and when the hon. member is not here and had no means of knowing whether the hon. gentleman, in the comparison he is making, is mistaken or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Surely this is an everyday practice in England, as well as here. There is no reason why an hon. member should not correct a mis-statement. An hon. member undertakes to make a quotation from a letter; he is mistaken in his quotation; it is found that the letter is not in the exact terms in which the hon. member read it. It is surely right that the discrepancy between the document as it appears in the newspaper and as it was read in the House should be pointed out. A member is bound to be correct in what he states to this House, and if a member finds that the statement is incorrect, he may call attention to it.

Mr. MILLS. During the debate, but can he draw attention to a mis-statement when the debate is over?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why not?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then, I can only say that the hon. gentleman's system of order would be very disorderly in practice. I do not think the hon. gentleman can give any instance in English precedents of such a thing being allowed. If a man is misrepresented, he has a right to bring up the matter before the House as a question of privilege. In this instance the question is simply, whether the report in *Hansard* of a statement made by an hon. member is correct?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has nothing to do with *Hansard*.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If it is correct, there is no grievance, and no statement of the fact can be made in our Journals.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to me that the question is not as to what the hon. member said, but as to what he read. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman is going to show

that the statement which was read is not correctly reported in the *Hansard*. That was done last night by the hon. member for Inverness, and I think it is in order.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to have this correction made, and I have not the slightest doubt that if the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) were here, he would consent to have the correction made. Instead of finding those comments in the Regina *Leader*, I find in the *Globe* of Nov. 6, 1883, the letter that I have just read, signed by R. Sykes, and following it, these words:—

"In drawing our attention to this letter a Conservative residing in the North-West furnishes the following explanatory notes:—Mr. Sykes is a large English capitalist, and the owner of 20,000 acres of land, purchased from the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the vicinity of Troy. He has imported one of John Fowler & Son's Steam Ploughs at an enormous expense, on which he was charged 35 per cent *ad valorem* duty by the Dominion Government, and enormous express freights, over enormous schedule rates, by the Canadian Pacific Railway. He has had a large gang of men at work on his lands since April, thereby necessitating large monthly expenditure, the greater portion of such expenditure being for supplies, which consisted largely of course, of canned goods and coal for running the plough engines. Imagine the idiocy of asking a man in this country to pay 50 cents per ton duty on coal. Mr. Sykes' letter speaks for itself, and any intelligent man can judge whether the asinine policy of the present Government is calculated to recommend the Canadian North-West as a field for investment to English or any other capitalists."

These are the expressions of the correspondent of the *Globe*, and not the comments of the Regina *Leader*.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 132) to amend the Act thirty-seventh Victoria, Chapter forty-two, intituled: An Act to extend to the Province of British Columbia certain of the Criminal Laws now in force in other Provinces of the Dominion.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 133) to amend the Act thirty-eighth Victoria, Chapter fifty-four, intituled: An Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba the Act for the more Speedy Trial in certain cases of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanours, in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on a certain Resolution respecting Subsidies to Provinces, said: On Saturday last I had distributed some amendments in the wording of this Resolution, and I beg now to move the Resolution:

That it is expedient to provide,—

1. That in the accounts between the several Provinces and the Dominion, the amounts by which the yearly subsidy to each was increased by the Act 26 Vic., c. 30 (as explained by the Act 37 V., c. 3, as to Nova Scotia), shall be calculated and allowed to Ontario and Quebec (jointly, as having formed the late Province of Canada), and to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as if the said Acts had directed that such increase should be allowed from the day of the coming into force of the British North America Act, 1867, and that the total amount of the half-yearly payments which would in that case have been made on account of such increase from 1st July, 1867, up to and including the 1st January, 1873, with interest on each at 5 per cent. per annum, from the day on which it would have been so paid, to 1st July, 1884, shall be deemed capital owing to the said Provinces respectively, bearing interest at 5 per cent. per annum, which interest shall be payable to them as part of their yearly subsidies from the Dominion on and after 1st July, 1884;

2. In the accounts between the Dominion and the Provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island, the amounts now calculated and allowed as the debts of these Provinces respectively, on which they are now paid interest by the Dominion, shall be increased by amounts bearing the same proportion to the respective populations of the said Provinces, as ascertained by the Census of 1881, as the total of the amounts to be added under these Resolutions as capital owing to Ontario and Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, bear to the combined population of the four last named Provinces, as ascertained by the said Census of 1881; and the amounts of such increases to the said Provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and Prince Edward Island shall be deemed capital owing to the said Provinces respectively, bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, which interest shall be payable to them as part of their respective subsidies from the Dominion, on and after 1st July, 1884.

The discussion that took place yesterday and on Saturday last with reference to the increased liabilities of the different Provinces renders it scarcely necessary that I should, especially at this stage of the Session, enter very largely into the subject further than to explain the effect these Resolutions will have in affording relief to the different Provinces. I may state, however, it is well known that previous to the Union in 1867, many of the Provinces had incurred liabilities for the construction of railways. It is well known that, for ten years previous to that time, there had been a demand in each Province, on the part of the people, to construct these public works for the purpose of developing its resources, and when the debt at which the different Provinces were to enter the Union was arranged, it was based largely upon the indebtedness of Ontario caused by subsidies contributed to railways and for the deepening of canals. In the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, their debt was, I may say, solely created by the construction of Government railways, or in providing subsidies to assist in the construction of railways, and though their debts at the time of the Union did not amount to a sum sufficient to cover the liability at which Nova Scotia and New-Brunswick entered the Union, still they both had engagements sufficient to cover the whole amount provided. We know that since that period, such has been the desire on the part of the people in all the Provinces to have railway extension, we know that the pressure has been such that these Provinces have had, from time to time, to yield to that pressure, until there is scarcely one Province that is not embarrassed at this moment, or if not at this moment, that will be embarrassed when the engagements entered into in the shape of subsidies to roads not yet constructed are met. In 1873 that was the state of things, and the Government thought it advisable, under the circumstances, to ask Parliament to assume the whole of the debt of Ontario and Quebec which then exceeded the amount they had assumed in 1867, and to give to the other Provinces a sum equivalent in proportion to their population. The proposition now before the House is to ante-date, as it were, the operation of the law of 1873, and to give the four old Provinces the benefit of this amendment to the law by giving them the benefit of the interest on that increased debt from 1867 to 1873. I may state here the effect of it will be to give them, not only the debt itself each year, but by allowing them 5 per cent. interest on it the whole amount to Ontario and Quebec jointly, is $5,307,593.13 —Ontario, $2,882,289.52; Quebec, $2,549,213.61, on the basis of which the other debt was divided:

To Nova Scotia	$793,368 71
To New Brunswick	604,519 35
To Manitaba, based on the population of 1881	110,825 07
To British Columbia, " " "	83,107 88
To Prince Edward Island	152,978 73

The amounts that will be payable to these Provinces, under the operation of these Resolutions, will be as follows: —To Ontario and Quebec, $269,875; or in round numbers, Ontario $142,400, Quebec $130,000; to Nova Scotia, $39,668.44; to New Brunswick, $30,225.91; to Manitoba, $5,541.25; to British Columbia, $5,155.35; to Prince Edward Island, $10,148 68. The calculations have been carefully made by the Deputy Minister of Finance, and are embodied in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the aggregate public charge.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. $7,142,297.89.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the annual charge?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. About $357,000. By this arrangement, will be added as a permanent annual charge upon the Consolidated Revenue. It is provided that the interest is to be paid to the Provinces at the rate of 5 per cent. The proposition, I am quite sure, will commend itself to the leader of the Opposition, because it is general in its character. It serves all alike, and is therefore not open to the objection taken by him on a former occasion. That, Mr. Speaker, is the proposition, and that is the result. I move that the House do now go into Committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then you admit that you did not serve all alike before?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, but I am addressing myself to the hon. the leader of the Opposition, who said we did not.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentlemen seems to allow 6 per cent. to some of the Provinces, and 5 to others. Take British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the calculation is at 6 per cent., and for the other Provinces it is at 5, as far as I can judge from what he said. These careful calculations will have to be gone over again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the figures in the Bill are not correct, we can correct them in Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Resolutions speak plainly enough of 5 per cent. and no more.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, it is 5 per cent. The Bill speaks distinctly on that.

Mr. BLAKE. I might say that, as far as I can judge, the Resolution which the hon. gentleman proposes to move in Committee goes a very long way beyond the Resolution of which he has given notice, because the original Resolution does not propose to give interest upon the sum from the period of 1873 up to the period of 1884, whereas, by the Resolution the hon. gentleman is going to move in Committee, he proposes to give that interest from 1873 to 1884, which adds somewhat more than 50 per cent. to the sum total of the capital.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As I stated, the first Resolution was prepared by the law clerk, and he did not get at the intentions and objects of the Government. I stated, when I gave notice of the Resolution, that the object was to allow interest at 5 per cent., but not compound interest. The calculation has been based upon that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did the hon. gentleman get at the figure of $2,800,000 for Ontario and the figure of $2,500,000 for Quebec? Is that based on the population in 1867 or in 1874, or when?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is based on the adjustment in 1873, under the decision, I understood, from the Deputy Head of the Department of the Commission. At any rate, it is on the same basis as was adopted in 1873.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The sum, the hon. gentleman says, amounts to $7,142,000. That, I suppose, is correct enough, or nearly so; but I understand him to say he does not propose to pay this or any part of it in money. He is going to pay 5 per cent. on it. Then the result of that is that, practically speaking, this measure means that we increase, to all intents and purposes, the present debt of the Dominion by $9,000,000, because $357,000 a year represents as nearly as possible, supposing we borrow money at 4 per cent, the interest on $9,000,000. That will practically be the effect of the proposition as made, I presume.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member knows perfectly well that, under the Terms of Union, any debt which was at the credit of the Provinces they were to be allowed 5 per cent. on. This is not interfering with those terms. That is the reason for allowing 5 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not interfering with it, but it is well we should understand what we are doing. This $357,000 almost exactly represents the interest on $9,000,000. As to what the hon. gentleman says, that is true, but I understood him to say that this was not a debt, but an act of grace, he considers, on his part and on the part of the Government. He does not consider that these are sums due, but simply additions we are making.

Mr. BLAKE. I must correct from recollection the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the circumstances under which the former increase was made, out of which this is supposed to grow. He stated, as I understood, that it was in consequence of railway engagements made by the different Provinces. I do not understand that at all. I understand that it grew out of the result of the arbitration between the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and a pressure which grew out of the result of that arbitration on the part of one of those two Provinces that the Dominion should assume the excess of debt. That was the origin of the Subsidy Act of 1873. It was not because of railway engagements entered into by either Ontario or Quebec, for indeed the railway engagements of those Provinces were not extensive anterior to the Act of 1873. It was upon a solution of the question which had been in controversy between those two Provinces ever since 1867. It was found to be very inconvenient, certainly to one of the Provinces, perhaps to both, that the matter should be, as it was up to that time, in the position that the excess of debt should be a provincial debt, and the Government undertook to assume that debt, and of course, assuming that debt, made equivalent allowances to the other Provinces. As to the present proposal I understand it to be based upon the suggestion which has been pressed upon the Government by the Province of Quebec, that it followed as a logical consequence of the action of the Government in 1873 that they should place the Province in the same position as if that arrangement had been made from 1867; and therefore it is proposed to place them as if, instead of the public debt of the old Province of Canada being fixed at the figure of $62,500,000, it should be taken as if it had been fixed at its actual figure; and inasmuch as there has been an accumulation of interest owing to the delay of six years before that adjustment was reached, the present proposal is what is necessary to put the Provinces in the position which they would have occupied if the original basis of Confederation had been, as far as debts were concerned, the debt of Ontario and Quebec instead of a sum of something like $10,000,000 less than the debt of Ontario and Quebec.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no doubt the present proposition is for the purpose of relieving some of the Provinces that are now embarrassed, and the embarrassments to which I refer exist to-day from the fact that they have been induced to incur large expenditures for the construction of railways, either by the Government directly or by giving subsidies. I think there can be no doubt about that; because in 1867 the amount of money that was provided for each of the Provinces at that time, had they incurred no additional debt, would have been ample, in my judgment, for them; and judging from the expenditures at the present moment they would have had sufficient had it not been for the larger liabilities incurred that had to be met and are to be met by the different Provinces. I think Ontario had a deficit this last year, though they have not pressed any claim. The hon. member knows, if he has observed the proceedings of the Legislatures of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, that they have been asking for assistance. The Province of Quebec, as he knows,

has been asking for assistance; their expenditure is very considerable in excess of their receipts in spite of the greatest economy that can be exercised, and the present financial representative of that Government says that they intend to reduce the expenditure to the smallest possible amount, but even then they will require assistance. There is no doubt, therefore, that the pressure for assistance became great, particularly from those three Provinces. With reference to Manitoba she will be dealt with separately; at the same time it was considered proper and just that as we were dealing with the Provinces that are in the embarrassed condition to which I refer, they should all be dealt with alike whatever may be the arrangements that may be subsequently made and submitted to Parliament for consideration at the next Session with reference to Manitoba. But with reference to the causes which led to the arrangement of 1873, perhaps the hon. gentleman's memory is more correct than mine, but I was under the impression that it came from the other three Provinces and not from Ontario. It may be that when the accounts were settled Quebec found she was not in the position she expected to be in, and therefore it was to meet the special debts of the three Provinces. Ontario, I may mention here, had paid less in proportion to her population for the purposes of education and for roads and bridges than was paid by the other Provinces; that is quite clear. Under these circumstances she expended far less in proportion to the population since the Union than the other Provinces, and the other Provinces having spent very largely in the construction of railways and for education, &c., found themselves weighed down with the debt which left them with deficits. The hon. member may be correct in what he says, but I was under the impression that it was the position in which Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick found themselves in 1873, which led to the measure of relief that was given at that time.

Mr. BLAKE. I think in the interests of historical accuracy it is necessary that we should have the thing stated as it was, and it was as I have stated in 1873. It is entirely a new version of the transaction of 1873 which the hon. gentleman has brought before us to-day. I am not now criticising this transaction; it may be perfectly correct or it may be quite wrong—that does not alter the facts as they actually existed. The fact is as I have said, namely, that at the conclusion of the controversy between Ontario and Quebec it was proposed by that Province—perhaps rightly, perhaps wrongly—practically to alter the Terms of Union in the way in which I have stated, namely, that the whole of the debt of Ontario and Quebec jointly should be assumed by the Dominion instead of only a portion of it, and it was in consequence thereof that the measure was brought forward. It was avowedly to meet that demand, and it was brought forward, of course, on terms which were presumed to do that. Of course, in justice to the other Provinces, it would never have done to increase the credit of one of the Provinces without increasing as nearly as possible to the same extent the credit of the other Provinces. I think if the hon. gentleman will examine the accounts of the Province of Ontario he will find that it is in consequence of the greater development of the municipal system and the fact that she pays much more largely than any of the other Provinces by means of municipal expenditure, which is the reason why the Provincial Government has paid less in proportion towards the services to which he refers. It is well known that the municipal system is much more extensive in that Province than it is in the others, and that the larger portion of the expense of education, the expense of the administration of justice and other expenses, which are in the other Provinces to a large extent borne by the Central Government, in Ontario are borne by the municipalities. No doubt that has nothing to do with the question immediately before us, but I thought it only right not to let this measure pass without that much of criticism from this side of the House. I maintain that if you want to ascertain what is the cost of the Local Government of a Province you have got to ascertain what is given by that Province through its municipal government. In a very able speech made a few years ago by one of the Provincial Treasurers of Quebec—I think by Mr. Church—he pointed out that it would be an entirely fallacious comparison to make between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec not to take into account the fact that the Province of Ontario, through its municipal machinery, contributed very largely to public expenditure in those items which were borne in so much greater proportion out of the provincial revenues by the other Provinces. I think, therefore, that the statement of the hon. gentleman deserves this criticism. But nobody suggested, that I am aware of, that this proposal could be made without considering the position of the other Provinces; and, of course, the only question is what the just consideration to be accorded to the other Provinces is. I am not prepared to judge whether the hon. gentleman's figures are accurate or not, except in the particular I have pointed out; but I suppose we will have an opportunity of seeing what the bases of his calculations are in the progress of the measure which he is about to lay before us. One is not wholly disposed to take these figures upon trust having regard to what occurred a few minutes ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman consider the position to be as regards the Provincial accounts just now? We have had for a long time the thirteen millions placed debtor and creditor. That I understood some year or two ago, the hon. gentleman proposed to deal with it and wipe it out, so that we may be no longer encumbered with the unnecessary additions to our portion of the assets and our portion of the credits.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That matter will be finally disposed of as soon as the accounts between the Provinces and the Dominion Government are settled, which I have no doubt will be during the summer.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Government to bring down this Session a measure to increase the subsidies to Manitoba beyond the $5,000 stated in this Resolution?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not the intention of the Government to bring down any such proposition. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that it was proposed by the Provincial Legislature, that a Commission should be appointed to confer with the Government here. Therefore, whatever the arrangement arrived at may be, it will be submitted for the consideration of the House next Session.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the proposal which the hon. gentleman has made to the Government of Manitoba?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government have given answers to certain proposals outside of the financial position of the Province, and it is proposed by the Legislature of Manitoba that a Commission should be appointed, and we have expressed our willingness to go into the question of the financial matter with a view to settlement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much did the hon. gentleman calculate as the total due in 1873?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Memorandum of the Auditor-General covers the following calculations:—The principal for Ontario and Quebec jointly is $3,151,826.65, with interest, $5,397,503; Nova Scotia, $433,281, with interest, $793,368; New Brunswick, $353,004, with interest, $504,519; making a total of $3,938,111.65 principal, with interest, $6,795,391. The amount for Manitoba, with a population of 65,954 in 1881, is $110,825, an average

of $1.68 odd per head; British Columbia, with a population of 49,459, $82,107; Prince Edward Island, with a population of 108,891, $182,973; making a total for these three Provinces of $376,906. The gross total for all the Provinces is $7,172,297.

Resolution to be reported.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon gentleman will have the figures corrected before the next stage is taken.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, the statement was handed to me by responsible officers, and I accepted it as correct.

FIRST READINGS.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally read the first time:—

Bill (No. 150) to extend the limitation of time under the Act 43 Vic., cap. 7, intituled: An Act for the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy under the Act, 43 Vic., cap. 3.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 151) to authorize the transfer of prisoners from one jail to another in certain cases.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 152) to amend the North-West Territories Act, 1880.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

PUBLIC WORKS OF CANADA.

On the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 134) to amend the Act 31 Victoria, Chapter 12, intituled: An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada, being read,

Mr. SPEAKER. I have looked into the point of order raised by the hon. member for West Durham with regard to this Bill. The point of order is that the Bill authorizes the disposal of a portion of the public domain, that it is a money Bill, and should originate in this House, and in Committee of the Whole. Section 53 British North America Act says, that "Bills for the appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost, shall originate in the House of Commons." But this Bill does not appropriate any part of the public revenue, or of the public domain which is, *quoad* this question, the same thing. It simply authorizes the lease or sale of some public works, and the money arising therefrom is to go into the Public Treasury, and it does not, therefore, in my opinion, come under the class of Bill appropriating any part of the public revenue. I am sustained in this opinion by the fact that the Public Works Act of 1868, which contains a similar clause to that in the Bill now under discussion, did not originate in Committee. I find also that the Ordnance Lands Act of 1877, which authorizes the lease or sale of ordnance lands, a part of the public domain, did not originate in Committee; nor did the Dominion Lands Act of last Session, authorizing the sale of public lands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. The latter portion of the clause which the hon. gentleman is introducing into the Bill gives power to the Dominion Government to sell or lease any portion of the shore or bed of any public harbour, the proceeds of all such sales and leases to be accounted for as public money. The hon. gentleman knows that in the Provinces there are Acts passed regulating the rights of the riparian owners, some of them giving power to obtain patents from the Crown on certain conditions, these grants only to be made to riparian owners or to those who may have their consent in writing. This, however, will be superseded by the present Act if it passes in this form. Whether that would authorize the grantee to construct on a portion of the shore granted any pier or wharf or other obstruction, I am not prepared to say; but my own opinion is it would not, so far, at any rate, as those obstructions would interfere with the rights of the owner. If this Act passes, there would be a different set of owners on the uplands from those on the shore, and the consequence would be, I fear, that there would be collision between them, and I think, therefore, there should be some provision to protect the legal rights of these people.

Mr. WELDON. This is a matter which has caused a good deal of consideration in New Brunswick, and a great deal of inconvenience has occurred. If the Government had the sole right to sell or lease, parties would not have any right to make buildings at all. That, however, is a right accessory to the ownership of the land, and being a civil right I do not think it can be interfered with by this Parliament, and to leave the matter in the position in which it is now would, I fear, create a great deal of litigation. It was decided by the House of Lords in the case of Lyon against the Fishmongers Company that they had no right to allow a wharf to be erected, or to prevent access to the person's land, as it was held that it was a question of property belonging to the person, as the owner of the land.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think my hon. friends are mistaken about the purport of this Bill. I do not see that if any portion of the shore or bed of any public harbour be vested in Her Majesty—it is not the property of Her Majesty, the same as any other property belongs to a private owner. Therefore, if it is the property of Her Majesty, Her Majesty has the right to sell it by public auction or otherwise to anybody she chooses, and I do not see that that would be depriving any person of his rights. But the hon. gentleman says that the riparian proprietor, according to the jurisdiction of the different Provinces, has the right to the shore in front of his property. Well, if that be his right, it is a civil right that belongs to the jurisdiction of the Provinces, and this Bill will not deprive him of it.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has quite seized the difficulty. The prior parts of the clause are old, and they apply to properties which have been acquired by the Crown; but this part of the clause is new, and it raises an interesting point which I do not think has received sufficient attention as yet from the Minister of Justice, who has probably prepared this Bill. It is obviously based on the view that a recent decision of the Supreme Court has led to the conclusion that, as a matter of law, it is the Crown in Canada, as distinguished from the Crown in the Provinces that is seized of the fore-shores or beds of public harbours. I do not think myself that that is good law; but if it be the correct view of the Constitution, it follows that there has been a severance of the supreme right of eminent domain and the right of tenure in reference to the riparian lands and the other lands. It was certainly the case before Confederation that it was the same parliamentary Crown which exercised dominion over the lands on the shore as the Crown which exercised authority over the lands, and therefore controlled the tenure of the lands, as well as shore and bed of the harbour. It naturally followed that as the same supreme jurisdiction dealt with the solid land as with the lands covered by water, there was a harmonious attention to the interests of the riparian proprietor with reference to the lands covered by water in front. While there was that union of jurisdiction, it was natural that the Legislature and the Crown should exercise their respective rights with respect to both classes of property. But if it be true that the decision of the Supreme Court imports that there is now a division of the supreme dominion, that the bed of the harbour is vested in the Crown as represented by Canada, and that the Crown as represented by the Provincial Legislatures deals with the shore, the hon. gentleman will see that the case is a peculiar and complicated one; and my hon. friend's contention—and I think it is a proper contention—is this—that when we are asked to legislate on the assumption, rightly or wrongly—I do not say that the Government is not right in

acting upon it, so far as this legislation goes—that this Parliament has power to deal with the land covered by water, we ought to declare certain general principles of action. Now, in the Provinces, whether by custom or by legislation—in some I think by legislation, in others, either by legislation or by invariable custom—there was a pre-emptive right on the part of the riparian proprietor to the fore-shore, and the Crown either could not or would not sell to any one else without giving that riparian proprietor the first opportunity of buying. What I maintain is that we ought to consider whether we should not guard the powers proposed to be vested in the executive with reference to these lands, by some reference to the invariable custom that the riparian proprietor has a preemptive right, and whether we should not say that that custom shall be recognized in the sales. Then, again, probably the hon. gentleman wants to sell in order that wharves and other obstructions to navigation may be erected. I do not think that any ground which could be made under powers so limited as these would create obstruction to navigation; it would require parliamentary authority to interfere with the public right of freedom of navigation. Of course, that power might be derivative, and not the direct parliamentary authority; but still I think great obstructive powers may be created by this clause. If, for instance, the Crown were to sell to "A" the bed, while "B" owned the land on the shore, I think that would be a very unfortunate state of things.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, I understand fully that the objection made in the first instance by the hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick was that they wished to preserve to the riparian proprietors the right that they had previous to Confederation and previous to the decision about the shore or bed of any public harbour. We do not intend by this to deprive them of any legal right they may have. The idea is only to give this power for any portion of the shore or bed of any public harbour vested in Her Majesty. We do not vest any portion in Her Majesty, but we say any portion that may be vested in Her Majesty. If you wish, however, to guard against any possible doubt, we may insert the words "save any legal rights the riparian proprietor may have." I may say that one of the reasons for this Bill is that there are certain properties—for instance, there is the old penitentiary property near Halifax, which is not wanted by the Government, and for the purchase of which we have had offers, but we thought we could not sell it without the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You own the shore there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have the property as any other proprietor would own it, and the question was whether we could sell it without special authority from Parliament. We thought we could not. Under these circumstances the hon. Minister of Justice drew this Bill and included in it this provision.

Mr. DAVIES. We had a Provincial Statute which stated that commercial enterprise would be encouraged by the granting to private individuals parts of the public coasts and shores hitherto ungranted for the purpose of building breakwaters and public slips. Under that, the Government of Prince Edward Island was empowered to give such grants the limitation that no grant of any fore-shore should be given except with the consent of the riparian owner, so that his rights were protected in every instance. Before the Crown could give the grant the applicant must produce the consent of the riparian owner in writing. What I suggest is that the same limitation be put in this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand the decision, although I have not looked at it lately, it was that the fore-shore belonged to the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. I was counsel in the case, and the court held that under the word "public harbours" the soil between high and low water mark passed to the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In recognized harbours alone that right obtains. Then there will be pressure made that these public harbours should be improved and the burden of improving them will be thrown upon the Dominion Treasury; in that case I hold the Government should have a clear right to dispose of any portion of that fore-shore at the highest price.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON. The hon. Minister proposes to sell the shore or bed of a river, or the ground on both shores when the Crown does not own the shore.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This applies only to harbours.

Mr. WELDON. It is contrary to law to sell the bed of a river where the shore is not owned by the Crown.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There again the hon. gentleman speaks of rivers.

Mr. WELDON. No, I spoke of harbours.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman must recollect that a good many of our harbours are really rivers, and extend for half a mile or more from the mouth of the river. The property on each side may be owned by a private individual and may be very valuable property, and this to some extent settles the question, if an application were made, who would have the right to issue the patent.

Mr. MILLS. I think it would be very desirable to ascertain in the first instance what is the nature of the right the Crown acquires in the case of a harbour. The hon. gentleman sees, of course, that there is no dispute that the property of the Crown in the shore, is in the first instance, vested in the Local Legislature, or in a private individual, who has derived his rights from the Crown through the local authorities. The Government here exercises the right of eminent domain and acquire possession of a certain portion of the shore for the purpose of erecting a harbour. It matters not whether the harbour was constructed before or after Confederation that would be the view. Then, we have this question as to the extent of the right which the Crown, by the exercise of this right of eminent domain, has acquired in the harbour. Has it acquired more than an easement, or has it acquired an actual right of property? It is to be applied, and I do not conceive that the property that the Crown has in the harbour is other than an easement. The right of property is in the original proprietor, whether the Crown is represented by the local authorities or by a private individual. If that be the case, the moment the Crown ceases to require the property for the purpose for which it is acquired, it seems to me it should go, as a matter of course, to the proprietor of the original right, whether that be the Local Legislature or a private individual, and that what the Crown would demand would not be the highest price the property might bring at public auction but what would be a fair and just compensation from the party who held the property originally and who has a right to the full property again when the Crown ceases to require it for the purposes for which it was obtained. I do not understand that in any of these cases it is an absolute right to property, but such a right as the use for purposes of a harbour would necessarily give.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that the decision goes farther than that.

Mr. DAVIES. It goes this far, that the actual soil between high and low water mark in Summerside harbour is vested in the Crown as represented by the Dominion of Canada, and that the Local Government grants which were formerly given of that soil are absolutely void. The hon. gentleman sees that, in the case of Lyon and the Fishmongers' Company, decided in the House of Lords two years ago, it is decided that the riparian owner had the right of free and uninterrupted access from his ripa to the channel of the river. If you grant in the bold, unlimited words of this Statute, the soil in front of that ripa to a third person, there will be two antagonistic parties. The riparian owner could not build a wharf to get to the channel, as he has a right by common law to do. What I seek to do is to suggest that, before the Government grant the right, under this Statute, to the soil to the third person, they should get the consent of the owner of the ripa, and I would move, if the hon. gentleman would accept it, to insert the following:—

"Provided that no such grant or lease shall be made without the consent in writing, properly authenticated, of the owner or owners of the land in front of or abutting upon which such parcel of the shore to be granted or leased lies. The word 'owner' means a tenant in fee simple or entail general in possession, and every tenant in possession of a term of years in which not less than forty years shall be unexpired."

That was the limitation put on the Crown's right by the Provincial Statute which we have always acted upon in Prince Edward Island, and which appeared to give pretty general satisfaction. If you give the grant now, a man could not put a wharf up against my bank, and I do not know what he could use it for, except perhaps mining purposes. I think some limitation such as I suggest would be necessary and would protect the interest of all parties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand it, the fore-shore of the harbour is vested in the Crown as represented by the Governor General. The Crown cannot convey more than it has. The hon. gentleman says, and I presume correctly, that the right of soil is subject to the right of the riparian proprietor, subject to the use of the water and navigation.

Mr. DAVIES. Uninterrupted access to the channel.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may give the right of access, but not the right to build. Then it is a matter of no consequence whether the Crown holds the title, or the assignee of the Crown holds it, to the fore-shore, to the absolute soil. It cannot affect the right of the riparian proprietors. There is no necessity of protecting them in any way. They have that right by law, and, if the right of soil is of no money value because the water is on the top of it, the Crown gets nothing for it; the Crown cannot build on it, nor can the assignee of the Crown. To say that the Crown, having the absolute title, cannot sell it without the consent of the riparian proprietor is abandoning the right of property, neither more nor less.

Mr. WELDON. But if the question be raised? In the instance given by the hon. Minister of Public Works, the case of Halifax, there is no difficulty, as the Crown holds the property; but in public harbours such as Shediac, it is different. All the land around the river and bay of Shediac is owned by individuals. Could the Crown selling a fore-shore allow a man to build a wharf? He would claim the right to do it. I think no legislation should be passed which would tend to raise these disputed questions. It seems clear to me, as far as the decision in England goes, in the case of the Thames Fishmongers' Association and the case I referred to in New Brunswick, that the Crown would not have the right to cut down the right of the riparian proprietor. It is a question whether the clause should not be amended to prevent the question being raised.

Bill reported.

Mr. MILLS.

REDEMPTION OF SMALL LOANS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise by way of loan such sum of money not exceeding two million pounds sterling, as may be required to redeem by one issue, under the existing arrangement, with the Financial Agents of the Government in England, the small loans maturing within the ten years next following the first day of January, 1882, or to make good to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, such sums as may have been paid out of it, for redeeming any such small loans which may have matured since the day last named; and also such further sums not exceeding in the whole three million pounds sterling as may be required to meet the charges placed on the Consolidated Revenue Fund by Acts passed in the present or any previous Session relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or for granting subsidies for or in consideration of the construction of certain railways; or to provide for the prosecution of certain public works; the said loans to be raised in accordance with the provisions of the Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 6, as amended by 38 Victoria, Chapter 4, but at a rate of interest not exceeding four per cent. per annum and the moneys so raised to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman might inform us what he proposes to do.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say to the Committee that the sums for which I require this loan are as follows: It is estimated that we will require to provide for the Canadian Pacific Railway between the first of January last and the first day of July 1885, out of the loan and on account of the subsidy, $20,000,000; liabilities redeemable during the next year, $3,483,000; loans to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and Quebec, and to the St. John Bridge Company, $1,000,000; to British Columbia, probably $400,000; to the Canadian Pacific Railway on account of contracts by the Government, a vote now in the Estimates, now before the House, $2,400,000; for the Intercolonial Railway, chargeable to capital, $750,000; to canals, about $1,500,000; to railway subsidies, $1,000,000. It is quite true that only between one and two hundred thousand have been paid already on account of these subsidies, but it is estimated that we will require before the first of July, 1885, $1,000,000—making altogether over $30,000,000. Of this sum $15,250,000 will be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, upon which they pay interest. Liabilities falling due that are bearing 5 or 6 per cent. interest, $3,483,000. That will not be of course a charge to be taken from the Consolidated Revenue; it will be so much interest saved. The total sum upon which interest will be either repaid to the Government, or out of the $30,533,000, is $19,723,000. We provide under the Act we now propose to the House for £5,000,000 sterling, or in round numbers, $25,000,000. There are, therefore, another $5,000,000 required. It is estimated we will have to meet the following items: A surplus from the revenue of $1,000,000 from the sale of lands, and $1,000,000 from deposits in the Savings Bank—$3,500,000. It may be necessary to use this, though we had a balance on our hands the first of July last. These items will be sufficient to cover the expenditures to which I have referred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that take into account all the various items that the hon. gentleman proposes to borrow in the several Supplementary Estimates he has laid on the Table within the last two or three weeks? I observe there are about $3,000,000 capital at least, and perhaps a little more that will require to be provided; and in listening to him I did not notice that he took any account of that sum.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think I have included $750,000 contained in these Supplementary Estimates for

the Intercolonial Railway, and for British Columbia probably $400,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For British Columbia there is a large amount more than that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It may or may not be more than that down to the first of July, 1885. Then we have, of course, the sum on hand in the banks to our credit on the first of July last. But this covers largely, I think, what will be required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose only to make one loan, then, before the first of July, 1885?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think that the loan asked for by this Resolution will be sufficient with the authority we took last Session. With reference to the redemption of maturing liabilities the first of January next, of course we have authority for that, but I think the loan now asked for will be all that is required to meet the expenditure down to the first of July next. There will be, of course, the balance to the Canadian Pacific Railway to be repaid in 1891, and it will be a question whether the arrangements for that should not be made for a short loan, but there will be time enough to consider that when Parliament meets again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What sum altogether has the hon. gentleman taken authority to borrow already, independent of this $25,000,000?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have taken authority to borrow a sufficient sum to redeem the debentures maturing on the 1st of January.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And nothing else?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This Bill does not interfere with the authority already given, and I think at this moment, without speaking positively, that existing legislation has authorized seven or eight millions for certain expenditures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, practically, the hon. gentleman expects to have authority—that is authority including this, and estimating it roughly at $25,000,000—he expects to have authority to borrow about $68,000,000. As I understand $35,000,000 is the sum nominally maturing in January; did the hon. gentleman ask authority to renew that?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think existing authority is sufficient to cover deposits in the savings banks for the year. It is to authorize whatever may be received in that way; therefore part of the eight millions is covered by the three millions and a half that we estimate will be received during the next year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman now in a position to communicate to the House what his intentions are with respect to the loan maturing in January? I put that question to him at an earlier part of the Session as to what he was doing with it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, I am not. As the hon. gentleman knows it is possible that the placing of two loans on the market within three or four months, or four or five months, might to some extent affect the rate we would realize from it. If it should be found that a more favourable opportunity would be offered for floating a loan after the first of January, such a course will be pursued, because the debentures which fall due on the 1st January are redeemable at the will of the Government. The Government, therefore, will not decide until they see what the state of the money market is likely to be and what the prospects are. If it is found that a new loan can be favourably floated for the redemption of the debentures falling due on the 1st January, it will of course be the duty of the Government to do so; but if, by delaying, better prices can be obtained, it will be in the interests of the country to take that course.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You require to give six months notice.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Judging from conversation I had with our agent, I think this is not necessary, although it may be desirable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the Minister is not in a position to state whether he proposes to float the whole amount at once or not.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We propose floating that loan in June; that is the present intention of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Beyond that, the hon. gentleman cannot say what the intentions of the Government are.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAKE. We were asked as long ago as last Session to give certain authority with respect to the redemption of the old loan of $35,000,000, and that was done at so early a period because the Finance Minister stated that he expected to be able to make arrangements for a practical renewal of about one-half of the amount of that loan with the present holders at a reduced rate, and he required the authority to make the necessary arrangements. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state what has been done in regard to the proposed arrangements and how far the expectations he entertained last Session have been verified?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The statement I made two months since covered that ground. I stated that the arrangements were that a portion of the loan would be floated in November last; but owing to the proposition of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the arrangements made with them, our plans were necessarily changed; and the new arrangement for the loan to the Railway Company necessitates, of course, an alteration of our plans with respect to the loan. If such had not been the case, the arrangement would probably have been made. To exchange the 5 per cent. maturing on 1st January next for 4 per cent., or something less.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it possible that these changes in the plans of the Government are to result in our not effecting this exchange, or are we to leave the old loan outstanding at 5 per cent. rather than effect an exchange at 4 per cent? What is there to prevent this transaction with present holders going on?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That may be done yet, but it will be a matter of arrangement. It was proposed not exactly to exchange but to advertise, and by looking over the list of those holding large sums, it was expected from communications had with them that they would be prepared to exchange. That course is still open to us, and I think it will very probably be carried out—I hope not merely an exchange of fives for fours, but perhaps something better.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the practical result of postponing the exchange of fives for fours—if we are able to borrow at the latter rate—for six months will be a loss of ½ per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That will be taken into account in making the arrangement, and no loss will result.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman stated some time ago that he had hopes of effecting a loan at 3½ per cent., or thereabouts. It will be a matter of general interest to know whether the hon. gentleman intends to venture on a step of that kind at present; whether, in fact, he is going to introduce consolidated Canadian 3½ per cents. I consider that would be an exceedingly desirable

object to accomplish, and I would have been exceedingly glad if the hon. Minister could have succeeded in doing so. Some time ago it appeared to me favourable for such an operation.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have not changed our opinion on this matter, and that course is still open to us. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a statement he made the other day regarding which I found it necessary to correct him, because he left the impression on the House that we had stated that we expected to float a 3½ per cent. loan at par. No such statement was ever made. I stated that the agents advised that the loan which would be issued next year, should be issued for a longer period as regards a portion of the amount, and for a shorter period as regards the balance, and the rate of interest for the longer period should be placed at 3½ per cent., and I think yet we may find it to the interest of the Government to place them at 3½ per cent. instead of 4.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is a little in error as I put the matter interrogatively. I asked if he was going to try to do that? If I mistake not, a large amount of debentures, by the operation of the sinking fund in connection with this five per cent. loan, have accumulated in hand. Any portion invested in five per cents. will of course disappear; it will be wiped off our books on the first of January, but a good deal of it, if I am correctly informed, exists in the shape of four per cents. What is the hon. gentleman going to do with this?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If there are no legal objections I think, of course, they would be cancelled, as they are the property of the Government. Of course that sinking fund was supposed to be held as a security for the holders of four per cent. bonds, and there might be some objection to their being cancelled, though I do not see that there should.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the money which was provided under the Loan Act, to be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, borrowed from English bankers?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, this is for part of it.

Mr. BLAKE. On what terms was it borrowed?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Four per cent. I may say that we sold the exchange and made a handsome thing out of it.

Mr. BLAKE. Were there any tenders invited for the exchange?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, we asked two parties, the bank of Montreal and another party in New-York. Some was sold to each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much of the four per cents. does the hon. gentleman hold?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know at this moment, but I think something like five or six millions in fours and fives—a considerable portion in fives, because latterly fives have been sold rather than fours.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will ascertain the amount.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy it is absolutely and wholly at the disposal of the Minister.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no intention of placing the fours in the market at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose simply to cancel them?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, unless there is some objection in connection with the engagement made with reference to their issue; but I do not think there is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman in introducing his Bill, will let us know what at present is the amount at our credit at the various bankers. I do not mean of course the London bankers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Resolution to be reported.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to make a free grant of not more than 6,400 acres per mile in Manitoba, and 12,800 acres in the North-West Territories, in aid of the construction of a railway from Manitoba to the Hudson Bay.

He said: The Resolution explains itself. The papers have been before the House, and it is known that there were land grants made, on certain conditions as to price, to two companies running to Hudson Bay, one to Nelson River and the other to Churchill. Those two companies have been negotiating, amalgamating, severing, and amalgamating again, I believe. However that may be, it has been found that unless we made a free grant, there would not be a sufficient inducement for capitalists to undertake the construction of such a railway, and the Government thought well to accede to the request, that the grant should be made a free grant. Whether the scheme is practicable or not, whether it will open up a commercial avenue or not, remains for the future. One thing, however, is clear; the Legislature and the Government of Manitoba have made up their minds that they must have that railway, that it will be a means of transporting their surplus produce, that there will be a steady grain trade between England and Hudson Bay. There can be no harm in granting land to the north of Manitoba, of the character of this land. It is broken, and I have no doubt some of it is good, and there may be a good deal of timber as well as minerals.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the latitude of the northern boundary of Manitoba?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I forget at the moment. I was not intending to discuss this matter at this time; but after the Resolution should be agreed to, I intended moving that it should be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Bill (No. 138) to amend the Dominion Lands Act, so that the whole question might be discussed at the same time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is the land proposed to be granted, along the line of the railway in some part of Manitoba?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Outside of Manitoba, along the line of railway, or along a considerable portion of the line. I do not think, however, that the terminus or starting point has yet been finally settled. At or near Winnipeg, there is little or no land at the disposal of the Government along the line of railway within the Province of Manitoba. If the line runs west of Lake Winnipeg, the land will lie to the east of the line of railway. The matter has been considered by the Department, and I will give full particulars when we come to discuss the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is taking this course, because it practically means that we are to get the information, and that will be the end of it. I had hoped to have some information as to the details now, so that at another stage we could comment upon it intelligently. Is the proposition to find 6,400 acres a mile in Manitoba for as many miles of this railway as are in Manitoba, and 12,800 acres a mile outside of Manitoba in respect to the line outside of Manitoba.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. So that, if it is impossible to find 6,400 acres a mile along the railway in Manitoba, it will be taken somewhere else, by arrangement with the company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By arrangement with the company.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed that the land will be taken in a block, or is the principle of alternate sections adopted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Alternate sections within Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. And outside?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think not.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed that the appropriation should be made according to the progress of construction—with every twenty miles of construction?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. After what the hon. gentleman has said, I will merely ask him to give us, as accurately as possible, the mileage in Manitoba, the mileage outside, and the localities, so far as he can judge, where the land will be taken in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And also the location of the proposed line, if it has been surveyed, or inform us when it is to be surveyed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will get all the information in the possession of the Department.

Resolution to be reported.

TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION.

Mr. KIRK. I wish to direct the attention of the First Minister to the condition of the Liquor License Law in the Province of Nova Scotia. He is, of course, aware that the judges of Nova Scotia have decided that the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 is not in force in those counties in which it has been proclaimed to be in force, in consequence of some defect in the law, and the consequence is that to-day it is not known what law is in force in that Province—whether the Local Law of Nova Scotia, the Liquor License Law of last year, or the Canada Temperance Act. A Bill has been introduced and has passed the Senate, for the purpose of remedying this difficulty in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and it has been sent down to this House and has been read the first time. I am informed that in one of the licensing districts in the Province of Nova Scotia, the License Commissioners meet to-morrow for the purpose of considering applications for licenses, and the people there, and I believe the Commissioners themselves, do not know whether or not they have a right to issue licenses under the circumstances. Parties have telegraphed to me, asking me to ascertain whether the Government intend to push the passage of this Bill, and to ask them if they do to put it through as rapidly as possible, so as to put an end to this confusion. I would like to ask the First Minister if he will try to favour those people by advancing this Bill as rapidly as possible?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill, I fancy, will be ready either to-night or to-morrow.

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

After Recess.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT OF 1879.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of Bill (No. 135) to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and the Acts amending it.

Mr. WELLS. I desire to move one or two amendments to this Bill, and with that object, will move that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House. Sub-section eleven of clause nine of the Consolidated Railway Act provides that:

"The deposit of a plan or map and book of reference, and the notice of such deposit, shall be deemed a general notice to all the parties, of the lands which will be required for the railway and works."

I desire to add to that, these words:

"Provided, that the date of such deposit shall be the date with reference to which the compensation for rights of way shall be ascertained."

I know, from my own experience, that there is always a great deal of confusion and dispute as to what date shall be taken by the arbitrators, whether the date of fyling the plans, the date of the arbitration, the date of making the award, the date of payment of the compensation, &c. The same difficulty has arisen in the United States, and generally they have settled that date as the date of fyling the plans. Thus, Mr. Pierce says, in his work on Railways:

"The damages are assessed as of the time of taking. In different jurisdictions the act of taking is fixed at different stages in the proceedings for condemnation—as at the time of fyling the location in some public repository, as required by the Statute, though on failure to comply with the Statute other acts may be deemed as taking."

Now, the particular circumstance which prompts me to move the adoption of this amendment is, that an amendment was moved in Committee last evening, to the effect that where a railway touches a building, the whole building must be taken if the owner so desires it. It will be found that in England that has enormously increased the expense of railway construction. All kinds of tricks are played—for instance, in locating a railway through a town, it may pass through the corner of a yard which is attached to a manufactory, and all the owner has to do is to put up a shed and connect it in some way with the building, so that it will be attached to the building, and in this way he can compel the railway company to take the whole factory at a high price. That is not fair. The company should only be compelled to take property at its value and according to its condition at the time of fyling the plans, and that is, I think, the spirit of the Act, because the clause I have read shows clearly that the deposit of the plans shall be notice to all parties, and being notice to all parties the position of the parties ought not afterwards to be changed. That I think should be the time with reference to which the valuation should be fixed, and it is in that view that I move that amendment. I also desire to make another amendment, changing the mode of arbitration altogether. The House is aware that the present mode is this: The land owner chooses an arbitrator, the company chooses an arbitrator, and the two choose a third. The practical working of this is, that the land owner chooses some intimate friend on whom he can rely, and with whom, although that is illegal, he is, during the arbitration, in constant communication. Now, practically, it is the award of the umpire which settles the matter, and the award is really that of one arbitrator. But the result is enormous expense. First, in having three arbitrators instead of one. Arbitrators, generally, charge very high fees, the average amount, so far as my experience goes, being from three hundred to four hundred dollars. Secondly, the land owner invariably calls a very large number of witnesses. I have known nearly a whole week to be occupied in taking evidence. In fact arbitrators will seldom exclude evidence, one reason, perhaps, being because the land owner's arbitrator is not disposed, in the interests of his friend, to do so, and therefore witnesses are called day after day. When the claimant gets through with his evidence, the railway company are heard, and usually about the same number of witnesses are examined. The consequences is, that the average costs of an arbitration is not far from $1,000. I

think that this is a great scandal; it is bad both for the land owner and for the company. As against the company, it works in this way, that after the costs have been piled up to this enormous amount—and we all know the loser has to pay the costs—the arbitrators naturally say, if we find in favour of the company this poor man will have to pay more than the price of his land; and, therefore, although the evidence may be altogether in favour of the company, we find against the company. I propose that there should be, as in effect there is now, but one arbitrator. We know that cases involving very large amounts are brought before one judge every day and there is no reason why these cases also should not be tried before one judge in the same way. I therefore propose that it shall be lawful for either party to apply to a judge of one of the Superior Court, of the Province in which the land is situated, for the appointment of a single arbitrator. In point, of fact, this arbitrator will generally be a County Court judge, but I do not provide that he should be so. I prefer to leave to the discretion of the judge of the Superior Court the appointment of a suitable arbitrator. I beg therefore to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third timebut be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with power to make the amendment to which I have referred.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With regard to the first amendment, I think it would be an important one in removing a doubt as to whether the time of fixing the deposit of the plan should be the period, and in that respect I should be disposed to concur with my hon. friend. The other is a more important change, and I would like to hear the views of hon. gentlemen in the House, who have had experience in connection with the question of arbitration between railway companies and land owners, as to the effect of the amendment. If the fact be as stated by the hon. gentleman, that practically the land owner names a friend and the company a friend, and that it is a game of battledore and shuttlecock between these two, and costs accumulate, and the decision in nine cases out of ten is determined by the third person named, it would be very well worth considering whether it would not be an improvement to have recourse to a judge of the Superior Court, who should name the sole arbitrator, the one person who should decide the question. If, in the opinion of gentlemen who have had opportunities of making themselves acquainted with the practice in this regard, the views stated by the hon. gentleman are borne out, it would be very well worth trying. There is no doubt there is a good deal of difficulty in connection with the arbitrators, and it is calculated to be more expensive, and I think to consume more time. I would like very much to hear the opinions of gentlemen in the House, who are familiar with this question of claims between railway companies and land owners on that subject. It is a point on which I have not any very strong opinion, and if there was a general agreement that it would be desirable to alter the law in that respect, I have no very strong objection to it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The proposition, coming from a lawyer, from a professional man, is such a singular one, reducing the expenses and lessening the fees to the profession attending the court, that I think it is a step in the right direction, and I think we ought to encourage such a tendency on the part of gentlemen who are engaged in these arbitrations. I listened attentively to the remarks of my hon. friend, and I entirely approve of the proposition made by him, and think he and his fellow professional men ought to be encouraged in lessening the expenses to the general public.

Mr. IVES. I think the hon. gentleman who last spoke has missed the mark. Where an arbitration takes place under the law as it at present stands, there is not really any proper legal work to be done; there are no taxable fees at all; but if, as my hon. friend here suggests, we should commence proceedings by an application to a judge of the Superior Court, there would be an opportunity for the lawyers, rather better than exists at the present moment. However, I must say, from my experience in these matters, that the hon. member is right in stating that, as an almost invariable rule, the third arbitrator is practically the man who settles the amount that is to be awarded. That has been my experience. I have not known so large costs to be made as the hon. member speaks of, perhaps because in our part of the country we are a more peaceful and less litigious people than they are in Ontario; but I know that the third arbitrator is practically the man who decides the question, and it seems to me it would be a less cumbersome procedure to apply to a judge of the Superior Court—thus giving the lawyers a chance—to name a disinterested and indifferent person, who would be as likely to be a good man as one agreed upon by the friend of the railway company and the friend of the land owner.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to say a word in explanation, with reference to the remarks of my hon. friend. My hon. friend took exception to my remarks, because he said there were no taxable costs at present. That is just what the lawyers like. Where the costs are taxable, they are limited in the extent of them, but we know that lawyers employed by railway companies regulate their own charges and fix their own costs, and they fix them pretty heavily, as far as my experience in relation to railways goes.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot quite agree with the proposition of my hon. friend from East Bruce (Mr. Wells). The proposition, I think, is that the Superior Court judge shall in each case appoint a sole arbitrator. That involves an application being sent from the locality where the lands may be situate, and where probably the owner or owners live, to the capital of the Province. It would seem to me better if, instead of leaving the appointment to the Superior Court judge, we were to leave it in the hands of a County Court judge. It is a local matter, necessarily, in every case, and if it is sent to a Superior Court judge, the Superior Court judge will have no knowledge of his own as to the fitness or otherwise of the proposed arbitrage; a large amount of evidence will have to be supplied to him and that evidence will necessarily be of a conflicting character; the efforts of the lawyers will therefore be called into requisition at the earliest moment, in preparing evidence as to the fitness of the various persons that the contending parties suggest as sole arbitrator; whereas, if the appointment rested in the County Court judge, there would be much less expense; the County Court judge himself would probably have some knowledge, and might be able to select a person at little or no expense. So far on the point whether the appointment should rest with the County Court judge or the Superior Court judge. But I think another suggestion might be made; perhaps it would not recommend itself, but it occurs to me at the moment, that perhaps it would be better to have an official arbitrator in each county, a man enjoying some public office, and who, thus having an official standing, is more likely to deal justice towards all. In that way he would enter upon the duties of his office without the parties having been, in the first place, put to any expense in the matter of selecting an arbitrator, while his official position might, in almost every case, be a sufficient guarantee as to his fitness for the office.

Mr. GIROUARD. I look upon the amendment as a dangerous one. In every country, in Europe and on this continent, cases of this kind have been determined by three arbitrators—two at least, and when the two do not agree, by an umpire—and, unless very good reasons are given to show that the practice which has been universal is bad, I am not prepared to vote to change it.

Mr. TEMPLE. The custom in New Brunswick is to settle railway land damages generally by a jury. It seems to be a different practice here, where they are settled by arbitration, but there seems to be a good deal of argument by hon. members on both sides, that it costs a great deal to settle these matters by arbitration. I have had a good deal to do with settling land damages at different times, and in settling them by a jury it costs very little. In the first place, there is a notice issued by the magistrate to a jury of five men. This jury go over the land and assess the damages; they go back before the magistrate and make up their award. It is tried by both parties, there are lawyers on each side, and it is settled at once. The whole thing is done in less than two days, and there is very little cost attached to it. I have known, in one instance, fourteen cases to be tried in one day, so you can easily imagine the amount of cost which would be attached to it. I consider it the most reasonable way of settling the thing, and a great deal less expensive to all parties.

Mr. WELDON. I quite agree with my hon. friend from York (Mr. Temple), as to the practice in New Brunswick. The only difficulty is that the railway company have the choice of the magistrate, and consequently are very likely to have a jury of their own way of thinking. I also agree with the remarks of my friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). The difficulty is, that one arbitrator very often considers himself the counsel of one party and the other arbitrator the counsel of the opposing party, and practically the umpire is the person who decides. My own experience in arbitration is in favour of a single arbitrator, and if I can get the parties to agree upon one arbitrator, I generally do it, because it is much more satisfactory and much less liable to be upset. Where there are three arbitrators, if they disagree, the losing party applies to a lawyer to endeavour to get the award set aside, but where there is a single arbitrator, it is less expensive and more satisfactory.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suggest that there should be an alternative mode. Where parties can agree to leave it to a single arbitrator they should be allowed to do so; where they cannot agree upon that, they should then resort to the plan at present in force.

Mr. WELLS. They can agree now to leave it to one arbitrator.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In that case, I see no reason for amending it.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria). Under the law as it now stands at present, each party nominates an arbitrator. The company claiming the land serves a notice which names its arbitrator; it is then the duty of the owner of the property to name his arbitrator within ten days, and if he fails to do so the County Court judge has the power of naming a sole arbitrator, if I recollect rightly. But if the claimant names an arbitrator, then the two arbitrators meet and appoint a third; if they fail to agree upon a third then it becomes the duty of the Minister of Railways to appoint one of the official arbitrators of the Dominion as the third. Practically, the result is that the two arbitrators named by the company and the owner respectively agree upon a third, that third one practically becomes the sole arbitrator. I have had a good deal of experience in arbitration, and I find that almost invariably the two arbitrators named by the respective parties are partisans, they are advocates for the party who named them, and the decision thus rests entirely with the third arbitrator, be he chosen by the other two, or be he one of the official arbitrators. The present system of leaving it to the Minister to nominate the official arbitrator, is not found to work satisfactorily. Their occupation is such, they are so much engaged with other business in various parts of the Dominion, that it is almost impossible to get one of them to give the necessary time and attention to the matter. It is within my knowledge that one case has been kept waiting for a year past, until an official arbitrator could attend to it, and even yet the arbitration has not been held. Nothing, in fact, could be worse than the present system. The result is a greatly increased expense to the parties. Within the last few months I have known cases where the property ranged in value from $400 to $1,000, and where the costs had been as much as the value of the property. That, every one will admit, is not a satisfactory mode of proceeding. Where they have three arbitrators, each party exerts himself to call witnesses, and they go on calling witnesses by the dozen, who add nothing to the information of the arbitrators, because after half a dozen witnesses have been examined on each side, the subject is exhausted. The arbitrators, after viewing the property, form their opinion which, generally speaking, is as good as that of any of the witnesses who were called before them to speak on a theoretical question like that of the value of property. The hon. member for North York has suggested that the County Court judge is the proper person to name the arbitrator.

Mr. MULOCK. I suggested it might be well, perhaps, to appoint as an official arbitrator, some official in each county, or as an alternative, to leave it to the County Court judge to make the appointment.

Mr. CAMERON. As the Bill was first introduced, it proposed to leave it to the County Court judge to name the third arbitrator, and I think that is not likely to be satisfactory. If a third arbitrator is to be named, he ought to be some one unconnected with the neighbourhood, unbiassed, and not in any way prejudiced by his previous acquaintance with the parties on the property—unless indeed he be a judicial officer. The real objection to leaving it to the County Court judge to make the appointment is that he could not appoint himself. Now, in most cases that have come under my knowledge, the County Court judge would be a satisfactory arbitrator, and if left to the Superior Court judge the result would be that in a great many cases he would nominate one of the County Court judges as the arbitrator; and he, being a judicial officer, accustomed to exercising a discretion in matters of that kind, and weighing evidence, certainly would be more competent than an inexperienced person. I think the proposal this evening to leave it to the Superior Court judge would, in the end, be found to work well. I think a person appointed by the Superior Court judge would be likely to be competent, and would be a far more satisfactory tribunal than the present Board of Arbitration undoubtedly is. The idea of the hon. member for North York, that there should be, as it were, permanent official arbitrators to arbitrate upon the value of property, a single arbitrator to go through the district and value the property in each case taken by the company, would be found to work well. In many of the States of the Union that is the system they pursue, and I think there they have less trouble and more satisfactory results in these land valuations than we probably have here. But undoubtedly some judge is required, and I think that, as we have found the present system very unsatisfactory, no harm would be done in allowing this proposal to go through and try it for one year, at any rate.

Mr. HALL. With some experience in matters of this kind I have no hesitation in saying that a change in this direction would be a beneficial one. The only difficulty that occurs to me, is one of procedure. I know that in the Province of Quebec the judges dislike very much to undertake duties of this kind, which are certainly extra judicial; and I think it will be found necessary that the person holding the office of the judge of the Superior Court should make the appointment. I have known instances where judges in their official capacity positively refused to undertake extra judicial

duties of this kind. It is not a matter of record, there is no record of the action that they take in reference to it, and therefore they decline, quite properly sometimes, to meddle with affairs of this kind. I do not think there will be any difficulty if that change were made, and the clause made to read "and the person holding the office of judge of the Superior Court shall be the person to select the arbitrator."

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire cordially to endorse the amendment moved by the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Wells). I can add my own experience to the statements made by my hon. and learned friends, and the result of the matter is that the third arbitrator makes the decision. I can agree with the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Ives), who states that under the present system the lawyers are not entitled to costs, and I think it is an injustice to the profession.

Mr. WELLS. Although there is no tariff of costs, it is very largely in the discretion of the County Court judge, who generally taxes liberal fees. With respect to giving the Superior Court judge the power of appointment, I only followed out the analogy of the law as it is now. Where one railway crossed another, the procedure is to apply to a judge of the Superior Court to appoint three arbitrators as between the the two railway companies.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not think, as the law stands at present, any injustice is perpetrated on any person as regards the mode of ascertaining the value of the land. It would be very unjust to take away from the person whose land is being expropriated by the railway company the right to name one of the arbitrators to determine the value of the land so taken. If it were determined by the wisdom of this House that the mode of appointment should be changed, then the House itself ought to determine who should be the arbitrators, and not leave that duty in the hands of a judge of the Superior Court. But as the law now stands, it works very much more equitably than would be the case by the mode indicated by the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Wells).

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite concur in the opinion expressed by the last speaker. If a change were made in the mode of appointing arbitrators it would be felt to be unjust to property owners, who have hitherto had a say in the appointment of the arbitrators who were to determine the value of the property to be taken by the railway company. If it were left to a Superior Court judge to appoint the arbitrators or arbitrator, the duty of making the application would devolve on the railway company. The result would be that property owners would feel that a valuator was appointed in whose choice they had no part. The law should be allowed to stand as at present rather than make a change in the direction of depriving property owners of a say in the choice of the arbitrators.

Mr. BEATY. The great difficulty hitherto experienced has been the great loss of time and expense in connection with these arbitrations. But we must remember that we have had thirty years' experience, and have built nearly 10,000 miles of railway, and during all this time the difficulty suggested has not been experienced. The person owning the property is interested, of course, in obtaining a large value, and the railway company, whose interests are in the other direction, usually employ an expert, a person who is fully acquainted with the valuation of land. In that respect the railway company has an advantage over the land owner, because they are represented by a really skilled person, with whom the owner's arbitrator cannot usually compete. The result is that the third arbitrator comes in and agrees with one or the other, for two of the arbitrators only, as a rule, agree. The difficulty of getting a judge to do work of this kind is, that it would take him away from his ordinary duties, and this could not be done except in some counties. If a Superior Court judge appointed the arbitrator or arbitrators this again would add to the expense, because the application as regards Ontario would have to be made in Toronto, and professional aid would have to be brought into requisition. In view of these aspects, and of the fact that we have had thirty years experience of the present system, the new mode proposed does not suggest itself as advisable. Parties can agree to a sole arbitrator; but they go to work with their eyes open, and after being informed as to the great expense involved, each appoints an arbitrator and the two appoint a third. If the parties do this with their eyes open, who can interfere? But if we are to adopt a different mode of solving the difficulty, my idea would be to let the owner and the company each appoint a friend and these friends appoint an arbitrator, and in such a case he would no doubt be a man of skill and judgment, and the system would involve less expense and loss of time than that at present in operation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, after the discussion, it is obvious that the general sense of the House is against the proposed change. Having listened attentively to what has been said, I am inclined to think it will be better to leave the Act as we have amended it, for the present, at all events.

Amendment negatived.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the following be added to sub-section 11: "And the date of such deposit shall be the date with respect to which such compensation or damages shall be so ascertained."

Bill, as amended, reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee, with instructions to strike out the second sub-section of the first clause and insert the following in lieu thereof:—

That every railway company shall be liable to a penalty of $50, to be recovered, with costs in any court of competent jurisdiction, by any person who may sue therefor, one-half of the penalty to be paid to the Crown, and the other half to the person suing for the same.

The difficulty under the clause, as it stands, is that suit can only be brought by the Attorney-General. I think it should not be necessary, in such cases, to wait for the Crown, but that any person might bring suit against the company under the ordinary terms, one-half the penalty to go to the informer and the other half to the Crown.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid that that would be likely to stir up a class of persons who are disposed vindictively to prosecute railway companies—persons of no means, bringing actions in which they have no sort of interest. This would involve the parties in litigation and expense, and what recourse would they have. It appears to me that the Bill as it stands should be sufficient. It provides for severe and stringent obligations on the part of the company, and it provides that the Crown shall prosecute, so that if there is a legitimate case, and the parties interested are respectable, I do not think there will be found any difficulty in protecting the interests of the public. I know that my hon. friend is more familiar with these matters than I am, but I am afraid that where there is no responsibility required in the prosecution of such suits, they will be apt to be brought on mere speculation.

Mr. MILLS. The amendment of my hon. friend may go further than the hon. gentleman may desire, but it seems to me it would be impossible, in many cases, to bring a suit if

the Bill is allowed to stand as it is. Supposing a municipality is making certain improvements, the railway corporations are subject to the law, the same law as any other corporation; a road may be built across a railway track, or there may be a want of drainage, but under the provisions of this Bill no one could bring suit against the railway company, except the Minister of Justice. I do not think the hon. gentleman should so far restrict the right of persons to bring suit against a railway corporation for such grievances. I think every such person, or at all events every municipality, should have the right to bring suit.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, perhaps the substitution of "any corporation" for "any person" would be acceptable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not object to that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would move that the words "any municipal or local corporation interested in the matter in which such railway company has made default" be inserted in place of "any person."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that take away the right from a private party from suing through the Attorney-General? Does it confine that right entirely to the corporation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It substitutes the one for the other, I think.

Mr. BEATY. I think persons aggrieved, in such a case, should have liberty to bring the action.

Bill reconsidered in Committee, amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT OF 1883.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 143) to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883.

Bill read the second time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There ought to be a general statement before going into Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to make some explanation of the amendments proposed. They are mostly of a formal character. One or two of the amendments, I may state at the outset, it is proposed to drop. The one proposing, perhaps, the most important amendment to the Bill, in which power was given to the Governor in Council to postpone the time for three years, as to the reduction of the number of licenses, it is not proposed to press. The others are mainly for extending the period for the coming into force of the Act, or, rather, for the coming into force of the practical part of the Act, and I think it would be better to make the explanation, section by section, in Committee of the Whole, as the amendments, generally speaking, are purely of a formal character.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there any provision to set aside the penalties.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; there is no provision of that kind. I understood the right hon. First Minister to state, on introducing the Bill, that in regard to that his proposition was he would advise the Governor in Council to remit the penalties until the constitutionality of the Act was settled and determined—that is in places where there was any other conflicting Act. In places where there is no attempt to enforce any other law the penalties will be enforced.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What about the costs?

Mr. McCARTHY. They cannot be enforced either, if the penalty is not enforced.

Mr. OUIMET. How is the penalty to be remitted? One part goes to the informer, another to the inspector and a third to the municipality. I do not see how the Governor General in Council can remit what belongs to individuals. The only part of the penalty that could be remitted is that which goes to the Crown; the rest of the costs will be at the charge of the prosecuting party.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not so understand the law.

Mr. WELDON. This Bill simply makes some amendments in regard to the License Act, and a discussion took place some time ago, on the Resolution of the hon. member for Maskinongé, in which we were led to believe that the only amendment would be an Act to suspend the penalties until a case was brought before the Supreme Court of Canada, or the Privy Council, for the purpose of testing the constitutionality of this law. There are serious doubts as to the constitutionality of the Act, and we see that already great difficulties have arisen in the various Provinces, not only in regard to the Local Governments, but with regard to the municipalities, through the effect of this law. The hon. member for Guysborough, before recess, called the attention of the First Minister to the position of some of the counties of Nova Scotia. On the 18th March, when the hon. member for Maskinongé moved his Resolution, the hon. Minister of Public Works said:

"My hon. friend may say, what will happen in the meantime? He may say there will be suits entered and penalties imposed, and the law may be worked in that direction, at the same time that it may not be constitutional. I may say that the Government intend bringing in a Bill to amend the law during this Session, and that one of the provisions of that Bill will be that, until a decision is obtained from the proper tribunal, as stated in my amendment, the penalties of the Act shall not have effect. They will not be exacted during that period, and thus nobody will suffer."

That is the explicit statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, when he opposed the Resolution of the hon. member for Maskinongé; and the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé) also said:

"Therefore, I say, as a matter of public convenience, as a measure of necessity, if we want to arrive at something definite, a recourse to the Privy Council must be adopted. Then the question could be virtually decided, and acting constitutionally, under the tenets and according to the precepts of the Confederation Act, avoiding the difficulties and expense of prolonged law suits, we would obtain, once for all, a decision to be followed. I say again, Sir, that the mode suggested is all the more advantageous, because from this time up to the date of the decision which we are to expect in the Privy Council, all the rights of the Provinces will be maintained and will not be infringed upon. The Local Governments will collect their revenue, the licenses will not be interfered with by the Federal authorities, and the result, practically and virtually will be, the suspension of the License Act of the Dominion until such time as the question is settled."

That was the language of the hon. member for Quebec Centre, in supporting the amendment of the hon Minister of Public Works. The Bill does not at all remit the penalties, and, as was stated by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), it is very doubtful whether the Government have the right to remit the penalties where once the right has attached and belongs to other persons. What was pledged to this House and to the country, to use the language of my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé), was a virtual suspension of the License Act until the question was decided, and that it should be carried to the Privy Council of England to get a decision as to the constitutionality of that law. That was the effect of the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the Resolution of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), and supported by the hon. member for Quebec Centre, and upon the faith of that the House adopted the Amendment. There is no provision in this Bill for any case. If there is no provision made before this House rises, for a case, we will find the courts flooded with applications to test this question; and, instead of having the matter, which is not only a question between the municipalities and the Government, but between the Provincial Governments and the Dominion

Government, suspended for the time being until that is settled, we will find that, immediately after the 1st May, applications will be made to the courts, and there will be litigation throughout the country, and the whole time of the courts and of the judges will be taken up in deciding the different objections that will be raised, because not only will the constitutional question be raised, but there will be technical objections of almost every kind taken, as it will have not only the opposition of the parties brought up for the violation of this law, but will have the public feeling of the country against it, because the Government have not carried out what they pledged themselves, on the 18th March, would be the course adopted in reference to this Act.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I think, if a clause suspending the penalties under this Act is not inserted, it will prove very difficult to meet the difficulties that will have to be met this year, pending decision of the Supreme Court or the Privy Council. It was understood, in that debate referred to by my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), that before the case is submitted and adjudicated upon, the penalties would be suspended, and upon that declaration I know that many people have applied for their licenses under the Provincial laws, and now they would be submitted to the trouble of being sued and being obliged to pay fines under this law. It would certainly be contrary to the expectations held out to us by the declarations that were made, so I hope the Government will see that it is necessary that a clause be inserted to suspend the penalties under this law.

Mr. MILLS. I think we should have some further explanation from the Government before we go into Committee. The hon. member for Maskinongé proposed that the License Act of last year should be repealed, as inconsistent with the decision of the Privy Council, in the case of Hodge against the Queen. That was met by a promise of the Government to introduce a measure, not such as is indicated by this Bill, not a measure to make the law more stringent than it was before, and assert in a still greater degree, aggressively, the authority of this House against the Local Legislatures, but an amendment to the law, which would suspend the penal provisions until the question was finally disposed of by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It was understood here that the decision of any court less than the highest court of the realm would not be satisfactory, because it would not finally dispose of the question, and it was distinctly understood that the Bill should contain a provision of this character. In order to make the matter clear, I will read the amendment proposed by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, to the proposition of the hon. member for Maskinongé:—

"In the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the question of the competence of Parliament to pass the Liquor License Act, 1883, should be submitted, with all convenient speed, to the Supreme Court of Canada or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or both."

Now, there is no doubt that, until this question is finally disposed of by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, this country will not accept, as a final disposition of the question, any decision that may be come to by any inferior tribunal. Then, again, it is important that there should be a provision that the penal clauses of the existing law should not be enforced until that final decision is had, because it is perfectly obvious that, while the Crown may suspend the penalties, so far as those penalties are payable to the Crown, it cannot suspend the penalties so far as they can be collected by any private individual. It must be done by Bill, or it cannot be properly done at all. I think that, before we go into Committee, we should have the assent of the Government to the acceptance of this amendment by them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The statement made by me at the time on behalf of the Government is, of course, one

that will be fulfilled. The statement I made was, that this question would be submitted to the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council or of the Supreme Court, or both. Then it was understood that we would see that the penalties were not enforced. That was a statement I made on behalf of the Government at the time, and I was authorized to say so, and that will be done. The hon. gentleman may be sure of this, that we may go into Committee, carry the Bill through, with such amendments as are required, and before the third reading is carried, there will be an amendment prepared and inserted in the Bill to fulfil the promise of the Government.

Mr. MILLS. I would remind the hon. gentleman of another provision—that the Bill itself was to provide for a case.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think that was stated, but I stated on behalf of the Government, that the Government would see that the question would be submitted to the Privy Council or to the Supreme Court, or both.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. Minister was out when I read what he stated. I will read it again:

"I may say that the Government intend bringing in a Bill to amend the law during this Session, and that one of the provisions of that Bill will be that, until a decision is obtained from the proper tribunal, as stated in my amendment, the penalties of the Act shall not have effect. They will not be exacted during that period, and thus nobody will suffer."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps it is so; but, at all events, whether it is in the Bill or otherwise, the word of the Government is given, and, of course, will have to be fulfilled.

Mr. FISHER. If my recollection serves me aright, after the discussion was concluded, my hon. friend from West Durham referred to the fact that the Government had not stated any plan by which the decision should be arrived at, and that then the First Minister said, when the Act came down, such a provision would be in it. I regret that no explanation in regard to the general tenor of this measure has been made from the Government benches. It is possible that in these amendments there is no general plan followed, except to repair the many errors discovered in the Act passed last Session. It is not very complimentary to the drawers of this Act that they have to come down to-day with a Bill of twenty-five sections amending that Act which was supposed to be drawn up with great care. I observe, in these amendments, a tendency to do away with one or two provisions which were contended last Session to be of great value. It was contended last Session that one of the great advantages of the Act was, that there should be a representative of the people on the Commission for granting licenses; but I find, by the first amendment, that that provision is practically taken away. In the fourth sub-section it is stated that if any first or second Commissioner has an interest in any business in consequence whereof he is disqualified to act, the Governor in Council may assign his duties to another Commissioner, or may appoint another Commissioner to act in his stead. Now, Sir, I am not a lawyer and cannot therefore give an opinion with regard to the effect of this amendment, but I know that in the Province of Ontario it practically places in the hands of the Government of the day the appointment of two members of the Commission. I find that in sub-section (*b*) of the first section, the Government take to themselves the appointment of a second Commissioner, whenever there are two or more wardens in the same district. So that we find the Government in some cases are assuming the appointment of all these Commissioners. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill say that he is to withdraw the most objectionable feature of it, and I think there are one or two other provisions which it would be well to with-

draw. I find that in section 7 of this Bill, the following proviso is added to sub-section 2 of section 22 of the said Act:—

"Provided always, that the personal attendance of the applicant may be dispensed with by the Board, in cases in which the report of the inspector has been dispensed with under section 29."

If the hon. gentleman refers to that section, he will find that in certain cases where the applicant for license resides at a distance from the place where the Commissioners meet, the report of the inspector may be dispensed with. You can easily understand that, under such circumstances, it is very important that some accurate knowledge of the applicant should be obtained, and if, as is provided by this amendment, the applicant may be relieved in certain cases from the necessity of appearing before the Commissioners, it is practically abandoning the only safeguard that we have in regard to the applicant's character and in regard to the place for which he wishes to secure the license. If this section passes, the applicant may appeal in writing to the Commissionners to give him a license. There is no check upon him in any way, and no means of obtaining necessary information in regard to his character. I think that although the original section in the Act was decidedly objectionable, this one makes it ten times worse. Another amendment, which I consider of very serious consequence, is that in section 8 of the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is an error; it is not intended to press that.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad to hear it. I find, then, that two of the most objectionable features in the Bill are mistakes.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to add the following amendment to sub-section 8 in section 5: "In the Province of Quebec he shall hold office for one year, or the portion of the year unexpired in which he is appointed, but he shall nevertheless continue to hold office until his successor is appointed." That only applies to the Province of Quebec.

Amendment agreed to.

On sub-section 2,

Mr. WELDON moved that the word "mayor" be inserted before St. John.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. AUGER. I desire to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that in the Province of Quebec the warden, who is named as the second Commissioner, is elected in March, and unless the section is amended, as has been done in another section, the office will be for some time vacant. Commissioners are appointed by name, not by office.

Mr. McCARTHY. The appointments are made by office.

Mr. FISHER. In the Province of Quebec, the warden would issue licenses and make all the arrangements and then go out of office, and he would no longer be responsible for what had been done.

Mr. BÉCHARD. In Iberville, the warden was appointed by name, not as warden of the county.

On sub-section 4,

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would like to ask the hon. member in charge of the Bill, why British Columbia is specially excepted in this sub-section?

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand it is on account of the difficulty in getting wardens in British Columbia.

On sub-section 5,

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask why it is that the third Commissioner is not included with the first and second, with regard to this provision, as to being interested in any business?

Mr. McCARTHY. For a reason evident on the face of the Bill. He is a Commissioner *ex officio*, appointed by the Governor in Council, and it is presumed that the Governor in Council will not appoint a disqualified person.

Mr. FISHER. It is possible that the Governor in Council might unknowingly appoint a person interested in the business.

Mr. McCARTHY. But if such a person accepted the office, he is subject, by the Act, to a very heavy penalty.

Mr. BOLDUC moved that sub-section *a* of section 5 of the License Act, be amended by inserting the words "sheriff, or district magistrate" after the word "prothonotary," in the seventh line of said sub section.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. McCARTHY. This is merely formal for the purposes of the Inland Revenue office.

Mr. WELDON. Who is going to take out a license if other people are not to be fined for breaking the law?

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought my hon. friend was pressing the Minister of Public Works to bring down such a provision, and now that he has promised to bring it down, my hon. friend is not satisfied.

Mr. WELDON. At this period of the Session, when we are so anxious to get home, I think we are wasting a great deal of time on this matter. We are providing for licenses to be issued, and does the hon. gentleman expect people to take out licenses when those who do not will not be fined, because the suspension of the penalties is the practical suspension of the law.

Mr. McCARTHY. The information we have is that they are taking out licenses.

Mr. MILLS. It is pretty obvious that no one would pay to take out a license if he was in no better position than those who do not pay to take out licenses.

Mr. McCARTHY. I rise to order. Is this discussion pertinent to this second paragraph?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It appears to me, in my judicial capacity, that this question should have been raised before we went into Committee.

Mr. BOLDUC. (Translation.) I move that sub-section (*c*) of section 7 be amended by striking out all the words after the word "ship." The effect of the amendment, which I have just moved, is to enable ships sailing between Quebec and Montreal, or between Montreal and Toronto, to sell liquor in a bar-room as it was done heretofore. As it is now, by virtue of the Act of 1883, liquor can only be sold at meal time on board the ships. Still if this clause is not amended it will always be meal time on board of the ships during the whole of the navigation season, so that instead of preventing disturbances we shall give rise to them.

Mr. LAURIER. No adequate reason has been given for this amendment. It is practically making a vessel a bar or a tavern.

Mr. BOLDUC. (Translation.) The hon. member for East Quebec says that no adequate reason has been given in favour of the amendment. For my part I say that no adequate reason has been given against the amendment, and I am waiting for the hon. member to give some.

Mr. McCARTHY. The effect of my hon. friend's amendment is to strike out the proviso which restricts the sale of liquors on vessels to regular meals, and prevents the opening of a bar on board the vessel.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amendment is, in fact, to establish a bar.

Amendment negatived.

On section 5,

Mr. McCARTHY. The object is to make clear the holder of the license under a local law, last year, shall be entitled to get a license without being required to have a petition signed by a number of ratepayers, and this applies also to Manitoba.

On section 7,

Mr. McCARTHY. The object is to dispense with the attendance of an applicant when through some cause, such as illness, he is not able to come to the meeting of the Board.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the amendment accomplishes the object desired, while it accomplishes something else. This only applies in cases where the report of the inspector has been dispensed with. If a report has been recorded, the Board cannot dispense with the personal attendance of the applicant, and where the report has been dispensed with, it seems to me to be doubly necessary the applicant should attend personally.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not go as far as I thought it did. The suggestion is if it is too far for the inspector to go, it seems hard to oblige the applicant to come that distance, and the Board will have the discretion of forcing attendance or not.

Mr. FISHER. The report of the inspector is necessary, in ordinary circumstances, to insure the granting of a license, and when that is dispensed with, we should do what we can to obtain the information otherwise. There is nothing but the dictum of the Board themselves to declare when the inspector's report shall be dispensed with, and the Board may dispense with the personal attendance of the applicant, under any circumstances which they choose to think would be a case of hardship. This is opening the way to a great deal of laxity on the part of the Board, and our only safeguard is the personal attendance of the applicant, under any circumstances. If we do not keep this in the Act, the applicant may make his application in writing, and nobody may know anything about him, if in the neighbourhood where the Commission are holding their sitting, and they would be taking a leap in the dark.

On section 8,

Mr. McCARTHY. We will drop that section.

Mr. WELDON. The word "hotel" should be struck out of that section.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was under a misapprehension it was inserted. There is no necessity there should be any connection. Take the case of the Windsor or the Rossin House: it would interfere with the carrying on of that business, and there is no reason why these shops should have any connection with the hotel.

Mr. WELDON. I think the word "hotel" ought not to be there, because, in the Windsor, in Montreal, or the Russell, or the Rossin House, there are entrances into the cigar stores and drug stores and barber's shops, and that might raise a nice question. I move, in amendment, that sub-section 2 of section 25 of the Act, be amended, by striking out the words "hotel or." Then it will read "no saloon shall form part of or communicate with," &c.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend will see that it is only for the Windsor.

Mr. BOLDUC.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The St Lawrence Hall is the same. The hon. gentleman may go to the Windsor or the St. Lawrence Hall, and he will see that those hotels communicate with shops or stores in which, for example, they sell cigars, and this would certainly go against the hotels; but, if the words "hotel or" disappear, there will be no inconvenience, and the hotels will not suffer from that provision. I think the hon. gentleman is right, and that the words "hotel or" should disappear.

Mr. AUGER. It may be very well for the Windsor, in Montreal, but in the country we do not want to have our hotels with our stores, and if you take that away they will have the hotel and store on the same premises.

Mr. JAMIESON. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has last spoken. I think it would be better to leave the section in the form in which it is in the Act. I think this is going to work mischief, especially in many rural sections of the country. I cannot see that, if a store were underneath a hotel, it could be said to be connected with it. It is no part of the hotel, though it may be part of the building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. "Communicates by any entrance."

Mr. WELDON. Take the case where a hotel is above, and stores below. If there was an entrance from any one of the stores, the party would be liable to a penalty.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It will meet the views of hon. gentlemen if this is made to read: "sub-section 2 of section 25 of the said Act, is hereby amended by striking out the words, 'hotel or.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The first question to decide is, whether that is repealed or is not. If it is repealed, that is enough.

Mr. McCARTHY. The best way would be, to say "is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—'No saloon shall form part,'" and so on.

Mr. LAURIER. Before that is carried, I would submit to the Committee that we may very well provide for the case of the Windsor, the St. Lawrence and other large hotels. In their case the provision is a good one, but there is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Auger) says. You open the door to a class of hotels to which there is a great objection, a class of low hotels, in rural places, where you have the hotel and store together, which are a source of inconvenience and demoralization of the people. I would suggest that such a clause could be framed as would protect these large hotels, but keep the provision as it exists in regard to other places.

Mr. GIROUARD. I have hotels in my county which are not so big as the Windsor, but which are in the same position, and I have not been able to observe the great inconveniences.

Mr. SCRIVER. My experience is entirely different from that of the hon. gentleman. I believe the mixed stores and liquor places in the country are the sources of very great demoralization. I am entirely opposed to any such amendment as would permit the continuance of any such establishments.

Mr. FLEMING. I would suggest that the Commissioners be empowered to dispense with that, in the case of any particular hotel.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think my hon. friend's suggestion would meet the difficulty. That would enable them to deal with the Windsor, and the St. Lawrence, and the Rossin, and similar places.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that is placing too much power in the hands of the Commissioners. The law ought to define what it means.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not suppose we are going to mention the names of the hotels in the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course you can scarcely form any law that will not work a little hardship somewhere. There is a slight hardship with reference to such hotels as the St. Lawrence, or the Russell House, of this city, but I do not think we ought to open the door very wide, as I am sure it will be opened if we pass this without some guard, just for the sake of a few city hotels. I think that, if necessary, a clause might be framed to let out these city hotels. Allow hotels in the city, in the discretion of the Board, to dispense with this, but do not give a discretion to Boards all over the country, with reference to rural districts. Would not all points be met by simply enacting that city hotels, under the discretion of the Board, shall be allowed to be excepted from this?

Mr. SCRIVER. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. GIROUARD. If it is right in a city it should be right also in rural districts.

Mr. JAMIESON. I see no necessity for changing this at all. If you look at the wording, you will see there is no necessity whatever for changing it. "No hotel or saloon shall form a part of or communicate by any entrance with any shop." Now, the Windsor Hotel does not form part of a shop. It may be in the same building, but it is not part of it.

Mr. BOURBEAU. (Translation.) I desire to say a few words on this subject in which the House seems to take such a deep interest at the present time. My experience of hotels where all kinds of goods are allowed to be sold, is that it is a cause of great inconvenience in country places. If some hon. members of this House think that it is proper that different kinds of goods should be sold in hotels, surely this can only apply to cities. As regards country places, I consider that it is a great source of annoyance. I understood that the law which we adopted in 1883 was intended rather to put a stop to the abuses resulting from the sale and consumption of liquor. Well, if we wish to attain this end, if we desire to diminish the sale of intoxicating liquors, means must be adopted to prevent the abuses to which I have referred. It has been found in country places that when liquors are allowed to be sold in a store where other goods are sold, this practice was a great cause of drunkenness. If we wish to encourge a misuse of liquors all we have to do is to allow it to be sold in stores, or in hotels, where the sale of other goods will be allowed. It may be proper enough in the cities, but I say it has a very bad effect in the country places, and a distinction ought to be made, to prevent, in country places, the sale of liquors in houses where other goods are sold.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that there be added to sub section 2, of section 25, the following words: "that in cities the Board may dispense, as to hotels, with the necessity of conforming to the provisions of this sub-section."

Mr. DAVIES. I would suggest, instead of that, the following amendment, "unless the Commissioners shall specially, in their license, permit such hotel or saloon to form part of, or communicate with, such shop or store."

Mr. CHARLTON. Sub-section 2 of clause 25, reads as follows: "No hotel or saloon shall form part of or communicate by any entrance with any shop or store where in any goods or merchandise are kept for sale." I suggest that the words "shall form part of" be struck out. This does not prohibit the letting of the basement of an hotel for stores.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think you can carry that in that shape, without amending the law in other respects. The Commissioners have only to decide who shall get licenses, but they have nothing to do with prescribing the places were licenses shall or shall not be granted.

Amendment to the amendedment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON moved to strike out of sub-section 2 the words "hotel or."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 42,

Mr. BAKER. I beg to move the following amendment, as a sub-section to section 42:—

"In the city of Victoria, B.C., the limits shall be one for each full 2,200 of the first 8,000 of the population, and for each full 500 over 8,000 of the population"

In the city of Victoria there are at present sixty-four licensed houses, and it is proposed to reduce them to eighteen, which I consider is an exceedingly arbitrary proceeding. I have received telegrams from the Board of Trade and a letter from the municipal council, requesting that this matter be taken in hand, so that a clause may be introduced making the reduction less sweeping. The amendment I propose would have the effect of reducing the number of licenses from sixty-four to about thirty, which the people there think quite a sufficient reduction for the first swoop.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BAKER. Why was clause 7 withdrawn, because that, to a certain extent, provides for what I have just endeavoured to provide.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Government withdrew it.

Mr. GIROUARD. I beg to move the insertion of the following paragraph at the end of section 43, and this will apply to both 42 and 43:—

"Provided always, that in the case of a rural municipality adjoining a town or village municipality, where no shop or hotel license is granted, or where a less number of licenses than is authorized by law is granted, the number of shop or hotel licenses for the said village or town may be increased to the maximum provided in this Act, provided that the said increase be approved by a by-law passed to that effect by the respective councils of the village or rural municipality, before the time fixed for the granting of such licenses."

Let us take the case of a village, and a township or parish. If the village is not incorporated, the number of licenses in that case would be determined by the population of both the village and the rural district, but if the village is incorporated, the population of the rural district is entirely ignored in determining the number of licenses. It is well known, however, that in most cases the population of the rural district is supplied by the village, and I do not see, since the principle of the Act is that the number of licenses is to be determined by the population, why the rural population should be ignored.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that in the first sub section of section 42 he will find that provision is made for sufficient competition for the rural as well as the village population, and by the fifth subsection of the same clause, special provision is made for summer resorts, such as those in the hon. gentleman's own county. But to make the hon. gentleman's amendment apply to the whole community would be to offer inducements to the building of a nest of hotels or saloons in any country village. Such an amentment would largely do away with the effects of the Act, in limiting the number of licenses, and that in a very insidious way.

Amendment negatived.

On section 11,

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman proposes, by this section, to authorize the municipal councils to do certain things. But we have no authority to do that. As the hon.

gentleman is aware, such clauses have invariably been struck out in the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not see why we should not have power. The matter decided in the Queen *vs.* Hodge case, was, that this or any other Parliament can delegate its power to other bodies.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman say that we can give instructions to a provincial municipal body?

Mr. McCARTHY. We do not give them instructions, we merely empower them. The question in the case of the Queen *vs.* Hodge was whether or not the Provincial Legislature could delegate their functions to an inferior body, and the Privy Council decided that they could, and if they can do it, why cannot we? We are a sovereign power, and these bodies are within our jurisdiction. If we have this power ourselves, we can delegate to a municipal body the same powers that we possess.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think that the decision of the Privy Council in that case maintains the assumption that either we or the Local Legislatures can delegate our powers to any other bodies, except to bodies of our, or their, creation, respectively. The township councils are the creation of the local municipalities, and I do not think we could delegate our powers to them, according to the decision in that case.

Mr. MILLS. There is no doubt about our being able to delegate our powers for the purpose of administering our own laws, but we must delegate them to parties under our jurisdiction and under our control. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he knows that under the Federal system it has been held that the boundary which separates a provincial establishment from a Federal Government is as distinct as the boundary between one State and another; and so far as this Government is concerned the Provincial Governments within their exclusive jurisdiction, are foreign establishments, and the municipal institutions of the country are unknown to our law. However, the hon. gentleman is proposing nothing on this occasion which has not been proposed in the amendments already adopted. I rise, not for the purpose of contesting the constitutional proceeding under this provision—for I hope we will have an opportunity of doing that at a later stage—but I rise to move an amendment to the second sub-section. Why should it apply to the Province of Quebec and not to the other Provinces? I have no doubt that the proposition to confer this power on the municipal councils shows that this is a power which belongs to the municipal bodies; it is a part of the municipal law of the Province. It was so at the time of Confederation, and there is no doubt that when the British North America Act provided that municipal institutions should be under the control of the Local Government, this provision was under the exclusive control of the Governments of the several Provinces. I propose to strike out the words "in the Province of Quebec," and to insert the words, "in any Province of the Dominion of Canada." I propose that the same powers that are conferred by this Bill upon municipal institutions in the Province of Quebec shall be conferred upon every municipal institution in every other Province of the Dominion. I do not, Sir, attach any very great importance to the amendments of this Bill. I have not taken any very great interest in it, for the reason that I assume that the Bill is *ultra vires;* but I think that we ought to deal with all the Provinces in the same way, and I hope that the members from the Province of Quebec who, I believe, are sincerely and honestly devoted to the maintenance of our Federal institutions, will support the amendment. Its adoption will not interfere with our right to deal with this question on its merits hereafter.

Mr McCARTHY. There would be no objection to doing what my hon friend proposes, but for the fact that the Bill does make ample provision for local option throughout the whole Dominion. The people in the Province of Quebec, however, have been in the habit of doing by by-law of the council what in the other Provinces is done by vote of the people. I do not think that councils in Ontario have power to pass a prohibitory law. It was always the case in Ontario, before Confederation, that a by-law for prohibition should be submitted to the people. But in the Province of Quebec it has been the practice of the people to do by by-law what the people in Ontario do by vote. Both principles are combined in this Bill, and what I propose to do here is to confirm and make clear the powers exercised by by-law in the Province of Quebec, while we have the power to do the same thing in all the other Provinces.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the meaning of the addition proposed to be made to section 45?

Mr. McCARTHY. Section 45 provides only for confirming such by-laws as existed at the time of Confederation. This addition provides that in every town, village, parish, and township in the Province of Quebec, the municipal council thereof may by by-law prohibit, within the limit of such town, village, parish or township, the sale of intoxicating liquors. The clause, as it stands, provides for the law up to 1867; the clause in this Bill provides for the future; and now I desire to add a similar provision with reference to the by-laws which have been passed since 1867.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon gentleman undertakes to confirm the by-laws of local municipalities. Does he?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Section 45 does so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is to say, you did wrong last year and you are doing wrong again this year.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend's friends all voted for it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would certainly vote against doing something that we have no power to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would suggest that the amendment should except by-laws which are at present in litigation. I know of several cases of that kind.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will so amend it.

Mr. MILLS. The Government are proceeding upon the assumption that the powers which the municipalities of Quebec have are powers derived from this Legislature and not from the Legislature of that Province. The hon. gentleman is proposing to confirm by-laws, which he assumes, have not the force of law, because they were authorized by a Provincial Legislature. He proposes to give the municipalities certain powers; if those powers are vested here, of course it may be possible for us to give them, but if we can give them, we can also take them away. In fact, the Government are proceeding upon the assumption that we are a Legislative Union, and that the powers we are giving the municipalities of Quebec, in reference to the subject of tavern licenses are powers derived from this Legislature and not from the Legislature of their own Province.

Mr. CHARLTON. This whole proceeding is a farce because we are perfecting unconstitutional law, or what we suppose to be an unconstitutional law, in the view that the constitutional question has been decided against us in the action we are now taking. It is a perfect farce, wasting a whole night in purposeless talk about a law that will never go into operation.

Mr. DAVIES. The effect of this will be that, although a by-law might not be confirmed before the courts of the land because of some informalities, you are legislating to confirm that by-law.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I would suggest that the words "restrict" be added to sub-section 2, making it "restrict or prohibit." This will also have to be put in sub-section 3.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 12,

Mr. FLEMING. I move, that in the second line, page 5, the words "a majority," be struck out. The section reads "no license shall be granted, save and except in towns and cities, unless a majority of three-fifths," &c. The words, "a majority," should be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GIGAULT. In section 66 of the present law it is provided that no hotel keeper is allowed to sell liquor after seven o'clock on Saturdays. There are many hotels known as summer resorts to which tourists from cities go on Saturday evenings, after seven o'clock, to leave on Monday, and it has been suggested to me, and I think it is right, we should amend this section with respect to these hotels. I move, therefore, that section No. 66 be amended by adding the following words:—

"The Board may authorize any hotel keeper keeping a hotel known as a summer resort, containing a least fifty bedrooms, to sell liquor on Saturdays until eleven o'clock in the evening, from the first of May to the first of October."

Amendment negatived, on a division.

On section 14,

Mr. AUGER. I move that the word "mayor" be added to reeve. There is no reeve in a Quebec county.

Mr. GORDON. There is neither mayor nor reeve in British Columbia. The word "warden" should be inserted to suit British Columbia.

Mr. MILLS. Before we leave that, I would like to ask the hon. member who has charge of the Bill, what the meaning of this "stipendiary magistrate" is? As it reads, it would be the stipendiary magistrate of the township.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think so. It does not read that way.

Mr. DAVIES. The stipendiary magistrate is generally the official of a city.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not so with us.

Mr. DAVIES. This does not give the power to a stipendiary magistrate of a city to act at all. The only official is the stipendiary magistrate of a township.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If you substitute "any" for "the" before "stipendiary magistrate," it would meet the difficulty.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is sense now, but we will make it more sensible.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to an observation that was made during the discussion on the motion of the hon. member for Maskinongé. It was then said we would proceed immediately before the highest court of the land. Mr. Blake asks "how?" Mr. Girouard goes on to say: "It is going to be provided by Bill; it cannot be done otherwise; I presume a Bill will be based upon this Resolution;" that is, the Resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman, that is a Bill providing for the mode of proceeding for the purpose of deciding the constitutionality of the License Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would suggest to the hon. the Minister that the proper way would be to amend the Supreme Court Act, if the terms of that Act already are not sufficiently wide to admit of a case being submitted, as possibly they are. Section 52 of the Supreme Court Act, says:

"It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to refer to the Supreme Court for their opinion, any matter whatsoever, as he may think fit, and the Court shall thereupon consider the same and certify their opinion thereon to the Governor in Council."

If that is not sufficiently wide, I think the better way would be to introduce a new section and amend that Act by giving power to submit this Act or any other Act for the opinion of that Court.

Mr. WELDON. How are you going to carry that to the Privy Council?

Mr. McCARTHY. State a case, by consent of the Governor General and the Lieutenant-Governor, and submit it to the Supreme Court, subject to appeal to the Privy Council.

Mr. WELDON. Will the Privy Council hear it on that? Can we direct the Privy Council to hear a case?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is always an appeal to the Privy Council, unless the right of appeal has been taken away.

Mr. WELDON. In an actual case.

Mr. MILLS. There is no doubt that, under the Act creating the Privy Council, Her Majesty may refer any question to that tribunal; but, in their exercise of their appellate jurisdiction, a case would have to come regularly before them. I do not know whether it would come regularly before them if it were an abstract question of law, as it would be under that particular Act the hon. gentleman has read. I do not think you could appeal from a decision of that sort. You would want a regular case brought before some tribunal in this country, having original jurisdiction, and then taken by way of appeal to the Privy Council.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are now proposing, without any question of our power to do so being raised, to refer the boundary question to the Privy Council, though any litigant may interfere in that as well as we can. It appears to me it would be a good provision, upon the consent of the Governor General and the Lieutenant-Governor, to determine the constitutionality of any Act is that way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suggest that we have another Session a little later on, to consider these intricate questions.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, we are referring that by consent of the two parties. It is not to decide absolutely and formally, but rather as a body of arbitrators, than as the Judicial Committee, because that was stated by the law officers of the Crown in 1857.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must hold that there is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to move an amendment to cure a doubt as to whether this law is in force, or affects in any way the provision in force, in the North-West Territories or Manitoba, where no liquor is to be sold, by adding these words to section 141:

"Nor to the North-West Territories, nor to that part of the Province of Manitoba which was added thereto on the west, by the Act passed in the forty-fourth year of Her Majesty's reign, chap. 14, entitled: 'An Act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Will the Minister of Public Works, at this stage, answer the question I put to him some time ago?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the third reading of the Bill, the Government will be ready to answer that question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will ask the Committee to consent to another amendment. The license Commissioner at Halifax

reports that sixty-nine persons who are entitled to licenses, under the law that existed there before the present Act came into force, have been denied, this year, a license, and he proposes that power should be given to the Commissioners to permit these people to sell out their stock for three months. They have been enjoying a license there under the local law and now coming under this law, a great many of them are deprived of the privilege of selling their stock. Both under the Crooks' Act and in this law there is a provision for a case, where a man has had a license and does not get it again, that he shall have a limited time to sell his stock. I therefore move that the following clause be added :—

"For the present year, 1884, in any case where the Board of any district do not think fit, or are unable, owing to the limit as to the number of licenses to be granted being reached, to authorize the issue of a license to any applicant who has been licensed during the preceding license year or any part thereof, they may nevertheless, by resolution, provide for granting a permit giving a license to such applicant for any specified period of the year, not exceeding three months at their discretion, and such permit, issued under the hand of the chief inspector of the district shall authorize, for the period specified on the resolution of the Board and no longer, the sale of liquors according to the nature of the license held by such applicant during the said preceding year, upon payment or tendering of the proportional part of the duty mentioned in sub-section 2 of section 40 of the said Act."

Mr. FLEMING. I do not think that amendment is necessary if the penalties are to be remitted, pending the decision of the constitutionality of the Act.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the use of that at all, if the Government are going to carry out the pledge they gave the House, that a provision is to be introduced into this Act suspending the penalties until a decision of the Supreme Court is reached?

Mr. AUGER. I think the amendment is useless, because it is provided for in section 39.

Mr. McCARTHY. That provides for the new licenses to be issued under the Act. This is the first year licenses are issued under the Act. The letter I have from the Commissioner, in Halifax, already referred to, states :

"In the license district, city of Halifax, the Board has been compelled to refuse licenses to sixty-nine who have previously held a license from the city. Of these, probably sixty would have received a license had the Board had authority to grant them, under the limit prescribed by the Act, and it will come very hard and occasion much pecuniary loss if such be compelled to dispose of their stock on hand, between this date and first proximo."

Mr. FLEMING. They have until the constitutionality of this Act is determined, to sell off their stock.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no necessity of remitting the penalties where there is no contest. I am informed there is no contest in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. FLEMING. There must arise a contest everywhere : any individual may raise the question.

Mr. WELDON. I would like to understand the hon. member for Simcoe, for the Government, as I understand, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, have taken it up. Further than that, in New Brunswick a case has been brought before the court and decided, and I assume that when the constitutionality of the Act is suspended it must be suspended throughout the whole Dominion.

Bill reported.

On the question for the consideration of the amendments,

Mr. DAVIES. If the amendments are to be considered now, we would like to understand from the Minister whether the statement he made is to be received in the sense he expressed himself the other day, or with the limitation the hon. member for Simcoe has put upon it. I certainly understood the hon. gentleman meant what he said the other day, and not what the hon. member for Simcoe now alleges he meant, namely, that those penalties are only to be suspended as regards some of the Provinces and not as regards others.

Mr. McCARTHY. I spoke only for myself; I suppose the House will have to decide shortly where the penalties will have to be suspended. I am only speaking as far as the Bill is concerned, and I made a suggestion to the Minister.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions from Committee of Supply read the second time.

On Resolution 304,

Optional Subjects.

To pay to to the undermentioned clerks, upon their passing their examination before the Civil Service Board :—

Department of the Secretary of State. F. S. Gouldthrite, two optional subjects	$100 00
N. Larochelle, two optional subjects...	100 00
Indian Department—H. McKay, three optionals	150 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I was not here when this vote was taken, and I think the Minister stated that the examination had taken place. Such is not the case, and I move that the item be struck out.

Resolution disagreed to.

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee and reported :—

Bill (No. 140) respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. McLelan.)

SUPPLY.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

309 Library of Parliament..... $280 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I move that this Resolution be amended by making the sum for the increase of Mr. Thayne's salary $200, thus bringing his salary up to $1,000

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

IMMIGRATION.

310 Aid to Montreal Women's Protective Society $1,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is the third time this vote has been given for this organization in Montreal, composed of the leading ladies of the city, for the purpose of inducing the immigration of respectable females to Canada. Their operations have been very successful in inducing this class of immigrants to come into the country.

MILITIA.

311	Public Armouries and care of Arms	$8,000 00
	Dominion of Canada Rifle Association	2,000 00
	Military properties—To provide for payment to the executor of the estate of the late Enoch Walkely, compensation in full of all claims against the Government in connection with buildings or occupancy of land on the Ordnance Reserve, or other lands, south side of Maria street, city of Ottawa	200 00
	Construction repairs of Military properties—For repairs and maintenance of buildings and barracks occupied by the Cavalry and Infantry School Corps	18,045 00
	Ottawa Rifle Range—Repairs	1,800 00

Mr. CARON. When the original Estimates were before the Committee, I stated that the vote of $2,000 for

sending a team to Shoeburyness had been dropped, and that instead of it, $2,000 would be devoted to the Dominion Rifle Association, for the purpose of sending a team to Wimbledon, and for the purposes of the Association of Canada. The vote of $18,045 is for the purpose of completing the repairs which are required to be made at the different infantry schools—one at Fredericton, one at St. John's, Quebec, and one at Toronto. The vote for the Ottawa rifle ranges is a new vote. Up to the present time, these ranges have been under the charge of the Dominion Rifle Association, and it was really a very heavy charge to be imposed upon the limited means of that association. In view of the fact that all the militia force in this district make use of these ranges for the purpose of rifle practice, it was considered only fair that the Department should relieve the Association from that charge. This vote of $1,800 is very much larger than will afterwards be required to keep the ranges in repair; I do not think that after this we shall require more than $200 or $300. The expenditure is large this year, from the fact that a portion of the property which was leased by the Department was taken back by the lessor, and that it is necessary to remove the targets from their present position to the position in which they will require to be placed, before they can be made use of by the force.

PUPLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Esquimalt Graving Dock.

314	To recoup advances made to the Government of British Columbia	$47,660 22
	To recoup payment to Government of British Columbia for amount expended on work	134,512 66
	To recoup amount advanced to Hon. J. W. Trutch, to meet necessary expenses incident to the charge and maintenance of the work	7,000 00
	Amount required to complete	475,827 12

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item of $47,660.22 should disappear, as it is more a book account than anything else. This amount, with the two succeeding amounts, were charged against the vote of $250,000 that was voted by Parliament as an advance to be made to the Government of British Columbia on account of the Esquimalt dock; but under the new arrangements that ceases, and therefore these amounts of $134,512.66 and $7,000 should be charged to another account. The last item is the amount that is estimated by the Chief Engineer of my Department as necessary to complete the Esquimalt dock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost to be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the total cost, so I am informed by the Chief Engineer.

PORT ARTHUR.

315 Amount required for the construction of Port Arthur Harbour and dredging the Kaministiquia River..... $150,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of this vote is to build a breakwater at Port Arthur, in order to make it a complete harbour, able to shelter the vessels that come there in large numbers, and will come in larger numbers now. The Canadian Pacific Railway have already built large works there, that have cost them over $100,000, I am told. They are also erecting other works at Kaministiquia, because the two places, which are only three or four miles apart, will really form only one harbour to the Kaministiquia river. I understand that bulky articles, such as coal, will be landed there and sent to Winnipeg. A portion of the vote will be expended in dredging the bar of the Kaministiquia, which will most likely cost $10,000 or $15,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So it has been discovered that the river, for articles of heavy transport, is an exceedingly useful harbour. I will not say the hon. gentleman now learns that for the first time, but it must be news to his colleagues and supporters. Still, I think he is doing a wise thing.

Mr. CHARLTON. What will the breakwater cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The whole work will cost about $250,000. The local authorities at Port Arthur have subscribed $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What size is it to be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At least 1,500 or 1,600 feet long.

Mr. CHARLTON. What depth of water inside the breakwater and the bar of the Kaministiquia will you have when this will be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, but I know the water is very deep there. The depth at the entrance to the river will be 16 or 17 feet.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

316 Cape Tormentine Harbour, N.B..... $150,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a work required to communicate between the Island and New Brunswick.

Mr. DAVIES. Has there been a survey?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Where is the harbour and pier to be built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is the railway——

Mr. DAVIES. The railway does not come down that far, but is waiting for the terminus to be settled. As there has been a good deal of dispute about the proper place, I would ask the Government whether they have settled on a place and what the length of the pier will be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will not require to be a long pier. It will be necessary to construct a wharf at Cape Tormentine, about 2,100 feet long, which will cost about $147,000; there will be 700 feet of wharf available for vessels, and the depth of water will be 10 or 12 feet at low water, in spring tide.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe these two items are charged to capital account. In the case of all the harbours constructed on the Upper Lakes, they have been invariably charged to income.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see why those large amounts should be charged to revenue. They are permanent works, the same as railways, and our children and grandchildren must help us to pay a little portion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are putting a great deal on our grandchildren within the last few weeks. Cape Tormentine is no different from Goderich or Southampton, yet those were charged to income. Is the hon. gentleman going to make a new departure and charge every saleable harbour to capital account?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not suppose we will have many of these.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see any ground for the distinction he is making. These other works to which I have referred, have cost several hundreds of thousands of dollars, and they were works very closely analogous to Port Arthur, at any rate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The piers at Halifax, for example, though they were piers and some did not cost this amount, were charged to capital. Why? Because they were connected with the railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were part of the Intercolonial, or were supposed to be.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is really a portion of the Island Railway, because you must have a place for the steamers to cross. Then, Port Arthur is a harbour connected with the railway as well. I think these are chargeable to capital; there is good reason for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not, in the case of Port Arthur.

Mr. CHARLTON. There seems to be a tendency to lessen the amount apparently chargeable to Consolidated Fund by charging these amounts to capital when they ought to be charged to Consolidated Fund. I hold that the Government are not warranted in doing this. It creates confusion in our financial statements, and the comparisons between the expenditure of the different years cannot properly be made. The present Government have charged $600,000 for Dominion lands to capital which were formerly charged to income, and here are other instances where these gentlemen may conceal one or two million dollars of expenditure in a year or two, by charging to capital what ought to be charged to Consolidated Revenue. I protest against this mode of manipulating and doctoring the accounts. They ought to honestly charge to Consolidated Fund what was formerly charged to it, and not to conceal the immense sums they are expending, by resorting to these shifts.

Sir LEONARD TILLY. The $10,000 and the $4,000 above are charged to capital by the mistake of the clerk, who placed them under that head. They will be transferred.

Mr. CHARLTON. The amount for Port Arthur harbour is charged to capital account.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand the wharf will be 2,100 feet in length?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will read from the Report: "For the protection of the steamer and the shipping, it will be necessary to construct a wharf at Cape Tormentine, about 2,100 feet in length, estimated cost $147,148, which will give 700 feet of wharf, with a depth of 10 to 12 feet at low water, spring tides."

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Nova Scotia.

317	Halifax Dominion Buildings—Improvements and repairs	$9,000 00
	Sidney (South), Post Office, Custom House, &c.	5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this building at Sydney a new work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. Where is that to be erected?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At Sydney, South.

Mr. VAIL. What Dominion buildings are these at Halifax?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The public buildings there belong to the Government. These are for changes and improvements.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Custom house and post office.

Mr. VAIL. It is only one building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have asked for only $9,000, and the Chief Architect was asking me for $14,500. I did not think I ought to ask for more. It is for pointing and building a scaffold, painting, whitewashing, colouring the windows, and repairing them, the blinds, and overhauling, and for general repairs; in the post office there is a new pitch-pine floor, the roof, and safe for registered mail matter. For the Custom house there are small repairs.

Mr. VAIL. Is it intended to make such an arrangement as to give the postmaster there an office to himself?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is to be the total cost of this South Sydney building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With the lot, I suppose between $18,000 and $20,000.

Prince Edward Island.

318	Charlottetown—New Dominion Building...	$30,000 00

Mr. DAVIES. Is the hon. gentleman going to build from the foundation there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. There has been a report made by an officer of the Department on the walls.

Mr. DAVIES. The local officer, Mr. Sterling?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. He has been instructed to take steps to remove such portions of the walls as are threatening, and to report upon the position of the walls, whether they are good still, and upon the foundations, and in the meantime sketches are being prepared and instructions received from the Departments that are to use that building, in order to know the requirements of each Department. This is only towards construction.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has not quite determined whether any portion of the existing structure can be utilized or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; because I do not know how it stands. It will have to be very good if it is to be used.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope so. I know Mr. Sterling is a very competent man, but many fears have been expressed that an attempt might be made to use some of the old portions and so spoil the building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The old building has been burnt down, and it would be only if the walls were very good that they would be used; otherwise they will be knocked down and the foundations used if they are good.

Mr. DAVIES. I suppose the style of architecture will be pretty much the same as that of the old building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say. We will try to make it a credit to us and the Island.

Mr. DAVIES. The old building was a very handsome one.

New Brunswick.

319	Moncton Post Office, Custom House, &c,....	$3,000 00

Mr. WELDON. Does that finish the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; that is to complete.

Quebec.

320	Montreal Custom House	$ 600 00
	Chicoutimi Marine Hospital—Additional amount required.	900 00
	St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary—Additional amount required.	14,200 00
	Queen's Wharf Buildings.	600 00
	Quebec Dominion Buildings—Improvements &c. (Revote).	2,400 00
	Montreal Drill Shed—Additional amount required to cover cost of demolishing, &c., walls of armouries, &c., condemned by City Inspector of Buildings	2,000 00
	Assistant Receiver-General's Office, Montreal—New safe....	2,650 00
	Montreal Post Office—Alterations and improvements..	5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the new safe in the office of the Assistant Receiver-General, at Montreal, cost this amount.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; it will cost that, $2,650.

Mr. FISHER. What is the nature of the expenditure upon the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will require additional material for the walls of the west dormitory, $1,300; materials for building, $300. Then an amount of $4,000 is asked for the conversion of the dining hall. Then we will purchase property to extend the penitentiary. There is a property next to it that we can have now for $3,500, and as it is very convenient, we do not wish to lose the opportunity of buying it.

Ontario.

321

Toronto—Custom House	$ 1,600 00
do Post Office	1,650 00
London Custom House—Enlargement of building	10,000 00
Gananoque Custom House, &c.—Additional amount required to complete	2,000 00
Prescott—Post Office, Custom House, &c	8,000 00
Ottawa—Geological Museum	3,500 00
Guelph—Custom House, &c.: Alterations, repairs, &c	1,000 00
Ottawa—Post Office: Improvements and repairs	3,000 00
St. Catharines—Post Office, &c., to complete	2,200 00
Kingston Post Office—Heating apparatus, &c	3,500 00
Belleville—Post Office, Custom House, &c., to complete	2,200 00
Sarnia—Immigrant Station	1,050 00
Toronto Post Office—Fittings, &c.	1,800 00
Toronto—Immigrant Station	420 00
Hamilton—Immigrant Station	620 00

Mr. WILSON. In that item there is no further grant for the buildings at St. Thomas. Somewhere about $18,000 have been expended, and certainly you will require more than that to complete the buildings. That does not amount to the original contractor's estimate. It seems to be evident that the object is not to complete the buildings in 1884 or 1885.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have consulted with the Chief Architect of my Department about this, and he reports to me that on account of the slow progress made by the contractor, he does not think that more money than the amount voted in the general Estimates for 1884-85 will be required, and therefore we do not ask for any more this year.

Manitoba.

322

Winnipeg Custom House—Repairs, &c	$ 1,000 00
Manitoba Penitentiary	40,000 00
Winnipeg Drill Shed	8,000 00
Brandon—Immigrant Station	1,000 00
Winnipeg—Immigrant Station	300 00

North West Territories.

323	Qu'Appelle Emigrant Station	$350 00

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c.

324

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Renewals, &c	3,500 00
Telephonic Service, Public Buildings, Ottawa—Additional amount required for maintenance at the	2,000 00

HARBOURS AND RIVERS.

Nova Scotia.

325

Petite Rivière	5,000 00
Five Islands	2,500 00
Ogilvie Wharf	3,000 00
Tusket Wedge	850 00
Mabou	1,500 00
Digby Pier	1,500 00
Port Greville	4,000 00
Tracadie	2,750 00
Margaretsville	1,500 00

Mr. VAIL. I would like to know where is Five Islands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the county of Colchester.

Mr. VAIL. Where is Port Greville?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the county of Cumberland.

Mr. VAIL. Would the Minister inform me if, before making this estimate, he considered the application that has been made from several places in Digby county, for instance, Sandy Cove, George Point, Salmon River, and other places. I do not see anything for Sandy Cove. The people there subscribed $800 or $900 themselves last year, and I understood the Minister last year to say that this year something would be done for them. They are very important works. But I am inclined to think they will share the fate of the Ingonish wharf, where something like $80,000 was lost for the want of a larger sum to complete the works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All these places were submitted to the Council, and the Council decided that those works should be undertaken for which we have made the estimates now presented to the House. If any of the piers are in danger of being carried away, it is a reason for asking for more money to put them in repair. I will not name any, but the hon. gentleman will see some on the list that he knows well.

Mr. VAIL. Really, I do not see any mention made of them. I observe that the two Ministers from Nova Scotia have been careful to look after their own interests, and both have received grants. For instance, the county of Colchester received last year $5,000, and this year it gets $5,000. I think she has but one harbour, and that is closed a considerable portion of the year. Then there is Port Greville, in the county represented by the other Minister. I think it is only fair they should have considered some of the other counties in Nova Scotia.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman must know that the county of Digby has shown in almost every Estimate in the House since Confederation, and even previous to Confederation large sums of money were voted by the Local Government to Digby piers and Digby wharves. There are perhaps twenty or thirty harbours in the county of Colchester that have never yet had any grants for public wharves in any of those harbours, and this is the first.

Mr. VAIL. My hon. friend will acknowledge that the only side of Colchester county at all exposed, to the east, is that portion of it on the Bay of Chaleurs.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. Both sides of it are exposed, one for thirty miles and the other for twenty miles.

Mr. VAIL. The upper end of it is frozen, and vessels never pretend to approach it in the winter season at all. In the county of Digby there are six important piers that are washed by the Atlantic, and the harbours are open from year's end to year's end. The people are constantly shipping in winter, as well as in summer, and it is very essential that these public works should be kept up in the interest of trade and commerce.

Prince Edward Island.

326

Tignish	$1,000 00
St. Peter's Bay (revote of lapsed amount)	3,000 00
Ordinary and extraordinary repairs to breakwaters, piers, &c., acquired from Local Government, Prince Edward Island, in 1884	12,000 00

New Brunswick

327

West Isles	600 00
Richibucto	3,300 00
Caraquet	500 00
Improvement of River St. John, between Bear Island and Fredericton	1,000 00

Quebec.

328	Chateau Richer	3,000 00
	Rivière Noire	1,000 00
	Rivière Bras, St. Nicholas	1,200 00
	Ste. Anne de la Pocatière	3,400 00
	New Carlisle, to complete	4,000 00
	St. Alphonse de Bagotville, to complete	3,500 00
	Trois Pistoles—Additional amount required	1,000 00
	Les Eboulements	2,200 00
	Ste. Anne de Sorel	1,200 00
	Longue Point and Boucherville Ferry	500 00
	Ste. Anne de Bellevue	4,750 00
	River Ottawa—Removal of a shoal opposite the line between the Townships of Bristol and Clarendon	3,000 00

Ontario.

329	Port Albert	1,000 00
	Lion's Head, Lake Huron	5,000 00
	Bayfield, Lake Huron	4,000 00
	Wilson's Channel	5,000 00
	Sault Ste. Marie	4,000 00
	Cobourg, Lake Ontario	10,000 00
	River Ottawa—Improvement of channel, Upper and Lower Narrows, above Pembroke	2,000 00
	Thornbury, Lake Huron	1,000 00
	River Sydenham	2,500 00
	Little Bear Creek	2,500 00
	Kincardine, Lake Huron	3,000 00
	Kingsville, Lake Erie	4,000 00
	River Ottawa—Projected improvements between Mattawan and Lake Temiskaming (examination)	5,000 00

Mr. WILSON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that frequent representations have been made respecting required improvements at Port Stanley and Port Burwell harbours. The applications made by the petitioners should have been considered and something done. Government engineers have been there, but they made no report to the Government. If no appropriation can be made this year, I hope the Government will send an engineer to make an examination.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter has been looked into since deputations waited on me, and we have determined to send an engineer to report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is intended to be done with the $5,000 for an examination of projected improvements between Mattawan and Lake Temiskaming?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A large deputation of members of Parliament and lumbermen waited on me in regard to this matter. They are urging the establishment of communication between Mattawan and Lake Temiskaming, a distance of about forty-five miles. They ask that some examination may be made, so that the scheme may be considered by the Government. They consider it is a most feasible work. By that means a large stretch of water will be made available for steamers and other craft, and it will facilitate also the settlement of the country. It is intended to construct a sort of reservoir, so as to assist the descent of lumber. There are two schemes; one a very extensive one, which would involve the expenditure of a very large sum; but there is another, by which a very important improvement could be made at a very moderate outlay.

Mr. MILLS. Will the surveyors be instructed to ascertain whether communication can be made between Lake Abittibi and Lake Temiskaming.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see that $5 000 will be sufficient to cover that additional work; but the engineers might be instructed to make a very hasty examination as to the character of the country, and then we could decide whether a more thorough examination might not be desirable.

Manitoba.

330	Waterhen River	$10,000 00

North-West Territories.

331	Saskatchewan River	10,000 00

Mr. VAIL.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the nature of the improvements, and where are they to be made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have expended money already for the removal of rocks, between the Forks of the Saskatchewan and Edmonton, and also on the south branch. Amongst the works required, but which have not yet been undertaken, are wing-dams, in order to increase the depth of water in the river. I understand from Mr. Brydges, who has shown much interest in the work, that the money expended last year has produced very good results; and we may expect from this additional sum even more important results. This work need not be carried on year after year, but if it is continued, so as to carry out the improvements desired, an amount of $30,000 or $40,000 will have to be granted in future years.

British Columbia.

332	Serpentine River	$1,000 00
	Cowichan and Courtney Rivers	650 00
	Victoria Harbour	2,500 00
	Fraser River—Cottonwood Canyon	5,000 00

Mr. BAKER. I desire to enquire whether one of the rivers proposed to be improved is not Nimpkish river?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I was not in a position to ask for that vote this year. That is a pleasure to come.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Is this amount for Victoria harbour intended for the preliminary steps towards the removal of dredger rock in that harbour?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; that amount is to be applied for that purpose, though it will not be sufficient.

DREDGING.

333	British Columbia—Additional amount required	$3,000 00
	British Columbia—Additional amount required for working snag boat	4,000 00

SLIDES AND BOOMS.

334	River Morasse	1,000 00
	Ottawa District	10,000 00

ROADS AND BRIDGES.

335	Aid towards the construction of a free bridge over the Old Man's River at Fort Macleod—(Local authorities furnishing $3,500)	2,500 00
	Bridge across the Battle River, at Battleford	5,000 00
	Portage du Fort Bridge—Repairs	5,000 00
	Aid to municipality of Russell, Manitoba, towards the construction of a bridge across the Assiniboine, near the mouth of Shell River (revote)	10,000 00

FISHERIES.

336	To pay for services performed by persons in the Customs and Marine and Fisheries Departments, and other expenses in connection with the distribution of the Fishing Bounty	4,000 00

MISCELLANEOUS.

337	Gratuity to the family of the late Henry Gray, lost in the *Princess Louise*	200 00
338	To pay legal and other expenses in connection with the Ontario Boundary Question	5,000 00
339	To pay one-third cost of Mail Service in the North-West Territories	3,000 00
340	To pay legal adviser	200 00
341	To pay rental allowance to Hugh Richardson, Stipendiary Magistrate, in lieu of the free quarters occupied by him at the late seat of Government, at Battleford	500 00
342	For safes, in dexes, register books, stationery, furniture, fuel, light, &c., for Registry Offices	3,000 00
343	Light, fuel and stationery for Sheriff's Office	300 00
344	To provide for the publication of the proceedings of the Royal Society	5,000 00

345 To pay Messrs. Alexander McLean and John Charles Roger, the amount ($69,781.43), awarded them by the referees in the suit brought by them against the Queen, in the Exchequer Court of Canada, the award having been confirmed by the judgment of Mr. Justice Henry (this payment not in any way to prejudice any right the Crown may have to appeal from that portion of the said judgment awarding interest on the said amount $69,781 43

Mr. CHARLTON. I think we should have some explanation of this vote. Was this amount for work done outside of the regular contract.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This was for work done outside, from 1873-74, until about the end of 1878 or 1879. They claim that they should have performed the work and judgment was given in their favour.

Mr. CHARLTON. When was the claim made.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think it was between 1878 and 1879.

Mr. CHARLTON. Have they any other claims of this kind?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; they relinquished all claims down to three or four months ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understand that they are about to set up a claim for profits on something like $250,000, given out in the same way, on which, in addition to the Government paying double prices for the work, the firm will probably claim $60,000 or $70,000 profits. I understand that the contract at the present time is in precisely the same form as the one under which this was recovered.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They have no claim against us, and I am not aware of any arrangement being made, since 1879, by which 25 per cent. was to be paid with regard to work which was sub-let.

Mr. DAVIES. Why does the hon. gentleman say they had no claim?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They made a relinquishment of their claim about four months ago, and the papers were laid on the Table a week or ten days ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman said that these men had not sub-let. Perhaps not, but we have found out that it is clear that the Government have been paying five or six times the genuine value of the work, over and over again, for printing done outside, for the purpose of aiding and assisting their particular friends. For instance, there is the case of the Montreal *Gazette* Company, an important member of which is a member of this House.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That was all certified by the Queen's Printer, as was done under the late Government.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the Finance Minister whether he is not aware that the *Citizen* Company had a contract for printing several thousand immigration pamphlets for the Department of the Interior, whether they have not been paid for that work, and whether, up to this hour, they have printed the pamphlets for which they have been paid?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not aware of anything of the kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it not the case that this company were paid three times over, and left their forms standing?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know nothing of that.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it is to be regretted that the Government should allow this kind of work to go on. I think they deserve censure for giving out this work at prices three or four times as great as the prices paid to the Government contractors, besides leaving those contractors a chance to sue for damages for the loss of the work.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When such an item as this appeared against the late Government, I am sure my hon. friend supported it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The perpetration of wrong by one party does not justify another party in perpetrating the same wrong. If the previous Government did wrong, I would advise the present Government to change.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the Minister of Finance tell me whether the rates for printing, now paid McLean, Roger & Co., are the same as those paid from 1873-74 to 1878-79?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The rates are lower, I think.

Mr. DAVIES. And whether or not any consideration was given to them for relinquishing their claim?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No consideration. The only consideration was, that they asked in the present contract for the transfer from Mr. Drummond, to which the Government refused to consent, until they would relinquish all claims they might have under that contract.

Mr. DAVIES. Can the hon. Minister give me the items for the different years, from 1873-74 to 1878-79?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot; the matter has been before the courts.

Mr. DAVIES. But I dare say the hon. gentleman has seen the claim.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I never saw it. The Minister of Justice may have seen it. They are also claiming interest on the amount, which the Government are resisting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long is their contract to run?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think about a year.

346 To provide the expenses of an expedition (by water) to Hudson Bay, to test the practicability of the route for commercial purposes $70,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When is this expedition to start?

Mr. McLELAN. This spring.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are arrangements made for it to be in the waters of Hudson Bay in the month of June?

Mr. McLELAN. Arrangements are being made.

Mr. DAVIES. Is the hon. Minister purchasing a vessel or chartering one?

Mr. McLELAN. If we can get a suitable vessel, we shall charter it. Enquiries have been made as to what vessels are available, and they will be examined in a few days.

Mr. DAVIES. Has any arrangement been made as to the gentleman who is to have command of this vessel?

Mr. McLELAN. If we charter a vessel, it is probable that the owners will furnish the sailing capital. Then there will be some scientific man to take charge of the expedition.

347 To cover expenses of taking evidence concerning the Public Accounts, and reporting the same to the Auditor-General of Canada, under authority of section 55 of the Audit Act (41 Vic., cap. 7). $ 500 00

348 To assist in promoting the purposes of the International Circumpolar Observations, by contributing towards the expenses of transporting the British party from Halifax to Hudson Bay Station, on Great Slave Lake, and return (revote) 4,000 00

349 Academy of Arts 2,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is an appropriation for the Academy of Arts. They wanted $5,000. It may probably be for an annual exhibition, but it is not decided yet exactly how it is to be disposed of.

INDIANS.

Ontario and Quebec.

350 To provide for the support of twenty Indian pupils, at $15.00 each, at the Mission School and Orphanage at Fort William, Lake Superior $300 00

Mr. DAWSON. This orphanage is maintained by subscriptions from a distance, and the number of pupils is from thirty-five to forty. For a long time it has received $200 yearly, and I would like to enquire whether this $300 is intended to cover the whole amount they are to receive, so that it will be only $100, in addition to the pittance they get now, or is the whole amount an addition, making $500 altogether.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot answer the question, in the absence of the leader of the Government

British Columbia.

351 To assist in the purchase of a printing press for the use of the Rev. J. M. R. LeJeune, O.M.I., at Kamloops, with which to print certain manuscripts of vocabularies, in five Indian dialects $50 00

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would like to ask upon whose recommendation this amount was put in the Estimates?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot answer—probably on the recommendation of the Indian Commissioner there.

Mr. BAKER. It is not a very large sum for an important Province like British Columbia?

North-West Territory.

352 To provide salaries for the teachers of two Church of England schools in the district of Athabasca, outside of Treaty limits... $400 00

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

EXCISE.

353 To provide for an increase of salary to Excisemen who have improved their classification at recent Excise promotion examinations 2,000 00

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is to provide for an increase of salary to the different Excise officers, under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What increase do they receive?

Mr. COSTIGAN. According to promotion; if a third-class clerk is promoted to a second class, he gets the minimum of a second-class.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

CANALS.

354 To increase the salary of D. Murphy, Collector at Carillon, from $500 to $600..... $ 100 00
To increase salary of J. S. Farley, Collector at Ottawa 200 00
To increase salary of J. B. Deschamps, Clerk in Lachine office 50 00

SLIDES AND BOOMS.

355 To provide for salary of C. McNutt, Assistant Collector at Ottawa, who is placed in the Estimates at $1,800, while his salary is actually $2,000 ..... 200 00

POST OFFICE.

356 To provide for the salary of two second-class clerks in the Toronto Post Office... 1,800 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

LEGISLATION.

House of Commons.

358 To provide for extra Sessional Clerks for the Session of 1884..... $650 00
To pay the undermentioned members the amount deducted from their Sessional Allowances on account of absence—
Hon. P. Mitchell..... 152 00
Mr. Labrosse..... 376 00
Mr. Rykert..... 128 00

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman ought to lay before the House a statement showing the payments last year. We do not know what members were paid, for what time, or anything in regard to it. There is no reason why the indemnity paid to members should be a matter of secret account at all.

CANALS.

361 Welland Canal—To pay John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, for services as sole Arbitrator in the case of F. B. McNamee & Co., contractors for Section 34..... $535 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government propose discontinuing this in the future, as it has been objected to that an officer should be paid for special services in this way.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

WELLAND CANAL.

362 Construction of a waste weir at Dunnsville, $25,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Last spring the whole country was very nearly flooded, and had the water been higher immense damage would have been caused, and it was considered of vital importance that this work should be constructed at once.

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Nova Scotia.

363 Boularderie Wharf ..... $ 2,000 00

Ontario.

364 Owen Sound 10,000 00
Collingwood Harbour 5,000 00
Meaford Harbour 2,000 00

Resolutions to be reported; Committee to sit again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:35 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was a notice on the paper yesterday which was given by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald in relation to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. When that motion was passed over, I asked why it was passed over, and the right hon. gentleman said it would be taken up to-morrow. Now we have reached to-morrow, and we have come to the order of the introduction of Bills, and I want to know what course is going to be taken with reference to the Bill on the paper intituled "An Act to amend an Act of the present Session

respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada," and to suspend all the Rules respecting Private Bills in connection therewith.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has any right to ask me about it, but I will tell him. I hope there will be no necessity for my moving that Bill, but if there is a necessity, I will move it to-morrow.

Mr. MITCHELL. To-morrow again. I make just one remark in reply to the hon. gentleman. He says he does not know what right I have to ask. I think it is the right of any gentleman occupying a seat in this House, when the Session is so near its close, to ask what course is going to be pursued with reference to a matter that affects the interest of Canada and the business of this House.

PUBLIC WORKS OF CANADA.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 134) further to amend the Act 31 Vic., cap. 12, intituled: An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada (from the Senate).

Mr. DAVIES. As the amendments I proposed yesterday in Committee did not meet with the approval of the First Minister, I beg to move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to be amended in the direction suggested by the Minister of Public Works, by adding the words "provided that no such sale or lease shall prejudice or affect any right or privilege of any riparian owner." The First Minister, in the remark he made yesterday did not, I think, apprehend the effect which the passage of this Bill would have in respect to any grants made under it. He said that by the decision of the Supreme Court, the Crown was held to possess the ownership of this soil, and could not confer on any grantee rights which it did not possess. But the decision of the Supreme Court goes no further than this—that the Crown, as represented by the Dominion of Canada, possesses rights formerly possessed by the Provincial Governments. The Crown, represented by the Provincial Governments, only held the rights of the fore-shore in trust for the public, and had no power to confer them upon anybody. Now Parliament steps in and proposes to confer a right which the Crown did not possess before, viz., to sell the fore-shore to a third party. If that right is exercised, the grantee under this Act will possess a right which the Crown before the passage of this Act did not possess. But I think this amendment will meet the case.

Bill recommitted, amended, reported and read the third time and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 140) respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to detain the House unnecessarily, but I have listened attentively to the explanations given by the hon. gentleman as to this measure, I have endeavoured to the best of my power to consider what is the necessity for the introduction of this Bill which, to all intents and purposes, is a measure for the creation of an additional Department, and I have not the slightest doubt, from former experience, that the result will be practically to add many thousands of dollars to our already exorbitant expenditure for Civil Government. Very possibly, in the fullness of time, having created an additional Department, having provided an additional Deputy-Head, having given half-a-dozen additional officers double the salary they now possess, we will find it will be necessary to add a Minister for the purpose of minding the machine properly. At any rate, I see quite clearly that the result of this will be without, as far as I can judge, adding at all to the efficiency of the service, to add a large sum to the annual public expenditure. I do not think any case has been made out in this House, I do not think any good will result from it, I see no reason at all why this should not be managed as a branch of the Marine and Fisheries Department as it has been hitherto; moreover I feel we are going on at a rate which cannot fail to land us in very serious embarrassment. In the last four or five years, beginning with an expenditure for Civil Government of $823,000, we have reached this year an expenditure of $1,160,000, and if all the items which properly belong to it were included, our expenditure would reach fully $1,200,000 a year for Civil Government alone. Therefore, without delaying the House further, who are naturally and pardonably impatient, I beg to move that this Bill be not now read the third time but that it be read the third time this day six months.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Lennox),	De St. Georges,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Fairbank	Mulock,
Auger,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	Platt,
Béchard,	Geoffrion,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Scriver,
Blake,	Gunn,	Somerville (Brant),
Bourassa,	Harley,	Springer,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Houde,	Thompson,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Trow,
Cartwright	Irvine,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Watson,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Weldon,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Wells,
Cockburn,	Mackenzie,	Wheler,
Cook,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Davies,	McMullen,	Yeo.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dickinson,	McDougald,
Amyot,	Dodd,	McLelan,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dugas,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi)	Dundas,	Mitchell,
Barnard,	Dupont,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Foster,	O'Brien,
Belleau,	Gault,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Ouimet,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Billy,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hastings)
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Scott,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Small,
Bourbeau,	Haggart,	Smyth,
Bryson,	Hay,	Stairs
Burns,	Hickey,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Taylor,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Tilley,
Campbell (Victoria),	Ives,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Carling,	Jamieson,	Tupper (Pictou),
Caron,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Cochrane,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Cuthbert,	McDonald (CapeBreton),	Williams,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Daoust,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth,
Desaulniers,	McCallum,	Wright—100.
Desjardins,		

Bill read the third time and passed, on the same division reversed.

SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the Report of the Committee of the Whole on the Resolution respecting Subsidies to the Provinces be received.

Motion agreed to; and Resolution read the second time and concurred in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No.154) to readjust the yearly subsidies to be allowed by Canada to the several Provinces now included in the Dominion.

Bill read the first time.

REDEMPTION OF LOANS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the Report of the Committee of the Whole on Resolution respecting a loan to redeem loans maturing be received.

Motion agreed to; and Resolution read the second time and concurred in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman brought down those details he promised ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount with our agents I think it was the hon. gentleman asked. It is $3,763,472.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 156) to authorize the raising by way of loan of certain moneys required for the Public Service.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House concur in the following Resolutions, reported from Committee of Supply, and postponed :—

On Resolution 22,

Contingent Expenses of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, &c..... $4,500 00

Mr. MULOCK, in moving

That the said item be reduced by $3,359, being 5 per cent. on $29,509, the cost of the High Commissioner's residence, and 15 per cent. on $12,500, the cost of the furniture for the High Commissioner's residence,

said: It will be remembered that, when this item came up in Committee on the 20th March, the following occurred, as appears by *Hansard*. Mr. Blake states as follows:—

"Originally house rent, fuel and taxes were paid directly by the Government, but subsequently an arrangement was made by an Order in Council giving a lump sum of $3,500, in lieu of house rent, fuel and taxes, and since that time we have paid practically the whole amount of $4,000 in a lump sum. Is it intended this amount shall cover those expenses?"

Sir John A. Macdonald answers "yes." Since that item was under consideration, the House has voted $29,500 for the purchase of a house and $12,500 for the purchase of furniture for that house. If, therefore, we purchase a house for the High Commissioner, it is clearly our duty to reduce the item which, up to that time, included house rent for the High Commissioner; otherwise we are doubly paying rent for the house of the High Commissioner. As to the amount mentioned in the resolution, 5 per cent. on the capital amount of $29,500 amounts to $1,475. I should think that is not an unreasonable rate at which to charge the High Commissioner, as it were, or to deduct from the appropriation to the High Commissioner for house rent. As to the interest on the furniture, that I estimate at 15 per cent., being I think not too high, considering the rent charged for furniture. Certainly it does not represent more than the depreciation and interest upon the money. Interest at that rate upon the item of $12,500, the amount voted for the furniture, is $1,875, the two items making $3,350.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is the intention of the Government to deduct the interest on whatever the building and furniture may cost, but, while we have some idea of what the building will cost, at present it is only an estimate with reference to what the furniture may cost. It is an outside estimate, and it is expected that the whole will probably not cost what the House has voted. Under the circumstances, you cannot sit down and make a calculation, you cannot say what the amount to be deducted is, when you do not know what the principal may be; but we state that out of the $4,000 is to be deducted the interest on the outlay for the building and the furniture. In reference to the rate of 15 per cent., I think it is somewhat excessive. I will be quite willing, when I have to give place to my hon. friend who has moved the amendment, to let him have my furniture at 15 per cent. a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let him have it for 15 per cent. deducted for each year you have it.

Amendment negatived; Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 170,

Indians, Manitoba and the North-West.....$688,271 70

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman was to bring me some information as to the amount asked for schools, as to where they were required. He was not able at the time to say. It was not an item in the Indian estimates, and no other schools were aided that I was aware of except the missionary schools.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really did not understand from my hon. friend that I was to furnish the information as to where the schools were to be situated. There is a reduction of $7,000 on the Indian schools this year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have not the item before me, but there was an item evidently for public schools, because the vote for schools in connection with the Indians was not in the Indian vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the Indian vote. The only enquiry I think was made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to the farms. There were originally twenty-six farms for the instruction of the Indians in the North-West. At present only seventeen are in operation, seven having been closed. The amount expended on the farms will be found in the details in the annual report of the Department.

Mr. MILLS. The report gives, not the product of the farm simply, but the product of the reservation in the immediate vicinity of the farm. If the product of the farm is included in the report, there is no distinction made between the product on the Indian reservations and the product on the farms in charge of these particular farmers. It seems to me we ought to know what each farmer is doing, and, if he is not succeeding in accomplishing the object of the Government, then we ought to know precisely why it is he has failed to do so. The hon. gentleman has not given the information that I specially asked for. I asked his attention to the fact that there is a charge in the Public Accounts of $80,000 for implements and supplies for those farms. Now it is a very extraordinary thing, those farms having been in operation for several years, that there should be so large an expenditure for supplies. Certainly the farmers are not even paying their way, to say nothing about purchasing supplies or aid to the Indians, when we find that nearly $81,000 has been expended in a single year supplying those farmers with such necessaries as they may require. Now it is very desirable that we should have a statement, not only of the operation of those farms, but also of the aid they have received from Government, what each particular farmer has obtained, what has been expended upon flour, provisions, cattle, agricultural implements, &c. What is the character of the supplies which those farmers have obtained from the Government—for I have mentioned to the hon. gentleman that the report of his Department discloses upwards of $80,000 expended on those farms ? In my opinion those farms have been a great failure; it was my opinion from the first that

they would be so. I think there is but one way efficiently of aiding the Indians in their agricultural operations, and that is to put an active, trusty and intelligent man, who is capable of doing almost anything required to be done on a farm, upon the Indian reservation—not upon a separate and distinct farm—to see that the Indians are properly instructed in their work, that they engage in their agricultural pursuits and do something towards providing themselves with the means of subsistence. A man with some force of character who is trusty and industrious, I have no doubt could, by labouring upon the reservation and by directing the labour of the Indians, do a great deal towards diminishing the expenses of the Government. Those farms have been now in operation upwards of four years—the hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he will remember that he asked a vote for those farms in 1879, and that is five years ago. At that time the farmers were appointed, and the next year we discussed the character of some of those parties whom he had appointed—I think one or two had been merchants from the county of Peel who had failed in business. And now I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that to supply those men with appliances for the purpose of carrying on their farming operations last year, a charge of $80,000 was made upon the Public Treasury. Now if those farmers had gone into the North-West as ordinary settlers they would have been obliged to pay their own way and provide for themselves the means of subsistence; and it does seem to me a very extraordinary condition of things that four years after their appointment, and after those farms had been established, a charge of $80,000 is made upon the Public Treasury to provide those men with the means of subsistence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that it will answer any good purpose to renew this discussion. We had it all the other day when the hon. gentleman stated fully what he now states again. He objects to those farms; it is a question of policy upon which the hon. gentleman and myself cannot agree. He asks for information respecting the public farms, the quantity produced, and the details of the expenditure. Well, I have given the hon. gentleman, as furnished me by the responsible officers of the Department, the references where all these details are to be found.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has only given part of the information asked for; his information does not give the amount expended, and the purpose for which it was expended.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 176,

Expenses of Government in N.W. Territories..... $32,000 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was asked for information which I was unable to furnish at the time about this additional $5,000. This sum is asked for on the recommendation of the Indian Commissioner, and is altogether for aid to schools in the North-West—to schools in the various settlements in the North-West outside Manitoba.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you any details as to the manner in which the money is to be expended, or is it merely a general vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a general vote—wherever there are schools.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At whose disposal is the money?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be placed at the disposal of the Lieut.-Governor, the Commissioner of the North-West; but we will take care that he consults his council, which is partly elected now. They have to provide certain funds for schools, and this money will be divided, I suppose, on the same principle as Government aid to schools in Ontario.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no local ordinance on the subject yet, I suppose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think they have.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 225,

To cover extra claims of certain Returning Officers at the last General Election..... $2,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some considerable objection was taken to that item, which appeared to involve the very questionable doctrine of paying the claims of returning officers, and we were to have some further statement on Concurrence.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think it would be worth while to detain the House a long time on this question. It may be stated in a few words. Certain returning officers made a return of their accounts of the various expenditures incurred by them and of the services rendered by them during the Election of 1882, and difficulties arose as to the correctness of their accounts. I need mention but few of the items disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite. For instance, the main discrepancy in the accounts was for the sub-division of the electoral polling districts of the city of Montreal, where a sum varying from $150 or $180 to $360 was charged by three returning officers in Montreal, that did not meet the approval of the Auditor-General, who held that this payment had not been contemplated by law. But the work had been done and the extra work was this: In other districts the municipal authorities are obliged to give lists to the registrars, and the registrars give them to the returning officers, and out of these the divisions are made. In Montreal such is not the case. The electoral district of Montreal East has over 14,000 electors. The lists prepared by the city authorities are not prepared according to electoral divisions in accordance with the Dominion Election Act. After a returning officer receives those lists he is obliged to make an actual survey of the city, ward by ward, and sub-divide it so that each electoral sub-division shall not include more than 200 voters. That item is sufficient to show that the amount claimed by the returning officer was for work done, but payment for which, in the view of the Auditor-General, was not exactly covered by the Act. On account of that part of the work the returning officer charged $360, every item of which is detailed in a special memorandum. Out of this amount of $360 only $150 was at first allowed; a subsequent amount was afterwards allowed and there was a balance of $270. Necessary printing was charged $117; and necessary service of assistants in preparing the list cost $60. Out of a total account of $1,457, the amount charged by one of the returning officers, $705 remained in dispute with the Auditor-General, the legality of the payment for which not being yet determined. I may mention this instance to the House: The printing costs were refused payment as being either extravagant or illegal. The printer sued the returning officer. The Government were notified of the suit; a counsel was chosen; the case went before the court, and judgment was rendered for the plaintiff for $117 and costs. Every precaution was taken that the legality of the charges made should be tested before the court, nevertheless the plaintiff won the suit. Judgment was taken against the returning officer and even seizure was threatened; by a compromise it was not executed, but it is still pending against that officer. I mention only the case of one returning officer, but there are others in almost the same position with the difference of a few dollars in their respective accounts. The third account amounted to a little over $2,050. Under the circumstances the defendants asked the legal opinion of an ex-Minister of Justice who was said to have prepared the Electoral Act—Mr. Laflamme.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That gentleman did not prepare the Election Act; it was done by the present Chief Justice of Quebec.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At all events we have the fact that an ex-Minister of Justice has given his opinion that the returning officers have a colourable right to the payment of these accounts. The Government are not ready to say that these accounts are correct in every particular; for they have to be examined and discussed. The question which the House has to decide is whether we should vote $2,000 *en bloc* to cover the expenditure mentioned in this account and other similar accounts, because I understand there are some other accounts amounting to a certain sum. The Auditor-General has sent a gentleman to Montreal to make a preliminary enquiry. The returning officers assert that this enquiry was *ex parte*, and that all the facts and evidence were not placed before the Commissioner. I said the other day there was a rather curious provision in the Act. Clause 126, which speaks of accounts which can be paid to a returning officer, mentions in sub-section 20 that expenses can be paid for services rendered under section 64. I only make these remarks because the other day it was mentioned that the details should be given, and that the legal opinion on the subject should be placed before the House. I am ready to give these details and the opinion of the legal gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not ask for the details which the hon. gentleman has given. The case which the hon. gentleman mentioned appears to have this peculiarity, that some of the lists in Montreal were not the same as those for the sub-divisions in the last General Election—they were different from the municipal divisions. Now we know that since the Gerrymander Act was passed there are a large number of counties which are different for the Local Legislature from those for the Federal Parliament, and if this account is right then there should be accounts from others also. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of not laying the matter fully before the House, because I think he has done so, but I cannot understand why there should be accounts only from Montreal when a number of other electoral divisions were in the same position.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand that the claims will not be granted unless a legal right is shown.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does this cover only one electoral division?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, there are claims from Algoma, British Columbia, and other places.

Mr. MILLS. It seems extraordinary that the Government should ask special votes in this House on the ground that the law is defective, and yet they do not bring in an amendment correcting the law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The legal gentleman whom I mentioned has said the account could be paid under the existing law, though there are certainly some legal difficulties with regard to section 126 which did not apply to the Election Act.

Mr. CURRAN. I regret that this sum is not destined solely for the returning officers in the city of Montreal, because it is less by some hundreds of dollars than is legally due to these gentlemen, for money paid out of their own pockets, and to meet judgments which have been delivered against them in the courts. Nobody has ventured to say that these accounts were not proper, legal, and legitimate accounts, or that they were overcharged in any way; and if they are not paid it will be impossible in future to get respectable men to be returning officers in Montreal, if they are to be harassed in this way before receiving their money. In spite of all the opinions given that the law covers this case, we find that this amount is to be divided amongst a whole host of people, though it is not sufficient to pay these particular claims.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 240,

Welland Canal.

To purchase a steam pump	$ 5,000 00
Services of Watchmen on canal.....	7,000 00
To pay for the damages to the cargo and hull of the schooner *St. Andrews*.....	16,555 95
To pay for damages to the cargo of the *Jennie Graham*	19,624 74

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Some further information was requested in regard to the last two items. I may say that I submitted on a former occasion the report of Mr. Lash, who acted for the Department of Justice, and on his report it was referred to arbitration. I was asked for such portions of the evidence as would establish the claim, and also for the report of the superintendent at the time of the accident. I have brought these papers and will read to the House the evidence in regard to the *St. Andrews*:

"The basis of claim was that the loss was caused by negligence on the part of some of the officers on the canal, and failure to maintain in efficient condition certain floats or tenders, provided to keep vessels from striking the rough rock edges in the bank of the canal, between Port Colborne and Stonebridge. The official arbitrators gave an award in favour of claimants, finding that negligence had been shown by the canal officers, charged with the management of the floats. In support of the plea of negligence John B. Smith, Deputy Superintendent of the Welland Canal, states:

"'The object of float tenders is to protect vessels from damage against the jagged sides of the canal in rock cuttings They should be placed floating on the water against the rock, or solid backing; they rise and fall with the water in the canal. In case, at any time, the inner edge of the floats should lodge on the projections of the bank, they should be shoved off. I would not consider that the canal men did their duty unless they shoved them off.'"

"William Ellis, Superintendent of Welland Canal, stated: 'Floats are placed on the water not on the bank. They have no business on the bank (except for repairs). They are not made for that purpose. I would not consider the float to be in a proper position during the season of navigation. The inner edge should not rest on the top of the bank, or any part of it; every part must be floating to protect fully the vessels. When these floats are in proper position it is impossible for the hull of a vessel to run foul of the rocks without first smashing the floats.'

"Alexander Hamilton, Overseer of the division of the canal, when the accident occurred states: 'His duty was to examine condition of the floats regularly. Could not say how long it was before the accident when he last inspected them. Did not think he had ever missed more than a week. Examined the floats on the day of the accident after it happened. They were all right except that the water had fallen away and left them lying on the bank on a slant. The lower edge was in the water, the other resting on the bank. The floats were not fastened in the usual manner. I think that the water going down parted the chain and that a stake was driven down to fasten it.'

"Charles Carter, Harbour Master, Port Colborne, states: 'He examined the floats after the accident. The floats were lying nearly flat on the top of the rock as the water was down about three feet; they would be about one foot above the water.'

"Question. You say then that none of the floats were in the water that day?

"Answer. I think they were not within 300 or 400 feet of the bridge. Some of them might have hung over, but I do not think they touched the water."

That is the evidence; in fact, there was no doubt that the *St. Andrews* ran upon the jagged rock at the side, tore off a portion of the planking, and sank. In the case of the *Jennie Graham*, the evidence is as follows:—

"The claim is based on the negligence of the person in charge of the canal. The claiments charge that a hole was knocked in the vessel at or in the Allanburg Lock by her striking upon some portion of a broken gate remaining in the water, which had not been removed.

"W. Hurley, tavern keeper, village of Allanburg, states to the effect that he was standing at the lock when the *Jennie Graham* entered the lock. She fetched up about thirty or forty feet from the head gates, the tug shoving behind. * * * Failing to get her in they surged her with both valves. She was lifted by the surge and settled down, the tug still shoving. * * * The captain sung out that his vessel was sinking and called to the captain of the tug to pull him out of the dock. Saw the next vessel, *Sylvester Neelon*, Captain Flett, passing into the lock. She brought up and stuck in the same place as the *Jennie Graham*. * * * Captain Flett pulled out of the lock, and lock-tenders Bruce and Higgins got a raft and fished with a pole, and found a piece of iron and a small block of wood with a piece of iron in it. * * * Mr. Higgins lifted the large iron out on to the raft. The small

piece of wood with the iron in it was taken out at the same time. The large piece of iron was a piece of an iron valve used on lock gates. After the obstructions were taken out the *Neelon* was hauled into the lock and went through without difficulty.

"Captain Flett, captain of the *Sylvester Neelon*, testified that he tried to enter the Allanburg Lock after the *Jennie Graham*, but could not get in. He thereupon backed out. Bruce and Higgins, lock tenders, got a raft, and felt around in the lock to try if there was any obstruction in the way. They found a piece of iron casting. It was a large piece of iron; there were two prongs, one, I think, partly broken. There was also a piece of wood, with a piece of iron attached to it like a roller. If the vessel came down on the prongs between the frames, the prongs would go through the vessel's bottom. Had no difficulty in entering lock after removal of the obstructions found.

"John Whelan and John Bengough, ship carpenters by trade, testify, that the hole in the bottom of the *Jennie Graham* was such as would be made by her settling down on the iron casting found in the lock."

"William Higgins, lock-tender, Allanburg, was present when the *Jennie Graham* was backing out of the lock, and also when the *Sylvester Neelon* tried to enter; confirms the evidence of Hurley and Captain Flett, that the *Neelon* struck as the *Jennie Graham* had, and was backed out of the lock. Mr. Bruce and I got a float and searched the lock. We found a mullion with part of an iron valve frame attached. We also found a small flat piece of iron. We began our search when the *Neelon* pulled up. Thought it was the obstructions we found which stopped the *Jennie Graham*. The whole four lock-gates were broken in September. Mr. Bruce is dead.

"David R. Bruce, assistant lock-tender, was with his father when the *Jennie Graham* sank at the lock at Allanburg. When she first attempted to enter the lock a tug was shoving her. I think she struck about half way; they then carried a line to a tug above the lock, and the two pulled and shoved. My father raised the valves to let the water in. The vessel did not get in, and they backed her out. As soon as the *Sylvester Neelon* could pass, she tried to get into the lock. I then went to dinner. On my return from dinner Mr. Higgins and my father were preparing to search the lock. I was present when they found the wooden end of the frame of the valve with iron end attached."

I do not suppose it is necessary that I should read the evidence any further. It is quite obvious that in both cases the arbitrators were quite satisfied that there was negligence on the part of those whose duty it was to protect the canal, and having been satisfied by this evidence, they ordered the damages which we are now asked to vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister has not read the report of the superintendent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will read the report of the superintendent. It is dated August 26, 1878, and is signed by Mr. Bodwell, who was superintendent at the time the accident occurred, and is as follows:—

"I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th of February last, forwarding to me the report of the Minister of Justice, as the basis of a further report upon the subject of the claim of the Anchor Insurance Company in respect of the vessel *Jennie Graham*, which you request me to supply. I herewith enclose letter of Mr. Paterson, overseer, division No. 2, Welland Canal, upon which division the alleged damage is said to have been done. I also enclose a sketch of the bottom of the *Jennie Graham* made by Mr. Shickluna, who built the boat. It will be seen by the latter that the keel of the vessel being 9 inches, and the planking 3½, that the keel extends below the planking 5½ inches, and this distance gradually increases as the dead rise is but 7 inches. The mitre sill rises 12 inches above bottom of lock. The keel of the vessel is 5½ inches below the planking, making 17½ inches between bottom of lock and lowest possible part of vessel beside the keel. The sketch of the obstruction shows that it could not possibly have risen more than 14 inches above bottom of lock, giving strong probability at least to Mr. Paterson's position that the broken valve could not have been the obstruction upon which the vessel received damage. I have seen Captain Graham and asked him to let me see the piece of iron alleged to have been taken out of his vessel when she was placed upon the dry-dock, but up to the present time I have not been favoured with a sight of the piece of iron. If he has the piece, and it corresponds with the missing portion of valve, it would be pretty strong evidence in favour of his allegations that it was the broken valve that did the damage, and I should naturally think there would be an anxiety on his part to exhibit it, as it would almost certainly set the matter at rest. I have nothing that I can add to former reports except the above. I still feel that neglect or carelessness on the part of officials has not been shown, as every diligence was used in searching the lock for obstructions at the time the lock was carried away. None were found when the lock was next cleaned out."

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is a supplementary report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it seems to be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to the main point that was taken the other evening, and perhaps he will have something to say on that. The question raised by my hon. friend from West Durham was whether up to that time any claim had been recognized by the Government for damages in the case of an insurance company, and the Minister promised to bring a special opinion of the Department of Justice on that subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The claim was made by Messrs. Mowat and McLennan on the part of the Anchor Insurance Company. That was referred to Mr. Lash, and he made a report upon it, which has been read to the House, in which he stated that they had no legal claim, that it was not pretended that they could maintain their action as a question of law because it was against the Government; but if the question was regarded as one between subject and subject and the Government decided not to take advantage of the legal technicality, it could only be determined by the arbitrators taking evidence whether there had been negligence on the part of the Government as common carriers in charge of this canal. I do not remember whether this was the first case of an insurance company gaining or not, but there was no pretention, there was no statement that because they were an insurance company and had paid the damages for the sinking of the vessel, they did not stand precisely in the same position as the owner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was precisely the point raised by the hon. member for West Durham.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was not raised by Mr. Lash, because he treated it on the ground that the parties who had suffered the damage were entitled to compensation, if the damage was caused by the negligence of the Government officials.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The insurance company insured the cargo, not the bottom.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In one case they insured both, in the other case the party obtained the value of the vessel on the same principle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for West Durham drew the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that Mr. Lash's report did not deal at all with the question of whether the Government ought or ought not to pay an insurance company, and on that point the hon. Minister declared he would get information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The application on the part of Mowat and McLennan, for the insurance company, was referred to Mr. Lash, and he did not raise any question as between the owner and the insurance company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We knew that; but the question raised by the hon. member for West Durham, on which the hon. Minister promised to get information was as to whether the Government ought or ought not pay the insurance company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think there is any special reference to that. This is the original report of Mr. Bodwell the superintendent:

"In reference to the *Jennie Graham*, I have to report that on the 25th of October, 1875, in entering Allanburg lock, she struck, and after ineffectual effort to surge her in, and supposing her to have struck on the mitre sill, search was made, and a broken valve and mounted block was found in the lock, which was supposed to have been the obstruction that had prevented her from entering, after which it was found she was damaged. Whether the damage was received from these obstructions, I am unable to say."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I wanted to know was whether the hon. Minister had considered the point taken and obtained information from the Department of Justice. All that was very fully gone into in Supply. Mr. Lash's report was read by the hon. Minister and handed over to the member for West Durham and it was on that report he raised the question, and the Minister said he would

get information. I will just read what occurred. Mr. Blake said :

"Because it is their business to take these risks. They receive the premium and take the risk. But what I have been asking is, whether there has been, up to this time, any claim on the part of any insurance company which has been recognized by the Government, and whether the legal department of the Government advise that claims of this description should be referred to arbitration without a special consideration of the question of the relation of an insurance company to the Government.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will get that information."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is not that point fully covered by Mr. Lash's report :

"Upon the reference from the Department of Public Works for opinion upon the petition presented by the Anchor Marine Insurance Company claiming compensation for damages to cargoes insured in that company which were being shipped in vessels per Welland Canal, I beg to report that the ground upon which the claims are based is that the damage was sustained by reason of the negligence of the officers in charge of the works. The petition states that the petitioners are advised that they have no remedy under the Petitions of Rights Act, the claim being in the nature of damages for a *tort*, the petition is not presented under that Act, but the claim is submitted to the justice and favourable consideration of the Crown. I am therefore relieved from expressing any opinion as to whether or not the liability sought to be imputed to the Crown is one which might, under the provisions of the Petitions of Rights Act, be enforced against it. Treating the case as it is treated by the claimants themselves, I now explain what would be the rights of the parties were the matter one between subject and subject instead of between subject and Crown."

Mr. Lash does not raise the question that this being an insurance company it stands in a different position from a private individual, but states that as, between subject and subject, they had a good claim, and he goes on to recommend that the claim be settled by a reference to the arbitrators and by sworn testimony being taken as to whether there was negligence or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point the hon. member for Durham did take was that the case was not precisely the same between an insurance company and the Government as it would be between subject and the Crown, and on that point he asked that special reference be made. There is one other point I would ask, and that is if any explanation has been given of the very long delay amounting to eight or nine years.

Mr. GAULT. This case will be made a precedent. I know of half-a-dozen claims that could have been made on better grounds than the present claim, and no action was taken because it was understood no claim could be made against the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. Assuming that the hon. Minister of Railways is right in his contention that the Anchor Insurance Company was subrogate to the rights possessed by the owners of the vessel, there were two material points brought to the notice of the Committee which I think the hon. Minister of Railways has not answered. The hon. member for West Durham first asked whether the point had been decided upon by the arbitrators as to the damage being caused by the negligence of the officials of the Government. He contended that the award did not show that the damage had been so caused ; the only point the arbitrators seemed to decide was how much damage had been caused, and not by whose negligence. He said that the Chief Superintendent was never called at all. The hon. Minister of Railways said he had no doubt his evidence was obtained and he promised to ascertain that fact and state it to the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will deal with the first question first. The hon. gentleman will find that Mr. Lash's report covers that case. He said :

"The legal right of the claimants as an insurance company to seek compensation in their own names may be doubted. I incline, however, to the opinion that they possess that right. See North of England Insurance Association *vs.* Armstrong."

And then he gives the authority, the case which establishes the right of the insurance company to claim as the owner. He states the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

"But, for the sake of greater caution, I think it should be required to procure an assignment to them from the owners of the cargo, of their claims, if any, on account of the loss."

With reference to the testimony of the superintendent of the canal, the then superintendent was, as I stated, in British Columbia, but the arbitrators had before them all the evidence he could give, because they had his report to the head of the Department, made when the accident occurred.

Mr. DAVIES. The other point was that the award did not find whether negligence was caused by these officials or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing could be plainer than the fact that the arbitrators, to whom was referred the question, and Mr. Lash's opinion showing that it was only in case negligence could be proved against the canal officials that they could find a verdict, recited the ground on which the claim was made, and then stated the amount to which the party was entitled. These arbitrators are not lawyers, but they are men of ability and common sense, and, with the opinion of the Department of Justice before them, that they could find a verdict only in case the negligence could be established, and having taken testimony which established beyond controversy the fact that negligence did exist, for no case could be stronger, they then set out the ground of the application and find the amount that the Government are bound to pay.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The award was written by a professional gentleman, not by the arbitrators. It was evidently written with a view to lead to the inference being drawn, instead of stating the fact. That is perfectly apparent. Not one of the arbitrators wrote that award. It is clear that it was written to cover the amount of damages, but without assigning any reason for it, and it is extremely defective on that account. I came to the conclusion that there was no negligence shown by the officers of the Department, and that was the decision of the Government at the time, and the report the hon. gentleman presents, shows that, if that iron instrument, which was accidentally, not negligently, left in the lock, was there, it was in such a position that the vessel would not touch it, the vessel must have floated at least four inches above it. So it is impossible that it could have obtained that injury through that iron, at least there is no probability that it did. Negligence would consist in its being shown that such a thing was there and no attempt being made to get it out, but there is no such proof given, there is no such evidence in what the hon. gentleman has read. To come to details, has the hon. gentleman got the policy of insurance?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then upon what is he proceeding?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Upon the award of the arbitrators, who had all the testimony and all the papers before them, and whose business it is, instructed by counsel, to see that there is no possible room for a failure of that kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does he know whether there was a subrogation clause in the policy?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I do not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the law officers of the Department do not seem to have looked into the award. Very material things are evidently absent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot conceive how the hon. gentleman can possibly entertain the shadow of a shade of doubt as to this matter. First, he has the superintendent, who was responsible for the keeping of the canal clear and preventing accidents, reporting what occurred, reporting that the vessel undertook to go through, that she struck upon something and sunk immediately after. He had that before him from the superintendent of the

canal. Then he has the evidence that they had the canal dragged, and that they found this serious impediment and obstruction there, the instrument which was calculated to make the hole in the bottom of the vessel. Then he had the evidence that the *Sylvester Neelon* came immediately afterwards, struck upon something, was hauled back, and could not get through; that they dragged the canal, got this obstruction out of the way, and that the *Sylvester Neelon* went through. If that does not satisfy the hon. gentleman, then he is very difficult to satisfy. There is no other hon. gentleman in this House that, I think, will have a doubt at all as to what occurred. The hon. gentleman has the testimony of Mr. Bodwell—who was responsible for this, the party who was responsible for the condition of the canal, and who was chargeable if there was not due care and attention shown, who admitted that this thing had prevented two vessels from getting through, knocked a hole in the bottom of one, and sunk her, and delayed another, until the obstruction was dragged out of the way—to these facts. Could anything be stronger? But he says there were a few inches between the bottom of the vessel and this obstruction, if it were lying in the bottom of the canal. But he has also the testimony here that the vessel was surging, that she was being pushed from behind, and that she would be surging so that, even supposing this weak attempt on the part of the superintendent to quit the canal authorities of blame were correct, it is perfectly accounted for why she should have struck this obstruction and knocked the hole in her bottom. There can be no shadow of a shade of doubt as to the way the accident occurred.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not to be deterred by the usual extravagance of language of the hon. gentleman. He says that no one can or ought to have a shadow of a shade of doubt. We are accustomed to that sort of language. I have discussed the matter in a temperate way, and I am satisfied that, instead of every other member being of his opinion, there are comparatively few in the House who hold his opinions if they examine the documents. If he found no shadow of a shade of doubt that this should be paid, why has he allowed it to rest unpaid from 1878 to 1884? That shows that either he has been grossly negligent of other people's interests committed to his care, or he has entertained very serious doubts as to the propriety of making this payment. We have not had documents presented to us which should be here. There are several that ought to be here and are not, and the evidence of the then superintendent, and his deputy, Mr. Patterson, was clearly that there was no negligence shown by the Government officers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think he admits it in the clearest terms.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He does not admit it. He says he is not able to say whether that produced the fracture or not, but in his supplemental report he encloses a diagram showing the position of the iron relatively to the vessel, and he shows conclusively, to use the words of the hon. gentleman, without the shadow of a shade of doubt, that it could not be the iron that produced the fracture. He also shows that a piece of iron was found in the vessel, and that it was asked that it be produced; but the captain never produced it to this hour, showing still further that it was not as clear as the hon. gentleman says it is. We came to the conclusion at the time that there was no case for the Government paying the money, and the hon. gentleman seems to have entertained the same doubts and the same belief, and to have come to the same conclusion for five years, and then he comes down and asks Parliament to pay the money, declaring that everything is as clear as evidence could make it, and that it is a claim against the Government that ought not to be resisted. It is quite clear, from the statement of the hon. gentleman from Montreal West, that numerous other claims, which the hon. gentleman said were much stronger, and are of a similar nature, exist. Now, my objection to these payments is not by any means so much on account of the amount in these particular cases as because I know, as everybody does know who knows anything of the working of these canals, that you have got to watch these things most jealously or you may have claims preferred to the extent of many hundreds of thousands of dollars on the precedent which, so far as I know, for the first time has been introduced here. It is not on account of this particular item so much as on account of the precedent established that it has been found necessary to investigate it. Did the hon. gentleman not take the point in law, with regard to the Prince Edward Island Railway case, that the Crown was not bound as an ordinary citizen?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was stated when this claim was made. The Minister of Justice said the parties admitted that they could not press their claim by Petition of Right because it is against the Crown.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, and you pay then all the same; but in the Prince Edward Island case, it strikes me you did not pay the parties.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The hon. gentleman has quoted the strongest possible case in point. Although the Government defeated the claimants upon the strict point of law, they respected the statement of the judges that they ought to have substantial consideration at the hands of the Government, and we asked Parliament to vote $23,000 for the purpose of meeting the claims on which they could not legally push. We thought the verdict was excessive and beyond anything that was reasonable in the one case, and we reduced it to what we thought was a legitimate amount, but we acknowledge the principle by paying the money.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the hon. gentleman has drawn a very violent conclusion from the evidence he read to this House to-day, and in the presence of the express finding of the arbitrators to whom it was referred, that there was negligence, I do not think he was justified in paying the claim.

Resolution concurred in on division.

On Resolution 255,

House and furniture for High Commissioner for Canada, London, England..... $42,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that hon. gentlemen were informed, in another place, that the present occupant of the office would not require to use this house and furniture. We would be glad to know if we are to have the pleasure of the hon gentleman's further residence here longer than we expected.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A statement was made by a Minister representing the Government in the other House, that the present High Commissioner is not going to London, and I think we ought to know whether that be correct or not. The statement was made two days ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not heard of it. It is news to me.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us, in confidence, if it is true or not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend that it is not only quite new to me, but quite unexpected. I fully expect to go to London.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am extremely surprised to learn that there is a cabal against the hon. gentleman in the Government.

Mr. MILLS. So far as we can understand, there are so many anxious to get out of the Government that the hon.

gentleman who is now Commissioner may be compelled to remain in.

Resolution concurred in.

Resolutions reported from Committee of supply (April 25th) read the second time.

On Resolution 315,

Amount required for construction of Port Arthur Harbour—revote, $50,000 ..... $150,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I have got to say to that is what I said last year--there does not appear to be any sufficient reason why that expenditure should not be charged as usual to the ordinary expenditure from the Consolidated Fund. There is no reason why the expenditure for Port Arthur harbour should be put on a different footing from that of Toronto or Goderich harbours, or any other large harbour. They stand entirely in the same position and ought to go to the same place -that is, chargeable to income and not to capital.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 316,

Cape Tormentine Harbour, N.B $150,000 00

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to refer, in the presence of the Minister of Railways, to a remark made last night on this matter. I understood from the Minister of Public Works that no reports or inspection had been made of the locality since 1878. Last night I referred to the great difference of opinion that exists as to the exact locality in which this wharf ought to be built. Of course, as it is of vital importance that the proper locality should be selected, I would strongly urge upon the Government, before they go on to build, in pursuance of Mr. McLeod's report, that they should make further investigation as to the best locality. There is a bay one or two miles long, and a great many people say the eastern end is the best and others say the western end is the best. There is a great difference of opinion, and I think the Government should satisfy themselves from further examination as to which is the best spot.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention to have those two or three miles specially examined ?

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 319,

Public Works, New Brunswick—Moncton Post Office, Custom House, &c..... $3,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire to call the attention of the Government to a return which came down lately, giving the amount expended in each town, the income from the various Departments of the Government at such places, and the population of the town or village. I find that the population of the village of Sussex is placed at 4,000. Surely that is inaccurate. The gross income is $1,500.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There may have been an error made in copying ; but the population is easily ascertainable by looking at the Census.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 325,

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia..... $22,600 00

Mr. VAIL. I am very sorry to observe that the vote under this head is decreasing year by year. The grant for Ontario and Quebec is undoubtedly a very important grant in the public interest, as I am prepared to admit; but when we come to Nova Scotia, a Province where more than two-thirds of the harbours are open the year round, and where a large portion of the population get their living from the sea, it will be admitted that harbour works are much more important in that Province than in those Provinces where the harbours are closed about six months of the year. In 1873, Parliament voted for harbours and break waters in Nova Scotia over $123,000. Next year, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power, the grant again was $123,000. The following year it was $145,000; but it was reduced to $42,000, in consequence of the failing revenue, which prevented the Government from doing all they considered necessary in regard to the Maritime Provinces. Nevertheless during the five years of the late Government the average amount granted to Nova Scotia under this head was $78,600 a year. Since the present Government came into power the amount has been gradually declining, and the annual average for the four years previous to 1882 was only $36,000, as compared with $78,600, granted by the Government of the hon. member for East York. I point this out because this is a most important service in the interests of the Maritime Provinces. I am quite aware there are other public services which are important in this country, but I do not hesitate to say that this is one of the most important, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, with which the Government have to deal. I do not think they are fairly looking after and doing justice to the Province of Nova Scotia in this regard, when they reduce a grant of $123,000, which was formerly considered necessary in the interests of the Province, to $46,000 for the present year. And strange to say, as I pointed out to the hon. Minister of Public Works in regard to the grant of last year, nearly all the money voted this year goes to the eastern portion of the Province, which has a population very nearly the same as the western portion of the Province. Only $10,750 is granted for the Province west of Halifax ; $5,000 of which goes to Lunenburg ; the other $5,750 is divided among six of the western counties, nearly all of which are maritime counties, and very much interested in the public works referred to. I do not pretend to say that the eastern counties are not entitled to a fair share of the public money ; but I think the Government should look after those counties that have their harbours open all the year round, which is not the case with some of the harbours on the north side of the Province. If the hon. gentleman is not able to bring down a supplementary estimate this year, I hope in future he will see to it that a sufficient grant is given to at least keep these public works in repair.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 330,

Harbours and Rivers, Manitoba—Waterhen River, $10,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state the object of this vote. Is this a proposal in connection with the lowering of one of the lakes, or simply a proposition to remove obstructions in the river ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to remove obstructions in the river, in order to make it a floatable stream, and also to prevent the flooding of the neighbouring country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have not seen any of the very recent reports on this subject ; but I understand that the difference of level between the two lakes is eighteen feet nine inches, and that the Waterhen river, performing a long circuit, has a comparatively slow current. If the improvement means the deepening of the channel of the river, the removal of boulders or the straightening of its course, the result will be the lowering of the water in the upper lake and the filling of the lower lake to an extent which may do serious damage. I suggest that great caution be exercised by the hon. gentleman in making the improvement he proposes, as the flooding of the country, either north or south, may be the result of the operation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we were to undertake the large works which were suggested by Mr. Gerret in his report last year, such danger might be apprehended. I do not know whether my hon. friend has taken notice of the report, but it is a very valuable one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes it is.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He recommends a canal, but he says it is doubtful if it can be done, or whether, if we should remedy the evil complained of, we would not be producing a still greater evil. In this case we only intend to remove the boulders without constructing the canal. That work must be left for future consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the hon. gentleman does not intend to shorten the channel of the river.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is wise.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 336,

To pay for services performed by persons in the Customs and Marine and Fisheries Department, and other expenses, in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty, and collection of statistics $4,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. I saw it stated somewhere lately that though there has been an expenditure of $100,000 upon the fish hatchery in Lake Ontario, the Government have never acquired any right to the property, either in fee simple or by lease. Is that the case?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a lease of the property and an annual payment. I took up the question some time ago, as to the acquisition of the property, but there came up another point, and that was, whether it would not be better to remove the hatchery to some other place. It was mainly placed where it is for the purpose of breeding salmon, in which it has been unsuccessful. The rearing of whitefish is proving more successful, and it is thought that a better point might be got for that purpose, nearer to the source of supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the matter has not been decided?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 340,

To pay legal advisers $200 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who is the legal adviser and what is the legal advice. I think we are not in the habit of giving votes of this kind unless specific sums are named.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not sure, but I am under the impression that it is for legal advice to the Auditor-General, who has authority to consult advisers outside the Department of Justice.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 346,

To provide the expenses of an expedition by water to Hudson Bay, to test the practicability of the route for commercial purposes $70,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister state whether he proposes to purchase or hire a steamer for this work?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not quite decided, but the probabilities are that the steamer will be hired.

Mr. DAVIES. I have been informed that it requires about £25,000 to purchase and equip a Newfoundland steamer, so it would seem, from the amount asked by the hon. gentleman, that he intends to charter a vessel.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be advisable to get extracts from the reports made by the Imperial officers of the Imperial navy, because many of the British vessels have been in that quarter and may have given valuable information to the Admiralty archives at home.

Mr. McLELAN. I am gathering all the information I possible can on the subject.

Mr. MILLS. Has it been decided who is to be put in charge of the expedition?

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 351,

Indians, British Columbia—To assist in the purchase of a printing press for the use of the Rev. J. M R. Le Jeune, O.M.I., at Kamloops, with which to print certain manuscripts of vocabularies in five Indian dialects $50 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What sort of use is that vote? I do not object to $50 for a printing press, but if they are going to print vocabularies in five dialects this amount would not go very far.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is to aid Father LeJeune in the purchase of a press, which I believe he has already acquired.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 353,

To provide for an increase of salary to Excisemen who have improved their classification at recent Excise promotion examinations $2,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Inland Revenue was to give a statement of the number of officers who are at present also acting as municipal officers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I asked the Commissioner to make enquiries and to let me know, as far he could, what officers are holding municipal offices in addition to their offices in the Department. He says:

"I only know of three—Knowlson, of Lindsay; Vincent, of Montreal; and Camyré. Vincent has since resigned."

That would leave Camyré, in the Province of Quebec, and Knowlson in the Province of Ontario, holding such offices. I may state that I have received indirect information of one or two other cases.

Resolution concurred in.

On Resolution 361,

Welland Canal—To pay John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, for services as sole arbitrator in the case of F. B. McNamee & Co., Contractors for Section 34 ..... $535 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. I just take advantage of this to say a word in regard to some remarks my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, made a few evenings ago. In replying to my hon. friend beside me (Sir Richard Cartwright), he made the statement that the expenditure for canals on capital account was commenced by the late Administration. I interposed a negative at the time. I have since looked into the accounts, and I find that prior to 1874 our predecessors let contracts on the Welland canal to the extent of $2,659,019, and on the Lachine canal to the extent of $1,112,882. I mention these facts in order to show that the hon. gentleman was mistaken in the statement he made.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not state that the expenditure on canals on capital account commenced with the late Government. What I stated, in reply to a statement made by an hon. member opposite, that the late Government were responsible for only $200,000 of expenditure

during the five years they were in office, was that they were not bound to execute any arrangements made by their predecessors, and that they were not bound to spend the sum of money they did expend, as they did not act upon the tenders that were in, but asked for new tenders. Therefore, it was quite competent for them to close the work at that time, if they thought it desirable to do so. But as for saying that the expenditure for canals on capital account commenced with them, I made no such statement, and *Hansard* will not show it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Nothing else could be inferred from the statement the hon. gentleman made. His statement was, that no tenders were let or acted upon when he came into office, whereas we find that nearly $4,000,000 of contracts were let before we came in, and however much we might be opposed to the enlargement of the canals, it was too late for us to stop the work. I do not pretend to say that I was entirely opposed to it myself, although I undertook no further work of that kind.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think I remember the hon. gentleman, or one of his colleagues, reading a statement in justification of the expenditure on canals, on the ground that the cost of labour was low, and that it was a good time to do the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will tell the hon. gentleman what was stated. It was pointed out by me, on more than one occasion, that that was an advantageous time for letting contracts, because at that time they could be obtained at a lower rate than previously; and I might remind the hon. gentleman that when my hon. friend beside me reduced some of those contracts, he was very viciously attacked by hon. gentlemen then opposed to him, because he was diminishing the amount of employment that might be given to people out of work at that time.

Resolution concurred to.

On Resolution 363,

Boularderie Wharf, Nova Scotia..... $2,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this quite a new work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is for the construction of a wharf at this locality to accommodate steamers plying there, and the Chief Engineer estimates that this amount will cover the cost of the work.

SALE OF COAL.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the Order for the consideration of Bill (No. 119) respecting the sale of coal, be discharged and Bill withdrawn.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS AND ORDERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 137) to further amend An Act respecting the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, in relation to summary convictions and orders, said: The object of this Bill is to make provision for an appeal from the decisions of justices of the peace in the unorganized district mentioned in this Bill.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

LEVIS GRAVING DOCK.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 149) to authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of the Lévis Graving Dock.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This sum will, according to the report of the engineer, complete the dock.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The whole plan?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The graving dock.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was a sum of $500,000 before, was there not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. More than that. This will make altogether $750,000. That will complete this work.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC TIDAL DOCK.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 148) to authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of their Tidal Dock, said: This Bill is, word for word, the Resolution; not a word beyond.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount there is $300,000. That is towards the contracts that have been made for the cross wall. The hon. gentleman is *au fait* with the work, and now we are going on with the cross wall, and then we will go on with the caisson. During the recess we intend to ask the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department, and two or three other engineers, to go over the whole work, and see exactly what will be wanted to complete the work, so that there will be no money lost and no work not in the proper direction.

Mr. LAURIER. That will not complete the work, then?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; this will not complete it.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 136) to amennd the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. Under the Scott Act, in the ninety-sixth clause, it is provided:

"When any petition, embodied as aforesaid in any notice and in any proclamation under this the first part of this Act, has been adopted by the electors of the county or city named therein and to which the same relates, the Governor General in Council may, at any time after the expiration of sixty days from the day on which the same was adopted, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare that the second part of this Act shall be in force and take effect in such county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire."

It has been decided by the courts in Nova Scotia that in those counties where there have been no licenses issued, the Act cannot take effect at all, because it says it shall "take effect in such county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire." It is obvious that those counties which had no licenses the Scott Act can never apply to, under the decision

of the court, and this was introduced in the other House at the request of the leading men in the temperance association, and without reference to the value or to the good effect or otherwise of the Scott Act. It is quite clear that, as long as it is on the Statute-book, it should be made workable, and it is clear that where no licenses were issued, it was not workable. This clause is therefore amended by adding thereto the following words: —

"And if in any county or city there are no licenses in force when the petition mentioned in the first part of this Act is adopted, then the second part of this Act shall become and be in force and take effect in such county or city after the expiration of thirty days from the day of the date of an Order in Council to that effect, published in the *Canada Gazette*."

Then the second clause is:

"If any Order in Council has been published in the *Canada Gazette* declaring that the second part of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' shall be in force and take effect in any county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire; and if, in fact, there were at the date of such publication no such licenses then in force in such county or city; then the second part of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, shall be deemed to have been in force and taken effect in such county or city at the expiration of thirty days from the date of such Order in Council."

The third clause is:

"Nothing herein shall be construed so as to;
"(*a*) Affect any existing legal right or remedy in respect of any prosecution heretofore brought under the second part of 'The Canadian Temperance Act,' 1878;
"(*b*) Authorize the bringing hereafter of any prosecution for any offence committed against the second part of the said Act, prior to the passing of this Act;
"(*c*) Affect any cause of action now existing, or any suit, action, prosecution or proceeding now pending."

The third clause has the effect of allowing all legal proceedings to remain unaffected by this amendment to the law.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. IVES. Before the preamble is adopted, I desire to move a fourth clause, in the following words:—

"4. Whenever a county municipality, after the passing of a prohibitory by-law under 'The Temperance Act of 1864,' or after the issue of an Order in Council under 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' declaring the second part of the last cited Act to be in force in such county, is divided, and a town or city municipality is created out of the territory separated from such county municipality, such by-law may be repealed or such Order in Council may be revoked as respects the new municipality in the manner provided by sections 97 and 98 of the said 'Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' in like manner as if such by-law had been passed or such Order in Council had issued in relation to the new municipality separately. And whenever a county municipality has been divided and a town municipality has been created out of the territory separated from such county municipality, before the passing of a prohibitory by-law under 'The Temperance Act of 1864,' or the issuing of an Order in Council under 'The Canada Temperance Act of 1878,' declaring the second part of the last cited Act to be in force in such county, said town municipality or said county municipality may petition the Governor General in Council for the bringing of the second part of said last cited Act into force within its territory, but in that case, the said town municipality and the said county municipality shall petition and vote separately and shall be considered separate and distinct municipalities, to all intents and purposes, as if they were different counties."

Under the law as it now stands, that is to say, the Canada Temperance Act and the Liquor License Act passed here last Session, the principle of local option, so far as the passing of prohibitory by-laws is concerned, has been extended to every town, township, village and parish in the whole Dominion, that is, the smallest municipal organization known to the law in any one of the Provinces may prohibit the issuing of licenses, whereas local option for the repeal of prohibitory by-laws, so far, has not been given to any smaller jurisdiction that a county or city. In this particular those who are promoting probibitory by-laws have a very great advantage over those who do not believe in prohibitory by-laws, and the principle of local option, which runs through the Scott Act and which runs through the Liquor License Act passed last Session, has been inequitably and unjustly extended much further in favour of prohibition than it is in favour of the will of the people being found out and respected, with respect to the repeal of prohibitory by-laws. This measure is as much in the interest of those in favour of the Scott Act as it is in favour of those who are opposed to it. It simply proposes to give to town municipalities that have an organization and a being independent of the counties, the right of adopting, independent of the county in which the town may be situated, a prohibitory by-law. It is well known that in many counties of the Dominion a prohibitory by-law might be passed, were it not for an adverse vote in some large town which is situated within that county, and therefore I say that the adoption of the amendment which I propose would be in favour of the temperance party, in this respect: that it would give the county the opportunity of dropping out the adverse vote of the town and of adopting the Scott Act in the rest of the county, and *vice versa*. What I mean to say, Mr. Chairman, is this, that the spirit which runs through our legislation on this subject is one of local option, the local option of the municipalities. They may adopt, and after adopting they may reject and repeal, and I say that it is unfair, and inequitable, and unjust, that the principle of local option in respect of prohibition should have been extended to towns, villages and parishes, and that the smallest municipal corporation that can repeal is a county or a city. Now, I desire to point out another reason why this amendment should be adopted. As the law now stands, there is no machinery whatever by which a prohibitory by-law can be repealed or can be adopted in a county where there is a separate and distinct municipal organization of a town. For instance, in any county in Canada, if there be an incorporated town which is not connected municipally with the county, there is no machinery under the law by which a prohibitory by-law can be repealed in any way, either by a vote of the two distinct municipalities or by a concurrent vote of the two municipalities voting together. Take, for example, the county of Richmond, in the Province of Quebec, where the Dunkin Act has been nominally in force, but not really in force, for many years. In that county a town has been incorporated, the Town of Richmond It is separated from the county for municipal purposes; it is not represented upon the county Board; it pays no part of the county taxes; it is a separate municipal organization, as separate from the county of Richmond as it is from the counties of Compton, or Drummond and Arthabaska, adjoining. Under the law, as it now stands, the Dunkin Act can not possibly, by any machinery known to the present law, be repealed, even though it were the unanimous desire, both of the town and county, to repeal it, because there is no machinery, there is no way of deciding who is to be the returning officer, no machinery by which a vote can be taken, either severally or jointly, by those two distinct municipalities. Therefore, there is a hiatus in the law which my amendment will cover. On the other hand, in that same county, where there are two distinct municipal organizations, if the Scott Act were proposed to be adopted there, it would not be possible to have a vote taken. A vote could not be taken in the county independent of the town of Richmond, and a vote could not be taken in the town of Richmond, and therefore I say the law requires the amendment which I propose. The amendment is introducing no new principle; it is simply giving to incorporated towns, towns of considerable importance, the local option, which the License Act already gives to villages, parishes and hamlets. I therefore move: first, where a prohibitory by-law has been in force, and after it has come into force, a town has been incorporated and made a separate municipal entity, that town or county may severally, without linking in the other, repeal that by-law; and on the other hand, the second part of my Resolution

says, that where an independent municipal entity has been created before the passing of the prohibitory by-law, either the remainder of the county or the incorporated town may pass a prohibitory by-law. I therefore say that this Resolution should not meet with the opposition of hon. members who generally support the Scott Act and everything in connection with the cause of temperance, because it is as much in the interest of one party as in the interest of the other, and it is necessary, in order to give effect to the principle of local option, which underlies our whole legislation on this subject. I move that the clause I have read be inserted as clause 4 of this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not my intention to discuss the question at any length. I would be sorry if the Resolution moved by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) should be carried and appended to this Bill. So far as I understand the temperance sentiment of the country, and I think I understand it pretty well, I look upon this Resolution as tantamount to a repeal of the Canada Temperance Act in most of the counties in this Dominion. In 1878, when the Act was given us by Parliament, it was given as a step in advance; it was passed as being something given to the temperance people in advance of the Dunkin Act, the Canada Temperance Act of 1864. The great argument against the Dunkin Act was that it applied to very small localities, and it was stated and found out by experience that it was very difficult to carry a prohibitory law in exceedingly small districts. Therefore, when this law was framed it was very wisely provided, in answer to the request of the temperance people of the country, that the district which could adopt the law should be a county or a city—a county taking in all the smaller municipalities, incorporated villages, townships and towns. It was in answer, I say, to the request of the temperance people that the law was framed on that basis. I think the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe would have the effect of destroying this law; it would make it inoperative in most of the counties which have already adopted it; and it would do more—it would stop the efforts of the temperance people in organizing plans which they are now adopting to carry the Canada Temperance Act in various counties of the Province. At this moment there are some sixteen or twenty counties in the Province of Ontario that are agitating for the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act. In most of these counties there are towns and municipalities which would come under the provisions of the amendment offered by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. If this amendment were carried, these counties would immediately stop the agitation for the Canada Temperance Act; and although I do not think such was the intention of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, I certainly think the amendment must have that effect. There has been no request made by the country at large for such an amendment as that introduced by the hon. gentleman. From 1878 up to the present time, there has been no public demand for either this measure or any other measure which would reduce the operation of the Act to a smaller limit, or which would in any way impair the efficacy of the Act. On the contrary, there has been a very large and powerful opinion expressed in opposition to any attempt to destroy the efficacy of the Act; there have been most influential demonstrations made in every part of the country, which have called on this Parliament and the Governments which have from time to time held power, to keep the Act intact and not impair its validity in any respect. I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will exercise your authority to prevent this disorder. It is a very peculiar style of argument to adopt. I think, Sir, it will not be necessary for me to speak very much longer, if this is the kind of argument which is to be used by the supporters of my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). I think a little more of that kind of argument would effectually kill his amendment. I wish to state, however, that the temperance people of Canada restrained themselves within bounds, in regard to this Act. There were a great many things which they thought might have been better, some clauses which they would have preferred as being more stringent, but they contented themselves with asking for the simple amendment before the House, in order that an Act which had been solemnly passed by this Parliament, which went into force by the people's will in twelve counties in Nova Scotia and was, by a technical defect, found to be inoperative, should be amended, so as to remove that difficulty. We do not ask Parliament to pass any other restrictions with reference to it, however desirable we might think them. We are making a simple request, after showing a commendable degree of moderation and temperance, and I think it is but fair that we should be allowed it. If the opponents of the Canada Temperance Act wish to destroy its usefulness, or impair its conditions, I think they might go about it in a square way. They might have the matter discussed in principle, and if it is found better to have the Act repealed, let it be repealed. But at this late hour of the Session, when there has been no call for such a repeal or amendment from the country, when there is a wide concensus of opinion standing on record as calling on this Parliament to keep the Act intact and not impair its provisions, and when, in addition, we had the statement of the right hon. the First Minister, given to quiet that uneasy feeling which was abroad in the country, a year or two ago, that in any legislation which took place in this Parliament, there would be no relaxation of the stringencies at present imposed on the traffic—I say, Sir, I think, under those circumstance, we have good ground for asking the Government and this House to reject the amendment of my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe, and to stand by what the Government introduced, in answer to the direct request of the people most interested. Now, Sir, I thank you and the House for the impartial and good hearing which has been allowed me, and I only hope that all disinterested hon. gentlemen present—and nearly all are disinterested—will weigh carefully my arguments, together with the arguments which have been going on at the same time, and decide according to which they consider the most reasonable.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. IVES. If you will not grant an amendment of this character as applicable to the whole Dominion, I presume that the hon. gentleman who last spoke would have no objection to a provision, which would be specially applicable to the county of Richmond, being adopted. The old Temperance Act of 1864 has been nominally in force in the county of Richmond for several years, but only nominally, at any rate, in the town of Richmond. Ever since I have known anything about the town of Richmond, liquor has been sold there as freely and with as little restraint as in any city in the Dominion. At the time the Dunkin Act was passed, Richmond was a small village; but at present it is an incorporated town, with a population of several thousands. About a year ago, the council of that town passed a by-law, repealing the Dunkin Act; so that the Dunkin Act is repealed in effect, but not legally. Therefore, I propose that this clause be added:

"It shall be lawful for the municipal council of the town of Richmond, in the Province of Quebec, to pass a by-law repealing the Temperance Act of 1864, within the limits of such municipality; and if the said council pass such a by-law, and the same be submitted to the vote of the electors of said municipality and be approved of by the majority of the electors, such Temperance Act of 1864 shall be to all intents and purposes repealed, so far as the said municipality is concerned, and thereafter it shall be lawful for the Commissioners of the

county of Richmond, appointed under the Liquor License Act of 1883, to grant licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors in the said town of Richmond, under the provisions of the last cited Act."

Mr. SCRIVER. I am sure I need not appeal to the House to grant this special legislation. As to what the hon. gentleman said with reference to the council repealing the Dunkin Act, I know that a good many members of this House have received representations from some of the most influential members of that town, urging them to oppose this amendment with all their heart.

Mr. OUIMET. I will vote against that amendment, for this reason: The power of regulating the liquor trade within the municipalities is a municipal franchise, and my opinion is that this Parliament cannot abrogate any municipal franchise which existed in 1867. Therefore, I will vote against this amendment, in order that my voice should not be raised to confirm the pretended right of this Parliament to abrogate any municipal franchise in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. IVES. The Local Legislature, so far as it could authorize the town of Richmond to repeal the Dunkin Act, did so, and the council acted under the power which the Local Legislature sought to give them; but the license Commissioners held that the Local Legislature had no power to permit a portion of a municipality to vote separately to annul the by-law, and that they had to come to this Parliament to obtain power to enable them to rid themselves of this by-law.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have an amendment to propose, which, I am quite sure, will be received with much more favour than those of my hon. friend, because I have an authority of the highest character in the temperance ranks in favour of the proposition which I propose to ask the House to adopt. I do not intend to occupy the valuable time of the House, and I will, therefore, briefly move the addition of the following clause:—

"That the 57th section of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 is hereby amended by substituting the words 'three-fifths' for the words 'one-half.'"

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman evidently refers to myself, because last Session, when we were passing the Act, I advocated the three-fifths vote, but the hon. gentleman will recollect that two Sessions ago, when a proposition of this kind was made, to interfere with the provisions of this Act, though I stated before it was introduced that there should be a majority, I would be the last person to interfere with the provisions of the Act as it was enacted. I shall take the same course to-day as I did two Sessions ago, and vote against the proposition.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). This House is solemnly committed to a three-fifths majority, as in the License Act.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Bill reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. IVES moved, in amendment, that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the following, as clause 4:—

"4. Whenever a county municipality, after the passing of a prohibitory by-law under 'The Temperance Act of 1864' or after the issuing of an Order in Council under 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' declaring the second part of the last cited Act to be in force in such county, is divided, and a town or city municipality is created out of the territory separated from such county municipality, such by-law may be repealed or such Order in Council may be revoked as respects the new municipality, in the manner provided by sections 97 and 98 of the said 'Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' in like manner as if such by-law had been passed or such Order in Council had issued in relation to the new municipality separately. And whenever a county municipality has been divided and a town municipality has been created out of the territory separated from such county municipality, before the passing of a prohibitory by-law, under 'The Temperance Act of 1864' or the issuing of an Order in Council under 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' declaring the second part of the last cited Act to be in force in such county, said town municipality or said county municipality may petition the Governor General in Council for the bringing of the second part of said last cited Act into force within this territory, but in that case the said town municipality and the said county municipality shall petition and vote separately and shall be considered separate and distinct municipalities, to all intents and purposes as if they were different counties."

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Béchard,	Dawson,	McDougald,
Benoit,	Desaulniers,	McGreevy,
Bergeron,	Desjardins,	Massue,
Bergin,	Dugas,	Montplaisir,
Billy,	Gigault,	Orton,
Bolduc,	Girouard,	Ropel,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Guilbault,	Scott,
Burns,	Haggart,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hall,	Stairs,
Carling,	Ives,	Tupper (Pictou),
Caron,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Casgrain,	Landry (Montmagny),	Valin,
Chapleau,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Costigan.	Lesage,	Weldon,
Coursol,	Mackintosh,	Wells,
Cuthbert,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams.—55.
Daly,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	De St. Georges,	McIntyre,
Allison (Hants),	Dickinson,	McLelan,
Allison (Lennox),	Dodd,	Mills,
Amyot,	Dundas,	O'Brien,
Armstrong,	Dupont,	Paint,
Auger,	Fairbank,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson(Leeds&Gren.)	Platt,
Baker (Missiequoi),	Fisher,	Ray,
Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Reid,
Beaty,	Fortin,	Rinfret,
Bell,	Foster,	Scriver,
Belleau,	Gault,	Smyth,
Benson,	Gillmor,	Somerville (Brant),
Bernier,	Gordon,	Somerville (Bruce),
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Taylor,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Temple,
Brecken,	Harley,	Thompson,
Bryson,	Hay,	Tilley,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hickey,	Trow,
Cameron (Inverness),	Holton,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Homer,	Vail,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Wallace (Albert),
Campbell (Victoria),	Irvine,	Watson,
Cartwright,	Jamieson,	Wheler,
Casey,	Kirk,	White (Cardwell),
Catudal,	Landry (Kent),	White (Hastings),
Charlton,	Laurier,	White (Renfrew),
Cochrane,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wilson,
Cockburn,	McDonald (Cap Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
Cook,	Mackenzie,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Davies,	McCraney,	Yeo.—93.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 142) further to amend the present Tariff of Duties of Customs.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

HALIFAX REFORMATORY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 141), respecting a reformatory for certain juvenile offenders in the county of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia, said: It is proposed to establish, in the county of Halifax, a reformatory for boys of the Roman Catholic faith, there being in existence an institution for

those shown by the Census to be Protestants. This Bill is drafted upon the Act respecting the industrial schools of Canada.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE JUDICIARY OF MANITOBA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 146) to provide for the salary and travelling expenses of an additional Puisné Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Manitoba, said: The Bill has not been distributed, but it is simply the Resolution, with the words "be it enacted" before it.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. This is a most extraordinary proceeding. There is no Bill at all. The hon gentleman is asking the House to take a Resolution and proceed with it as if it were a Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well?

Mr. MILLS. I think that is a most extraordinary proceeding.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has often been done.

Mr. MILLS. I have not seen it done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, you have, often.

Mr. MILLS. My impression is, I shall not see it done to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move, Mr. Chairman, that you rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

MANITOBA AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of the Resolution, reported from Committee of the Whole, to authorize a free grant of land in aid of the construction of a railway from Manitoba to the Hudson Bay.

Resolution read the second time, and concurred in; and referred to Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 138.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 138) to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883, said: The Bill contains a number of amending clauses. Perhaps it will be more convenient to go into Committee at once.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just state generally what they are, please.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under the original Act, persons holding land could not obtain a homestead or preemption entry on contiguous lands unless the land they owned and the land they desired to preempt as a homestead did not exceed a quarter of a section. Then the second clause of this Bill is to provide for the case of families containing several sons. At present, if a father and two or three sons settle on adjoining lots, they must each of them, under the present law, build a house before they can get their patents. This is to enlarge that restriction and to enable parties living within a radius of two miles from the homestead, to live together, so that families or friends going up there and settling together can put up one good, comfortable house and live in it, each one cultivating their farms. Then there is a clause which, in some discussion which took place in this House, seemed to meet with very considerable favour, that is to say:

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, for the preservation of forest trees on the crests and slopes of the Rocky Mountains, and for the proper maintenance throughout the year of the volume of water in the rivers and streams which have their sources in such mountains and traverse the North-West Territories, reserve from sale, lease or license, such portions of the land in the North-West Territories, on, adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the Rocky Mountains, as to him appears expedient so to reserve, and may define the limits or boundaries of such reserves; and may set aside and appropriate such lands for a forest park, or forest parks, as he deems expedient, and may appoint officers for the preservation of such reserves and forest parks."

The next clause provides for protecting timber. Then I am going to move an amendment that is not in the Bill from the Senate, and that is, to extend the privilege of preemption for two years. By the present law the privilege of preemption expires the 1st January, 1885. Now the right of preemption being so extensively advertised in Europe by colonization companies, by the Pacific Railway, and by Government agents, it is believed it would cause considerable disappointment if this right was allowed to expire next January, and so we propose to extend it to the 1st January, 1887.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he was going to move that the Committee consider the Resolution respecting a free grant of land to the Manitoba and Hudson's Bay Railway at the same time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; and add that to this Bill. It is convenient to do so. Under the Dominion Lands Act the Government have power, for the purpose of aiding railways, to sell lands at such prices as they may fix. They may fix a nominal rate if they please. Under the general purview of the Act, land cannot be sold under a dollar an acre except for special purposes, and there is provision in this Act that for railway purposes and other public purposes land may be sold at a price fixed by the Governor in Council. We might have fixed a nominal rate, but we thought that would be an evasion of the Statute and so we thought we would lay the case before Parliament and get the consent of Parliament.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that this is not the form in which the Bill was introduced. The Bill, as introduced, provided that if a person settled upon land his brother, or his father, or his son, specifying the relationship, could live with him.

Mr. MILLS. Supposing the father lived five miles away, then this Bill would not apply at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It provided that they should live on contiguous lots. In the Upper House there was a strong attempt made to introduce a cultivation clause without residence, but that was opposed by the Government, as giving too much chance for speculators. The law now is, that they must each have a residence, and this is to withdraw that restriction. They are allowed to live in one house if they make these improvements. In the homestead clauses it was provided that parties should each put up a house and reside in them. If a man puts up a house and resides in it, that ought to be sufficient evidence that he is a settler and is going to cultivate the land, but as this does not provide for putting up a house, it provides that they must go on from year to year and make substantial improvements—ten acres the first year, fifteen the second, &c. That is the alteration here.

Mr. MILLS. A patent should not be issued until some buildings are erected and indications given of permanent settlement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The house must be put up before the patent is issued.

Mr. WATSON moved the following as sub-section 7 to section 33:

"In addition to the cases heretofore mentioned, any person claiming a patent for a homestead shall be entitled thereto, upon proving that he has erected upon his homestead a habitable house worth not less than $400; that within the first year after the date of homestead entry he had broken and prepared for crop not less than twenty acres of the homestead quarter-section; that within the second year he had cropped the said twenty acres and broken and prepared for crop not less than thirty acres additional, making in all not less than fifty acres of the said homestead cropped and thirty acres additional thereof broken and prepared for crop, within three years from the date of making his homestead entry; and that he has been a resident of the Province in which the homestead is entered during the entire period covered by his entry."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am opposed to the idea of cultivation without residence; and if we adopted this clause, we would be simply opening the door for speculation.

Mr. WATSON. I think the great object of the Land Act is to encourage people of the Province to place their earnings in the cultivation of the soil. This amendment would have that effect, because a great many men worth, perhaps, a $1,000, and now employed in trade, would put their earnings into land cultivation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause was submitted last Session and the sense of the House was against it. It is introducing a new principle; it is doing away with the homestead principle, which is that a man shall build a house and the Government afterwards give him the land.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was in favour of this clause last year; but I found it was very unpopular among the settlers. They at once set up the argument that rich men would pick up all the best sections and poor men would have no chance. The amendments proposed in the Bill are in the right direction; and I am glad to see the hon. gentleman has given to farmers sons and unmarried brothers who reside with married brothers and work adjoining lots the right of holding their land, even if they live in the same house. This concession will be found to be very popular. I am not sure that the cultivation homestead clause, which I proposed last year, would be popular. I received a great many letters after I made the proposal in question last year, condemning the clause, which I then thought would be a good thing for the country. I find, however, that it is not popular, and I cannot support it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Minister states that the opinion of the House last Session was against a clause similar to that now proposed. The Government have, however, made a long step in the direction of concession since that time. They have abandoned the stipulation that homesteaders shall be actual residents on their lots; and it is well to bear in mind that the conditions of the present proposal are very stringent—that the person shall erect a house of not less value than $400, and break eighty acres in three years. I believe such a measure calculated to bring the country under cultivation cannot be a bad measure; that a person taking a homestead, breaking eighty acres and building a house, cannot be considered as a speculator seeking to take up the best lands of the country. I see no reason why the Government should not depart from the rule laid down last Session still further than they have done. The person would have to be a resident in the Province, and I doubt whether only rich men would take up land. On the contrary, I think mechanics and many of the wage-earning class would avail themselves of this privilege and seek to secure farms for themselves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under the clause these persons must be residents in the Province. Speculators would build houses, but they must live in Winnipeg; this privilege does not extend to men in Ontario. It limits the privilege to gentlemen of means in Winnipeg.

Mr. WATSON. I know that a great many persons besides speculators would avail themselves of this privilege. There is not much speculation in securing 160 acres, when in three years eighty acres have to be broken and a $400 house erected. They work at their trade in order to keep themselves, but they hope eventually to procure themselves a home on a farm. If this clause were added, you would induce artisans to become farmers and to put their earnings in the cultivation of the soil, which as I understand, is the great object of all the land regulations passed by this House.

Mr. MILLS. I think the leader of the Government does not make sufficient allowance for the effect of withholding the patent. Of course, so long as you do not base the patent upon the actual improvements, you can allow a great deal of latitude with regard to residents. I do not see any reason for that provision limiting the period of residence, the party to reside within two miles. Suppose a young man went there and was unable to obtain property within two miles of his father, he might wish to reside at home and cultivate his land. He and his father's hired man might spend a part of the time on the lot he had taken up, and it might be four or five miles away instead of two. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Marquette would not be liable to the slighest difficulty. If the party does not receive the patent until after he becomes a resident, there would not be any danger of speculators taking up lots. There are many tradesmen scattered throughout Ontario and other parts of the Dominion who are anxious to take up land, and ultimately give up their trade for farming, and they simply wish an opportunity of securing the lots under favourable circumstances, while there is an opportunity of obtaining land.

Amendment negatived.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that clause 39 of the Act be struck out, and the following substituted:—

"The privilege of preemption in connection with a homestead entry shall be discontinued from and after the first day of January, A.D., 1887.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the following amendment:—

"That the Governor in Council is authorized to make a free grant of not more than 6,400 acres per mile in Manitoba, and 12,800 acres per mile in the North-West Territory, in aid of the construction of a railway from Manitoba to Hudson Bay."

The question was asked, when we were in Committee of Supply, whether the land lying on each side of the railway, outside Manitoba and in the North-West Territory, would be sub-divided into sections, and every alternate section given to the company. That would be found very inconvenient, because it would cost a great deal of money to survey the land, and from the broken nature of the country it would be an absurd waste of money to survey it. This clause enacts what the Resolution provides for, viz., a grant of lands for the Hudson Bay Railway.

Mr. MILLS. The objection I make to that clause, as it stands is, that it does not correspond with the plan the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table, because it does not provide that the land shall be along the line of railway. As I understood the hon. gentleman's proposition, it was that the land should be granted in alternate blocks along the line of railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course the land granted will be along the line of railway as long as it will

hold out. There was no such specific provision, however, made in any of the grants to railways, except in the case of the Pacific Railway.

Mr. MILLS. That fact ought to be stated, then, in the Bill, otherwise a Government might make a private arrangement with a company to grant it the best lands in the North-West. The clause ought certainly to express the intention of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Resolution as passed by the House is rather more liberal than this plan. It gives a larger grant.

Mr. MILLS. That is not the point. In that clause he has not confined the grant to the land along the railway. It may be granted a thousand miles away where the road is not of the slightest consequence to the development of the country. It does seem what ought to be done is to provide that the land should be granted on each side along the line, and then if any further land be required the Government might have power to give it elsewhere.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have stated that to be our policy and we will carry it out.

Mr. MILLS. It should be put in the Statute. The hon. gentleman may not be in office six months hence. It is contrary to our notions of Parliamentary Government that we should hand over the entire public domain to the Government to give any portion of it they think proper to any railway company. We do not do so with the public funds. The Government are obliged to state to Parliament the particular purpose for which every dollar of public money is required. The public domain is part of the public resources, and the whole theory of giving aid to public railways is that the lands which are to be improved in value by the construction of the road shall be given in aid of its construction, so that the parties who settle on that land and enjoy the facilities for transportation will, by the payments for such lands, contribute to the building of the road. The hon. gentleman brings down a plan intended to mislead the Committee. That plan is laid on the Table. The right hon. gentleman says we propose to do so and so. We ask him to put that statement in the Bill, and he refuses. He must have some object in that refusal. This is not carrying on the Government in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people. I say the proposition is a monstrous one, and this House will not support it if hon. members do their duty.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to suggest another amendment. Section 37 provides:

"Any person who has obtained a homestead patent after three years residence, or a certificate countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, as in the next preceding clause mentioned, with the additional statement that there has been three years' residence, may obtain another homestead and preempti n entry.

The Bill provides also that a man who resides on his homestead continuously for twelve months and brings 30 acres under cultivation has the privilege of purchasing at $2.50 an acre, but has not the right of acquiring a second homestead. As a rule, the Government grant permission to take a second homestead, and I do not see, therefore, why it should not be made statutory. A man who resides twelve months continuously on his homestead, and has brought under cultivation 30 acres, and paid $2.50 an acre, should have the right to take a second homestead as well as the man who resides on his homestead six months in the year, for three years, living in all eighteen months on his land. I move, therefore, in amendment, that the following section be substituted for section 37:—

"Any person who has obtained a homestead patent or certificate countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, as in the next preceding clause mentioned, may obtain another homestead and pre-emption entry."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is out of order. It would be giving away the lands by giving a man the right to have a second homestead, and must be introduced by a Resolution.

Mr. WATSON. Not so; he purchases the land. It could pass under the principle set down by the right hon. gentleman in admitting a clause of similar character in this Bill.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has never introduced a Bill here with homestead clauses, in which the homestead clauses were introduced by Resolution in Committee, where the consent of the Crown was had before they were inserted. I do not think the hon. gentleman's objection is well taken. He has introduced a homestead Bill and has never introduced a Resolution in Committee.

Bill, as amended, reported.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 147), to authorize certain subsidies and grants for and in respect of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to amend the first clause. Hon. gentlemen will see that the third clause provides for carrying out the objects of the Resolution with regard to the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from its terminus at St. Martin's junction, near Montreal, or some other point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the harbour at Quebec, and the necessary legislation is provided in the third clause for that. I propose to amend the first section by putting in, on the fourth line on the fourth page, after the words "four years," the words "except the line mentioned in the third section of this Act, which shall be commenced within one year," so that it will read:

"All the lines, for the construction of which subsidies are granted, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of July next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, except the line mentioned in the third section of this Act, which shall be commenced within one year, to be fixed by Order in Council."

This is to make it conform to the third clause.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I should like to know, in case that the road should not be commenced in twelve months from now, if the $960,000 would revert to the Quebec Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member I must say that in case the road should not be commenced within a year, Parliament will then have to take action and to give effect to the provision which is contained in this Bill, viz: to either extend the Pacific Railway as far as Quebec, or to dispose of the $960,000, in the way pointed out by the hon. member. Parliament is asked to pledge itself to have the extension built this year; if that is not done, Parliament will have to take action again. As to the question whether this amount will be given to the Province of Quebec, or whether it will be applied to the railway extension, Parliament will be perfectly free to act in whatever way it may be thought to be the most proper.

Mr. AMYOT. I want to put another question. The hon. the Mininter of Railways has declared that the Government would be ready to accept the services of some engineer designated by the local authorities. We want to enquire by whom that engineer would be paid, whether as forming part of the general exploration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will be a matter of arrangement. I think the Government will be disposed to deal very fairly with any suggestion from the Province of Quebec or any localities interested in having a full exploration. I do not think there will be any difficulty in that.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the Northern and North-West subsidy of last year, I would ask the hon. Minister whether he would not allow it to remain. It is an entirely new departure to repeal a subsidy. I understand the parties have spent a good deal of money, some $80,000, for the purpose of carrying out that railway, and the Minister said, last year, he changed the vote in Committee for the purpose of giving the very option the Local Government have now taken. It seems to me that, after the parties, on the faith of that subsidy, had gone in and made expenditures, the hon. Minister should allow the vote to remain, and not make another vote in lieu of it. The matter can be discussed by the parties with the Local Government, and the company being organized and having gone to this expense, it is a very serious matter to repeal that subsidy, and it is adopting a very bad principle, where parties have, on the faith of these subsidies, entered into this expenditure, to say that their subsidies should be repealed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will see that, by the legislation of last Session, the company, if they proposed entering into any engagements whatever, were bound to make an agreement with the Government. They have never made any agreement. So far as I am aware, they have never proposed any agreement. That was the first step, because they did not know that the terms that would be exacted would be the terms they would comply with, until they had come to the Government. The legislation of last Session, while it gave greater latitude in the selection of a route, still retained that selection. It did not at all give that to the Government of New Brunswick, or any other party than this Government, so that, until the company made an arrangement and entered into an agreement in the terms of the Resolution, and until they had their route located, by their location of the route being adopted and confirmed by the Governor in Council here, they had no ground of complaint whatever. In the next place, the amount proposed to be given to that company is increased. They are getting, for the same line of railway, a larger subsidy, and in addition they are getting the construction of fourteen miles as a branch of the Intercolonial Railway. I think they have very little ground of complaint; in fact, they have no ground of complaint.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. Minister will see that, up to this Session of the New Brunswick Legislature, to get the subsidy given by the New Brunswick Government, they were fixed to a certain point and were not in a position to come before this Parliament. The charter was renewed in 1881, giving them ten years, and they were not in a position to come here until the legislation was passed by the New Brunswick Legislature. That has only been passed within the last few weeks, and it seems to me unfair to take that subsidy away from them. That subsidy is for an entirely different portion of the road.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend says it is unfair to take that subsidy from them, as the legislation which changed the subsidy was passed in the last two weeks. He forgets to tell the House that that subsidy was fixed by the Local Parliament of New Brunswick, and fixed in a particular place, and the subsidy last year was granted for that place. It was applied for by me for that locality, from Derby siding upwards. It was upon that application the Government granted it, and it was only when the legislation was laid before this House and was passing through, that the telegrams were received, asking to leave the junction an open question. To that I assented; but when I found that nearly a year had elapsed and no step had been taken, except to get a Chancery lawsuit up between two companies, when I saw the chances of a railway at all for the locality were going to be baulked, I applied to the Minister of Railways to do what I asked him to do in the first instance, to build it as a branch of the Intercolonial. That is the only chance I saw of getting a local railway through the county, a railway very important to the county. When my hon. friend takes such a deep interest in Northumberland and makes these assertions he ought to tell the whole facts in relation to it. He has not told the whole facts. He has left the impression on this House that the changes had been made contrary to justice and to right. I tell him that of the men who sent that telegram not one of them had ever asked to obtain a subsidy for the road they are going to build. I applied, on my own account, knowing, as I did, what the county wants, and knowing its interests far better than the hon. gentleman. I applied for that subsidy for this particular locality, where the branches are going to be built. I would not be doing justice to the people of the parishes through which it is proposed to build this road, if I permitted it to be diverted from the purposes Parliament had in view and the purposes I had in view. If these gentlemen want a subsidy and will come and ask for it, they will find me as ready to help them to get a subsidy for their line—if it is necessary, as I have no doubt it is—as I have been to get this. But I will not allow the people of the parishes, who have not the same facilities for sending telegrams to the Opposition as well as to the Government, who have not the same facility for combination as the town people—I will not allow them to be cheated out of the subsidy which I asked for on their behalf, and which the Government granted to me for that particular purpose.

M. WELDON. Of course, I am not the member for Northumberland, but I am a member for the Province of New Brunswick, and I feel as much interest in the north shore of that county as the hon. member himself, who is not now a resident of that Province. With regard to this matter, this grant was given to the Northern and North-West Company, which is now regularly organized. My hon. friend says there were two companies. There were not; the court decided there was only one company, the company seeking this subsidy. They are the parties who now send forward this telegram, the parties who applied last year, when the Minister of Railways said he was in receipt of telegrams which changed the position. My hon. friend says I do not tell the facts. Does he tell the facts? The route originally was through Nelson and Derby, but when his friend, the late Surveyor-General, came in, and the subsidy was renewed, he had it confined to the north shore entirely and left the south shore out in the cold. But when it was brought before Parliament this Session it was made optional, so that justice might be done to the southern part as well as to the northern part.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was a Subsidy Act passed in 1872, but after ten years the subsidy of $5,000 a mile was allowed to lapse. Why did not these gentlemen go on and build the line themselves? Why, Sir, they never made the first move. My hon. friend says the court decided the second company had no existence; but this company which was decided by an *ex parte* statement of the judge to have no existence was really the only company that has been in existence for three or four years, and the president even of that company, was the man who came up here and at whose instance I got a requisition signed by two-thirds of the New Brunswick members in this House, asking for this subsidy for these very men. Before he came, though, I had applied on my own behalf, knowing what the county wanted, for this road to be built as a branch. My hon. friend has not taken the trouble I have taken to get a subsidy for

a railway through Northumberland. The only interest I have ever seen him take in the county is to thwart its interests. There has not been the slightest chance of either of the companies doing the work, because the district is divided; and I felt it was my duty to endeavour to get it through, even if I had to shorten the distance, for I would rather have four miles as a branch than fifty miles built by these private companies, the possibility being so remote of the companies going through with their enterprise.

Mr. FORTIN. I crave the indulgence of this House for the few remarks I have to address to it before the vote is taken. I think this measure is one of justice towards the several Provinces of this Dominion. Perhaps it is not extended equally to each Province, because some of the Provinces had formerly received their shares, directly or indirectly. It is but natural I should say a word in reference to the share that falls to the Province of Quebec out of these subsidies. The subsidy for the railway built by the Province of Quebec, from Ottawa to Quebec, is nothing but what was due, in my humble opinion. I approve especially that part of the subsidy which provided for the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway being placed definitely and irrevocably at Quebec. It has been promised repeatedly by the promoters of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the establishment of the North-West. How could any one, having at heart the welfare of this country, consider, without the greatest regret, the greatest magnificent port of Quebec, isolated from the trade of the west and the north-west of this continent. And it would be so, if Quebec were not one of the principal eastern termini of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, Montreal being the other; I mean the termini, especially for the produce and articles which, coming by the Canadian Pacific Railway, are destined for Europe and have to be transported through the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence. I consider that it is the bounden duty of the Government and I will add, of the Liberal Conservative party, to carry that idea and put it into execution. I hope it will not be considered out of place for me if I say a few words in reference to the Bay des Chaleurs Railway. I thoroughly approve of the course the Government has adopted in this respect, as it appears to be the only way this important branch of the Intercolonial Railway could be secured. It will be several years before this work can be brought to completion; but the population of the two counties, interested in this important branch railway, will now not only live in hope, but will be sure that their aspirations after the long cherished idea of being put in communication by means of a railway with the other ports of Canada and especially with the markets will be realized. When this railway will have reached the important port of Gaspé, one of the finest and most secure harbours in the world, it will have traversed the greatest part of the counties, of Bonaventure and Gaspé containing over 5,000,000 (five millions) acres of land, of which a large part is of the best quality, with a population of 40,000 inhabitants, which is fast increasing—witness the increase of the population of the county of Gaspé, from 15,557 in habitants, that it was, in 1871, to 20,685, in 1881. That does not include the population of the Magdalen Islands, which is of 4,316 inhabitants. I think, it will be interesting to know what are the principal productions of that country, in 1881:

	Bonaventure Produce.	Gaspé Produce.	Total Bushels.	Total Value.
Wheat, by bushel	35,839	28,247	64,086	$64,086
Barley do	31,932	46,957	78,889	63,111
Oats do	194,570	87,551	282,121	141,060
Rye do	5,529	6,609	12,188	9,103
Pease and beans, by bushel	2,527	6,172	8,699	6,961
Buckwheat, by bushel	64,446	1,552	65,998	32,999
Corn do	327	101	428	428
Potatoes do	704,432	423,591	1,128,023	564,011
Turnips do	101,490	114,561	1,216,051	86,420
Other roots	31,753	13,493	45,246	18,098
Hay, tons	16,891	17,169	34,060	340,600
Hay and clover seeds	541	63	604	6,040
				$1,322,917

Animals.

	Bonaventure.	Gaspé.	Total.
Horses	2,272	2,302	4,574
Colts and fillies	518	430	948
Working oxen	1,436	1,818	3,254
Milch cows	5,053	4,996	10,049
Other horned cattle	4,611	4,299	8,910
Sheep	15,030	19,468	34,498
Swine	7,428	9,448	16,876
Cattle killed or sold	1,773	1,404	3,177
Sheep killed or sold	4,785	4,288	9,073
Swine killed or sold	5,935	6,188	12,123
Wool, lbs	41,109	44,467	85,576

In 1882 the different products of the fisheries carried on the coast of these two counties amounted to nearly $600,000, as follows:

Salmon, barrels, at $15	32	$ 480
Single salmon, 7 cts. per lb	139,753	9,872
Cod, quintals, at $4	87,699	350,796
Haddock, at $4	377	1,508
Ling, at $4	75	300
Haribut, bbls. at $6	59	354
Herring, barrels, at $5	12,053	60,265
do smoked, boxes, at 25 cts.	1,426	356
Mackerel, bbls. at $6	432	2,592
Trout, bbls. at $8	13	104
Eels, bbls. at $7	25	175
Cod tongue, bbls. at $9	127	1,143
Whale oil, bbls. at 40 cts	9,785	3,914
Cod oil, barrels, at 40 cts	49,049	19,619
Fish or bait and manure, &c	30,382	30,382
Lobster, cans, at 15 cts	387,352	58,102
Fish used for local consumption, barrels, at $4	9,757	39,028
		$542,962

82 vessels, 7,037 tons; 1,628 fishing boats—flats, 1,362; 3,329 fishermen; 1,296 shoremen.

I think I have said enough to show that the Government is doing a patriotic act when it takes this means of developing the resources of this important part of the country. I am sorry I was accidentally absent from the House when the vote was taken on the concurrence to the railway Resolutions embodied in this Bill, because I would have voted in favour of the measure.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved, that after the second clause the following be inserted:

"The Canadian Pacific Railway Company may, within six months from the passing of this Act, purchase the North Shore Railway from St. Martin's junction to Quebec, or may obtain control of the same, or may make with the owners of said railway such arrangements as will allow the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company to extend its railway to Quebec, failing which, the provisions obtained in the three following sections may take effect."

This is merely a prelude to the clauses which follow, for the purpose of carrying out these Resolutions.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to amend the third clause by adding after the words, "said railway," on the 41st line, "to the harbour of Quebec."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. BELLEAU. (Translation.) I understand, that by this clause it is intended to provide for the case in which the Company should build an independent line from the North Shore Railway to connect at a certain point with the Lake St. John Railway. As it may not be easy for the Pacific Railway Company to buy the Lake St. John Railway—for that will depend on the willingness of the

owners of the road to part with it—it might be expedient to provide that the Pacific Railway may leave this road or make with the owners of it such arrangements as may be entered into to give them the right of way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I am informed that the words "which may be acquired" cover not only the buying but also the leasing of the road; consequently, what is desired by the hon. member is included in this clause.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES. (Translation.) I was glad to hear the member from Lévis (Mr. Belleau) advocating the cause of the county of Pontneuf, which I represent, and through which passes the Lake St. John Railway. I regret that what is granted to railways in other Provinces has not also been granted to that line. I have heard with great pleasure the explanations given by the Government on this question, but still I think that the same subsidy which is granted to other railways should have also been granted to the Lake St. John Railway so as to put us on equal footing with the other Provinces.

Bill, as amended, reported.

JUDICIARY OF MANITOBA.

The following Bill was again considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 146) to provide for the salary and travelling expenses of an additional Puisné Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Manitoba.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

ORDERS DISCHARGED.

The following Orders for second reading were discharged:—

Bill (No. 7) respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 106) to define certain offences against persons employed in Factories.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

SUPPLY.

The House then again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

303	Post Office Department—To provide for the salary of one first-class clerk	$1,400 00
305	To pay the undermentioned Clerks the amounts granted under the provision of an Order in Council of the 15th February last, being $50.00 for each and every optional subject passed by them at the examination of the Civil Service Board, viz:	
	Privy Council—L. H. Chute	25 00
	Post Office Department—E. F. Taylor	50 00
	H. P. W. Chesley	100 00
	E. F. Jarvis	100 00
	A. Geddes	50 00
	E. W. C. Stewart	50 00
	F. E. S. Grout	100 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Postmaster-General was to explain this item.

Mr. CARLING. It is thought necessary in the Department that a first-class clerk should be appointed in the supply branch; and as soon as an examination is made, one of the clerks at present in the Department will be promoted to the position, and this will be substituted for his present salary.

LEGISLATION.

Senate.

	To provide for increase of salary of the Law Clerk, Master in Chancery, Clerk of Committees, and English Translator	$200 00
	Second Clerk Assistant, Master in Chancery, and Chief French Translator	300 00
	First French Translator and Clerk	300 00
308	Clerk of French Journals and Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms	200 00
	Assistant Accountant and Junior Clerk	50 00
	Junior Clerk	50 00
	Bank Messenger	50 00
	To provide for salary of one Messenger, unprovided for in main Estimate	600 00
	Postage and carriage of Mails, unprovided for in main Estimate	100 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Finance was to give details of this vote.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Law Clerk, Master in Chancery, Clerk of Committees, and English translator now receives $2,000, and this increase will make his salary $2,200. The second Clerk Assistant, Master in Chancery, and Chief French translator now receives $1,900; this will give him $2,200. The first French translator and clerk now receives $1,600; this will give him $1,900, the same as it is proposed to give to the chief French translator. The clerk of French journals and Assistant Serjeant-at-Arms now receives $1,200; this will give him $1,400. The Assistant Accountant and junior Clerk now receives $1,200; this will give him $1,250. The bank messenger now receives $750; this will give him $800. For postage and carriage of mails, it is proposed to increase the amount from $800 to $900.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is meant by bank messenger?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know. That is voted every year.

Mr. DAVIES. Will these increases make the salaries of these officials the same as those of the Commons officials?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Law Clerk in Chancery receives $2,200; our Law Clerk receives $3,200 and his assistant $2,000. This will make it $200 more than the assistant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long have these officers been employed?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That I cannot say. The Law Clerk only two or three years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have a pleasant way of increasing the salaries of their officers without any particular regard to the amount of work they do. Their position is important enough, and I have nothing to say against these gentlemen, still the duties attending the offices in that venerable body are very much less onerous than those discharged by our officers. I am not prepared to acquiesce to any doctrine that they are to be paid necessarily in the same ratio as the officers of the House of Commons.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

312	Intercolonial Railway—To re-imburse the Government of New Brunswick for money expended by them on the construction of the section of railway between Painsec Junction and the boundary of Nova Scotia	$150,000 00
	Additional coal cars	250,000 00
	Towards bridging the St. John River, between Grand Falls and St. Francis, the United States Government contributing an equal amount	10,000 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In regard to the $150,000, the case stands thus: When the Intercolonial Railway was provided for, a portion had been constructed by the Government of New Brunswick. When the Intercolonial Railway was being constructed under an Act of this Parliament, from Rivière du Loup to Truro, the question arose as to the section constructed in the Province of New Brunswick. After some pressure from this Government, the Gov-

ernment of New Brunswick were obliged to accept a smaller sum than they had been obliged to pay to secure the construction of that road; it has been a matter in controversy from that time to this. A memorial from the Government of New Brunswick was referred to my Department, and I instructed Mr. Frank Shanly, who was acting as Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial, to take the question up and examine it in all its details, and make a report. He made a report to the effect that this $150,000 was fairly due to New Brunswick, in connection with the construction of that portion of the line, and he showed that the basis which had been adopted, when this settlement took place with the Province of New Brunswick, required to be revised. When the road was purchased it was purchased on the ground that the amount of money paid to New Brunswick was the sum that would be required to construct it, if it had not already been constructed by the Province of New Brunswick, and when it subsequently proved that the estimated cost per mile of the contracts which were let upon the Intercolonial Railway, on which the cost of construction was based, were greatly exceeded in the course of construction, it was considered only fair that that matter should be reconsidered, and the Government came to the conclusion, on the report that had been made and in view of all the circumstances, that it was only just we should pay the Province of New Brunswick this $150,000 which the road had cost them, over and above what they had received for it.

Mr. WELDON. I hope the Government next year will give us the interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is pretty clear that everyone of these items will open the door for a great many other demands. I see the hon. Minister asking for another quarter of a million—I forget how many quarters of millions he has had already for rolling stock within these last few years—for coal cars. How many will be built?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Four hundred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose they will hold twelve tons or more apiece?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They will hold twenty tons each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What additional quantity of coal does the hon. gentleman expect to transport with these?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. According to the coal companies, the amount of coal they are prepared to provide for the output during the coming year will be greatly in excess of the provision I am making. This provision does not cover, according to the evidence the coal companies have given as to the contracts they are making, the necessity for increased means of transport. The output of the Spring Hill coal fields is about 1,000 tons per day, and it is stated that by August next their output will reach 1,500 tons a day, so that undoubtedly there will be a great additional demand for the means of moving coal, and this amount is the smallest we could ask, with any regard to the evidence, to meet the increased traffic.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is $625 a car. Where will they be constructed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall call for tenders and take the lowest we can obtain, so as to secure their construction at the least possible cost. The moment the vote passes, tenders will be called for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not to be constructed at the old Government works?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state roughly how many coal cars he possesses now on the Intercolonial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About 1,400, of different capacities.

Mr. WELDON. Are there any arrangements with the United States about the bridge across the St. John river?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This will only be expended in case the Government of the United States make provision to the same extent to build the other half.

313 Repairs to road dyke along Lake St. Francis.. $4,000 00

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

359 To pay contractors and others, as reported by Commissioners appointed to enquire into claims arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway..... $358,200 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I need not tell the Committee that this is a question that has long been pressed on the attention of the Government, and various efforts have been made to arrive at some solution. Mr. Fleming gave two estimates originally for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, that is the whole twenty-three contracts up to formation level—one the maximum, which would be sufficient to cover it under any contingency, and the other the minimum estimate, the very lowest for which he supposed it would be possible to secure the construction of that work. His maximum estimate was $13,750,000, and his minimum estimate $11,000,000; that is, for the construction, up to formation level, of the entire Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup to Truro; on the whole, twenty-three contracts, leaving, of course, the ballasting and track laying, and steel rails and everything of that kind to be provided in addition. The aggregate of the first contract prices for the whole twenty-three contracts amounted to $8,705,000. A number of the contractors broke down. The prices were found to be inadequate; they abandoned the work, and the Government were obliged to re-let the contracts, and the aggregate of the contract prices, after these sections had been re-let, was $10,037,000; and, deducting the wooden superstructure of bridges, of which the contractors were relieved, which amounted to $270,000, the total of the contract price was reduced to $9,767,000. In the first instance, as hon. gentlemen opposite know very well, the contracts were made with a provision to have wooden bridges constructed. Subsequently it was decided not only to adopt steel rails for the Intercolonial Railway, but to substitute iron bridges for those of wood and relieve the contractors of this work, which reduced the amount of the contracts by $270,000, which was the contract price for the wooden bridge superstructure. When the work was finished, it had cost the Government $1,200,000 more; that is to say, the Government had been obliged to take hold of a number of contracts in which the contractors broke down, and finished the contracts at the public expense. In that way, the total expenditure for that work, for which Mr. Fleming had estimated a minimum of $11,000,000, was $10,960,000. Claims were made for over $4,000,000, on various grounds, by the contractors who had been engaged in the construction of this work, and the Committee will recollect that Mr. Frank Shanly was appointed for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon these claims, making a careful examination, taking testimony, giving the parties an opportunity of establishing, as far as they were able, the justice of their claims, and making a report, not for payment, but for the information of the Government. Mr. Shanly discharged that duty, but although he was an engineer of very considerable ability, the Government felt that, in a matter involving such a very large sum of money, it was necessary to take still greater precautions

in regard to the expenditure likely to be involved, and it was finally decided to appoint a Commission, consisting of parties who were thoroughly qualified to investigate, with great care and attention, claims of such magnitude, and possessing a thorough knowledge of, and acquaintance with, railway work. That Commission consisted, as hon. members are aware, of Judge Clark, Mr. Broughton, the manager of the Great Western Railway, who had had great experience in regard to claims in connection with railway work, and Col. Boulton, who had had experience both as a barrister, as a person accustomed to weighing testimony and dealing with questions from a legal standpoint, and also very considerable experience in regard to railway matters, as I believe he had been president of a company, if not a railway manager. The result of that examination has been an award by the Commissioners, or a report, deciding that they found just legal claims to an amount of $148,000, in round numbers. If you add to this the sum, after waiving the right to deduct the value of the diminution of work caused by change of grade and location, exclusive of interest, it would make a sum of $183,000, which, with the total amount of the cost of the work before stated, would bring up the entire expenditure, on the twenty-three contracts, to $11,143,000, or $143,000 only in excess of the minimum estimate prepared by Mr. Fleming before the work was undertaken. Some time after the works were undertaken, when they were in active and vigorous progress, it was found the prices were inadequate to enable the contractors to proceed, and Mr. Fleming reported to the Commissioners that, in his judgment, it was better to waive the claim for the diminution of work. The contracts provided that, where the work was diminished or increased by a change of grade or location, the contract sum would be diminished or increased, as the case might be. If the work was diminished, the amount of diminution was to be taken off the contractor; if it was increased, the additional amount was to be paid to the contractor; and I may state that in every one of the twenty-three contracts, from beginning to end, there was a very considerable diminution of work, as the road was finally constructed, below the amounts stated in the contract. When it was found that the prices were inadequate, that the contractors would break down, and that the works would have to be re-let, that not only time would be lost, but probably a large increased expenditure incurred from the increased prices that would be asked by new parties taking these contracts, Mr. Fleming reported that he thought it was better to go on paying the contractors for the amount of the work they performed, irrespective of any diminution which took place. I may say that the Commissioners never formally adopted that course, but practically it was done, because it was found that, in a large number of cases where the contractors were unable to finish their contracts, notwithstanding that a deduction for the diminution had not been enforced, they were constructed at a large additional expense to the country, over and above the amount that related to the diminution of the work. That being the case, the Government have felt that they might fairly waive that $183,000, and might apply the same principle, that practically had been applied to the contracts that were settled and to those that were taken out of the hands of the contractors. There is $71,349 of the finding of these Commissioners that applies to ballasting and other matters outside of this question of bringing the works to formation level, embraced in Mr. Fleming's minimum. Add that to $182,647, the finding of the award of the Commissioners, with the waiving of the right to charge the contractors with the diminution of the work, and it makes a total of $253,996, and if you add the interest to that, from the date of the completion of the contracts, it would make a total sum of $405,200, which the Government submit for the approval of Parliament. That would add, as will seen be at a glance, but a very insignificant sum to the minimum estimate of Mr. Fleming, in the first instance. Those who are familiar with the progress of these works are aware that the contractors took these contracts at prices altogether inadequate, in most cases, for the performance of the work. This sum of $405,200 covers the award of the Commissioners for work performed in the St. Julien and Bic station yards; but waiving the right to deduct the diminution of the work and adding interest on the amount, you still have the work preformed at a much smaller amount than would have been possible had the Government done it themselves, except through the agency of contractors working upon a bulk sum. These contracts were not let like those on the Canadian Pacific Railway and on the canals, but they were let on a bulk sum; and as I said before, where the contractors broke down and Government had to intervene, it was found that the prices Government were compelled to pay, in order to secure the completion of the works, were much greater than the amount paid to the contractors who had thus broken down—in fact, I may say, to any of the contractors; and I think, under the circumstances, this vote having been examined with great care, the report which has been laid upon the Table, stating in the clearest manner the grounds of the action of the Commissioners, the principles by which they were guided in coming to the conclusion they did, the House will agree with me that it is not unreasonable we should ask for the larger amount, that we should ask for the amount of their finding, without deducting the diminutions that were not deducted from the other parties, and adding the interest, making a total of $405,200. Now, I may say these claims, which have been examined, exceed $4,000,000, and the sum awarded is only one-sixteenth the amount of the claims that were placed before them. I will not detain the Committee further, because the report which was laid on the Table, and which will, doubtless, be printed, shows clearly the mode upon which all these claims were treated; and in addition to that, I have made, in regard to all these amounts for which we are asking Parliament for appropriations, a special report in each individual case, giving the minutest details as to the principles upon which these amounts were arrived at.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The amount asked here is $358,200.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. $47,000 of the $405,000 was the amount already paid and voted in the Estimates this Session, for McDonnell & Company, and is deducted from the total.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought that was struck out?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; that was. It is paid deducted from this total of $405,000. I treat the whole because that amount is embraced in the Commissioners' reports, as my hon. friend will see, if he refers to the report on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were there not a considerable number of other claims paid some years ago, in connection with these same Intercolonial Railway claims?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These are all embraced in the amounts I have stated: that is to say, they are all covered. Half a dozen of the first contractors broke down, and the statement made to the Government, when tenders were invited, was that the information was so utterly inadequate as to make it impossible for them to arrive at a correct conclusion. A large number of these parties had been unable to meet the claims for labour, and we asked Parliament a specific vote for the purpose of covering the expenditures on those contracts at the time the works were re-let, and all those sums thus voted are embraced in the total amount that I have

stated here the work has cost. Then there has been some comparatively small sums, that were reported upon by Mr. Shanley, specific items that were voted, but those are insignificant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there were other items which were examined into and arbitrated on by Mr. Samuel Keefer, if I remember rightly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are all embraced in this total expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it has been paid already.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was a year ago—$100,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some others, I think.

Sir CHARTES TUPPER. That is the principal sum, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that would form part of the claims of $4,000,000, to which the hon. gentleman referred, surely?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; the $4,000,000 are the claims referred to this Commission, and that were settled and paid previously.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister tell me, generally, what has proved to be the cost per mile to us of the Intercolonial Railway that we constructed—apart, of course, from the Rivière du Loup branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About $47,000 per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I recollect clearly having heard, a good many years ago, in this place, that it would probably cost us from $21,000 to $22,000 a mile—quite a difference from the actual cost. I think it would have been better, in drawing this vote, if either a list had been appended or if that be too long, that special reference should have been made to some item in the report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is on the Table. For the convenience of hon. gentlemen, I had the report prepared by a type-writer, so as to make it more legible, and on the last page the hon. gentleman will find a detailed statement of the amount recommended for each individual.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see these are made, in the first instance, without interest, and this $405,000 includes interest. I will oblige the hon. gentleman by reading the items for him: Mr. McGreevy, $55,313, with interest, $84,075; Alexander McDonald & Co., $36,761, with interest, $61,758; Neilson & McGaw, $41,707; D. Macdonald, $36,397; Jones & Co., $30,032; Smith & Pitblado, $2,279; Starr & De Wolf, $14,453; D. Fraser, $9,472; Martin Murphy, $14,417; D. Macdonald, $22,269; McBean & Robinson, $5,483; John Russell, $36; Alfonse Mattè, $479; J. M. Blaikie, $1,865; F. Turgeon, $2,242; A. McDonell & Co., 47,005; and some other small amounts. These constitute the sum total in the present case, wholly the total amount of claims paid, including those adjudicated on by Mr. Keefer and Mr. Shanly?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The principal one was Murray & Co., about $100,000. The others were comparatively small sums. I suppose $10,000 would cover them all.

Mr. DAVIES. Will this close up all claims in regard to the Intercolonial.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the report of the Commission.

Mr. DAVIES. Are there any outstanding claims?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; none that have not been considered by the Commission.

Mr. DAVIES. Then this pays everything.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This report deals with all the claims against the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to reopen them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, I do not propose to reopen them.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are two or three trifling claims that I have brought under the Minister's notice, and which I received from my constituents. I hope these claims will not be shut out from consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing can be foreclosed. That is a matter for Parliament entirely.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand then it is quite possible that Parliament may be called on to devote further sums in liquidation of other claims than those before us now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the hon. member for Northumberland refers to small matters, respecting which he has sent a communication to me, they will have to be examined; and it is impossible to say that we will close the door against all such claims. I say that all claims against the Intercolonial have been dealt with by the Commission. They have reported on all of them.

On item 362,

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

360	Amount awarded to contractors on Section B.	$395,000 00
	Salaries and expenses of inspecting engineers, and land other contingencies	21,000 00
	Amount required to settle the balance of the claims of Messrs. Sifton, Ward & Co., contractors between Red River and Cross Lake	175 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I may say, in regard to this matter, that the Committee is aware that very extensive changes were made by the Department in the construction of Contract 42 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, known as section "B." The amount of that contract was over $4,100,000, that is to say, the contract prices at which the work was let amounted to over that sum. In the progress of the work, as the Committee is perfectly well aware, we were exceedingly anxious that the work should be prosecuted as vigorously as possible, and we considered it of the utmost importance, in respect to the development of the North-West, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, upon which so much money had been spent, between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, should be completed as rapidly as possible. The engineers in charge came to the conclusion, some time after the contract had been let, that it would be impossible to accomplish the object of opening that line of railway within the time stated in the contract (and it was opened within that time) without losing another year, unless a very considerable change took place in regard to some of the structures, unless we substituted trestle piling for solid rock embankment, in crossing a number of the water stretches that were encountered on that line. Under these circumstances, feeling it was quite practicable to construct a first-class road and to make this section equal, in every respect to the other sections between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, and at the same time affect a very large reduction by this change, the change was made. The contractors raised grave objections, on the ground that the rock borrowing was the only profitable portion of the work; that the change was of such a radical, or as they called it, a revolutionary character, as to expose them to ruin; and, in fact, they stated that if we persisted they must demand payment for

work done and abandon the contract. Under those circumstances the Government, knowing that to re-let the contract would involve a great increase in the expenditure, and that it would be impossible to do so without losing a year's time, which was considered of the greatest value to the country, the Government agreed to submit to an independent arbitration. Questions were raised by the contractors. They raised two questions, both of a very formidable character. They raised the question that they had been led to expect that Section 15 would be completed at a much earlier period, than was actually the case and would afford an easy access to their section; that such contract was not completed for more than one year after the date named in the contract for its completion, and that they had in consequence been put to an enormous expenditure in getting in plant and supplies. They also claimed that the radical change in their contract took away the only portion of it which was profitable, and they refused to go on with the work. They demanded payment for the work they had done, and said they were prepared to abandon the contract. Under these circumstances, the Government considered that it was in the interests of the country that they should agree that an arbitration should be had, under which the contractors should chose one arbitrator, the Government another, and in case these two could not agree upon the selection of the third, that he should be chosen by a judge of the Supreme Court, and that to that arbitration should be submitted the question of what damages they were entitled to, if any, by non completion of Section 15 at an earlier period, and also the question as to the changes which had been made in the character of the work. That arbration has taken place. The contractors selected Mr. Brydges, the Government, Judge Clark, and as Mr. Brydges and Judge Clark could not agree, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court nominated Mr. Light, the Government engineer for the Province of Quebec, as the third arbitrator. That arbitration has dealt with the two questions submitted to them. In the first place, the contractors maintained that the Chief Engineer, and myself, as Minister, had done them great injustice in the principles we applied to the measurement of loose rock, and some other questions of that character—in fact, they denied that they had had the fair measurement to which they were entitled. In the second place, the question of the extent of the damages, if any, inflicted upon them by the delay in the completion of Section 15, and the radical change of contract by the substitution of a different kind of work for a kind which they were prepared to carry out, was also considered. The first point was disposed of, and an award was made of some $44,000. There were two awards made. In the first place, they dealt with the question of classification of work, as to which they complained of the rule adopted by the Chief Engineer and myself. The award given by the arbitrators on that point was unanimous, and it was, that they were entitled to an amount, in round numbers, of some $44,000. Then they took up the second question. They proposed to postpone the consideration of this question, but I stated that I was anxious that the whole matter should be brought to a conclusion. Mr. Brydges returned from Winnipeg, and after an exhaustive examination, after the best defence the Government could make, two of the arbitrators awarded the contractors $395,200 for damages. That award the Government have not decided to pay. We think it prudent to take the vote, but at this moment the matter has been referred to the Department of Justice, and as the amount is a large one and greatly exceeded that which the Government considers they should claim, by any possibility, it is proposed, before paying the award, to take the opinions of the ablest counsel at the command of the Government, who will carefully examine the whole question. If it is considered it is an award from which we should appeal, from which there is a prospect of appealing with success, the appeal will be had. If, on the other hand, we are advised, after the best opinions we can obtain, that it would be hopeless to appeal, that there is no prospect of successfully appealing, then this money will be paid. I have stated to the Committee frankly what the position of the matter is. I propose now to draw attention for a moment to the position in which the contract will stand, assuming the worst—viz.: that amount of the award is paid. The amount of the contract, when it was made, was $4,130,707. The total cost, including the award, will be less, as shown by the figures which I will now give. The final estimate of all the work done by the contractors, will be $2,863,000. The portion of the contract work undertaken by the contractors remaining undone was $359,800. We have made a contract for the completion of that, under circumstances of which the Committee are well aware. The further amount claimed, on account of tressle work, is some $62,000. Including the award of $395,600, would bring the total amount to $3,680,400, which sum, would be $450,307 less than the contract price, when the contract was made, and less than the lowest estimate of the Chief Engineer, for this work. I may state that the amount claimed and which was submitted to the arbitrators by the contractors was $711,335.

Mr. DAVIES. Which of the arbitrators made the award?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The award was made by Mr. Brydges, the arbitrator chosen by the contractors, and Mr. Light, selected by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Mr. DAVIES. What counsel represented the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The counsel representing the Government were the firm of O'Connor & Hogg, Mr. Hogg being chiefly engaged, and Mr. Christie, of the firm of Pinhey & Christie, two of the ablest counsels to be obtained in Ottawa.

Mr. CASEY. In the main Estimates the sum of $500,000 was asked for the portion of the railway between Prince Arthur's Landing and Red River. Was this to cover the arbitration?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but I gave to the leader of the Opposition a detailed memorandum, showing how that $500,000 was expended. The only portion of this contract it covers, is $359,800 of work belonging to the contract taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the award laid on the Table?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and I only discovered this morning that they had not sent down the demand made by the contractors.

Mr. CASEY. In connection with this matter, some statements have been made which it would be perhaps as well to have settled once for all. One was made by Mr. Manning, I think, in a letter to the *Globe*, when the subject of the removal of Mr. Jennings, the engineer in charge of the work at that time, was being discussed in that paper. It had been asserted by the *Globe* that this engineer had been removed at the instance of the contractors, and Mr. Manning stated that that was correct, that they had not been satisfied with Mr. Jennings and demanded his removal, and that he was removed consequently. Mr. Jennings, I believe, was afterwards sent to British Columbia, but did not stay there long. I would like to ask the Minister if this statement is correct—that the engineer was removed at the demand of the contractors, whose work he was appointed to supervise, and, if so, whether he was given other work, and whether he is still in the pay of the Government; and if he was not removed for that reason, for what reason was he removed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that Mr. Jennings' connection with that work was severed when I was not in the country. There is no doubt that at a very early period the contractors became very hostile to Mr. Jennings; in fact, from the very day on which this contract was let, down to the hour at which it was at an end, they have been at constant issue with the Department, and have been making complaints of the way in which they have been treated by the Government, by the engineers, and by everybody else, so far as I am aware. There is no doubt that they complained of Mr. Jennings, as they held that he was not giving them fair play. With those representations I have not been satisfied. I have always had confidence in Mr. Jennings; I believe he was an able, faithful and trustworthy engineer. He was recommended by Mr. Fleming, who stated that he was an engineer of high standing, and he was appointed by me in consequence of that recommendation. I hold the same opinion of him to-day; all I have seen of him goes to show that he is a thoroughly conscientious man and an able engineer; but, as hon. gentlemen know, it is not always such a man who gets along smoothly with contractors. As a rule, I find contractors very much disposed to find fault with whoever has the duty of supervising their work. I did not act on any representation that was made by any of the contractors; but when these works had reached that stage of completion, Mr. Caddy, who was also an able engineer, selected by Mr. Fleming, was considered able to perform the work on both sections, and Mr. Jennings was transferred to British Columbia. He remained there for some time, and subsequently returned to Canada, and I am glad to be able to say that he is at this moment — for I have always taken the very warmest interest in him—occupying a very important and responsible position, and is receiving the greatest salary and advantages that he has ever enjoyed.

M. VAIL. In the Government employ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; in the employ of Mr. Onderdonk, on his section in British Columbia. If Mr. Jennings was not employed there, he would be to-day in the service of the Government, because I had decided to send him as the inspecting engineer over the Canadian Pacific Railway work, between the Columbia river and Kamloops, when Mr. Onderdonk made an application for him to the Government, and he is paying him $3,600 a year, with a free house.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad to hear from the hon. Minister such a well-deserved tribute, as I believe it is, to Mr. Jennings. But the hon. Minister has not yet answered my question, as to whether the contractor was correct or not when he stated that Mr. Jennings was removed on the demand of the contractors. Although not in the country at the time, the Minister must know on what grounds the Department acted; they must have left some memorandum of the reasons for this proceeding. I am aware that Mr. Jennings went, in the first instance, to British Columbia, and that he came back from there a year ago last Christmas on account of severe illness in his family, on the understanding that he was to return there as soon as circumstances would allow. However, he did not return, although I have been told that he remained in the pay of the Government while looking for another job. I asked the hon. Minister how long that arrangement continued. I would judge from his remark, that when Mr. Onderdonk applied to the Government for him he was still, at that time, in the pay of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He was in the employ of the Government when Mr. Onderdonk applied for him.

Mr. CASEY. Was he constantly in the employ of the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. CASEY. Intermittently?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Then I think the hon. Minister ought to say whether or not the statement of Mr. Manning is correct. It is true, as the hon. Minister says, as a rule, the more honest and conscientious an engineer is, the harder time he has with the contractors, because he is put there for the purpose of looking after them; and if this able and conscientious engineer, who is so highly endorsed, has been removed from the work on the demand of those he was set to watch, it is certainly a very serious charge against those who were in charge of the Department at that time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that there has never been a moment when that contract has not been under the close supervision of an able and experienced engineer. When Mr. Jennings was transferred, the work on Section A and Section B had advanced sufficiently to enable one engineer to do the work, and Mr. Caddy took his place.

Mr. CASEY. I am not disputing that an engineer has been in charge. If I am rightly informed, Mr. Caddy did not actually do the work which Mr. Jennings had been doing, but a resident engineer named, I think, Mr. Davie.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; Mr. Davie was only resident engineer. It is of no consequence where the superintending engineer resides, because it is necessary for him to go all over the work, and he has all the resident engineers under him. Mr. Jennings was in charge of the entire contract of 65 miles, from end to end, and when he left Mr. Caddy assumed his work as superintending engineer over the whole.

Mr. CASEY. But I understand that Mr. Davie had supervision of the same work that Mr. Jennings had when he was there. Since that time, the contractors appear to have been satisfied with the supervision of Mr. Davie and Mr. Caddy more than with that of Mr. Jennings. No doubt these gentlemen did their best, but they could not have been as familiar with the work as a gentleman who had charge of it from the beginning. I hope the hon. Minister will be able to give a positive denial to the positive statement of Mr. Manning, that this engineer was removed at the demand of the contractors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have stated the facts as clearly as it is in my power to state them If the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who was kind enough to act for me in my absence, were present, he would be able to give more definite information; but I think I have stated the facts fairly, and the hon. gentleman can hardly expect me to go further.

Mr. CASEY. Probably the hon. Minister could get the information from the proper source, and give it to us on Concurrence.

Mr. FAIRBANK. As a year's time was saved in the construction by the change of plan, I presume a considerable saving was made in the cost. Has the hon. gentleman an estimate of that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About $850,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From that, this $400,000 has to be deducted?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The result is this: Under the original contract we were to pay $4,130,000. If

this sum has to be paid, we pay $3,680,000. That is so far well, but we receive a considerably inferior road to that we contracted for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. True, we do not receive as good a road, but we receive a first-class road, equal in every respect to every other contract between Lake Superior and Red River, and there were several—14, 15, 21, 25 and 13. This road will compare favourably with any other of the contracts between Lake Superior and the Red River. It is a first-class road, but not so permanent as it would have been if the original design of having a rock embankment up to water level had been carried out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many miles of trestle-work have been substituted for rock filling ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would not be miles ; I will furnish that information.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister stated Mr. Jennings was in the employ of the Government at the time he was transferred to Onderdonk.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He was employed in making out the final estimates of this very work. He was brought here by the Government, to give evidence and support the Government as strongly as possible before the arbitrators, and then he was engaged in making out the final estimate of the work, with which of course he was familiar.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman intended sending an inspecting engineer ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Was it not a pity to give away an engineer of that capacity ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My difficulty is how to dispose of engineers of ability who have been long in the public service. The work on which Mr. Marcus Smith is engaged is coming to an end, and I found he could perform this duty which otherwise I had determined to assign to Mr. Jennings. This was advantageous to the Government, and prevented, at an early day, the difficulty of knowing what to do with an engineer long in the service. When this offer was made to Mr. Jennings, I advised him to accept it, and Mr. Smith would be the inspecting engineer.

Mr. DAVIES. Last year the hon. gentleman said that, in his opinion, and the opinion of the Chief Engineer, there was nothing in this claim. When the hon. gentleman is considering the advisability of appealing from this award, is he going to leave it simply to eminent counsel to advise on the law points connected with the award, or act on the judgment of the Chief Engineer and himself, as Minister of Railways, on the practical part of the evidence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is mistaken in saying I said there was nothing in the claim. I said I was bound to assume there was nothing in it. It was my duty to pay any legitimate claim, and the fact that the Government refused to pay it, showed we considered there was nothing in it.

Mr. DAVIES. What was your opinion ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Acting as the Head of my Department and upon the advice of my engineer, we resisted these claims and fought them as strongly as we could. I have no hesitation in saying I consider that these contractors have accomplished very arduous and difficult work, which they were only able to accomplish by the command of a great amount of capital, and the exercise of untiring energy, but I regard this as a very excessive award.

Mr. DAVIES. Is the hon. gentleman going to take the opinion of eminent counsel, as to whether the Government should, under the circumstances, appeal from the award ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This question is now in the hands of the Department of Justice. They are instructed by the Government to take the best opinions that can be obtained, as to whether this is an award which we can appeal from, and whether there is any chance of improving the position of the Government should an appeal be had. The Department of Justice will, of course, have the advantage of all information, opinion or advice, from the Chief Engineer and myself.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman was asked what the Government had calculated would have to be paid ? We know now what the contractors' claim was. It was but natural to suppose the Government had some estimate of what amount might be properly due to the contractors, if certain contentions were held good. Has the hon. gentleman such information ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said we were bound to assume there was nothing due.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the Government had calculated on what would be due to the contractors ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No ; we did not assume anything was due to them. If we had thought anything was due, we would have paid it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the evidence brought down ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was sent to the Department of Justice.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, if everything was agreed upon, there would be no dispute about this, but if the contention that they had a right for damages for delay was admitted, the Government ——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We did not admit it.

Mr. CASEY. I know ; but suppose it was sustained by the arbitration, the Government must have had some estimate of the amount of damages it would be proper to give for that claim. They must have considered the point first, whether the contractors had any claim on the ground of delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see the point. I do not hesitate to say, that if the contractors were entitled to damage, for not having access to their contract at the time named for the completion of contract 15, the amount would be very large—the additional expense entailed upon the contractors by not having that access would be a large one.

Mr. CASEY. In settling up with the sub-contractors on this road, I understand that they were settled with on the basis of the original measurements. Were any steps taken to recoup these sub-contractors when the measurements and classifications were changed to the benefit of the original contractors ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no information on that point.

Mr. CASEY. Will the Government take any steps to see they are recouped ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know that we have any power to do so. We have nothing to do with sub-contractors. If we give anything at all, it is on compulsion. If we were making a bargain it would be a different thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that it was stated, whether correctly or not I do not know, that the examination of these witnesses was conducted in private and the press excluded. Does the Minister know if that was the case, and if so, why ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I saw it so stated, and saw comments in the press in regard to it, but I do not know why it was done. Shorthand writers were present, who took everything down, I believe, so I suppose it was for the purpose of being able to prosecute their enquiry with less interruption. I know nothing more about it than the hon. gentleman knows.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad if the Minister would enquire and let me know, before to-morrow, if that was the case. I would like to know the reason why, because I have observed on many occasions, in these enquiries, that the publicity given to the evidence on both sides, when claims are made against the Government frequently lead to other and more valuable evidence being produced, when the examination extends over a period of time, and I think it is much to be regretted if the press were excluded, unless there was some very grave causes for it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must say that I take the same view myself. I do not know what led to this. I take it for granted it was done, because I saw it stated in the newspapers and I did not see it contradicted, but I could not see any reason why an investigation of that kind could not take place in the most open manner.

Mr. CASEY. Will the evidence be published in a Blue Book?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That had not been considered at all.

Mr. CASEY. Can it be brought down to-morrow and laid on the Table?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The evidence has been sent to the Department of Justice. It would be impossible to make copies; we would have to bring down the originals, and it would be a very serious matter to lose anything of it. It will all be available for Parliament, if they wish to have it.

Mr. DAVIES. It would be very desirable to have an opportunity of looking at it before Concurrence.

Mr. CASEY. What are the "land and other contingencies" referred to in this vote, in connection with the inspecting engineers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We cannot charge this now to the Canadian Pacific Railway vote, as the money and the loan are appropriated in a particular way, and we have to provide outside for the expenses of the engineers. There are a few land claims still coming up from Manitoba, in connection with the right of way.

Resolutions to be reported.

DISPUTED TERRITORY BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 144) respecting the Territory in dispute between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario, said: This is a Bill to carry out the triangular arrangement made between Ontario, Manitoba and the Dominion. The first clause is:

"The Governor General in Council may agree to refer the questions in dispute between the Governments of Canada and of Ontario, in respect of the boundaries of Ontario, to the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, upon such terms and conditions as he deems proper, and the decision of the said Judicial Committee shall be final and conclusive, so far as the Parliament of Canada has authority so to declare or enact."

Then it provides:

"Until the boundaries of the said Province have been decided under the said reference, the courts, judges, magistrates, sheriffs and other officers of the Province of Ontario, and the courts, judges, magistrates, sheriffs and other officers of the other Province or territory in which the locality in which any question as to the boundaries arises, is claimed to be, by the Government of Canada, shall, in respect of all matters within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, have the same jurisdiction and authority in such locality as if such locality were within the Province or territory in which such courts, judges, magistrates, sheriffs or other officers have undoubted jurisdiction, and were part of the county, district, or bailiwick, over or in which they are entitled to exercise jurisdiction and authority."

Then it continues the Act passed in the 43rd year of Her Majesty's reign, with respect to the administration of justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The First Minister, I suppose, would inform us as to whether he would be prepared to advise His Excellency to agree to this on the terms and conditions agreed upon between Manitoba and Ontario. If I am not misinformed, the case has already been agreed upon between the two Provinces which, no doubt, the hon. Minister has carefully considered. This first clause leaves it in doubt. Do I understand he is prepared to recommend His Excellency to acquiesce, on behalf of the Dominion, in that case?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman looks at the papers he will see there was a case prepared between Manitoba and Ontario, and that arrangement provided that the agreement could be altered within a certain time by a consultation between Mr. Mowat and Mr. Robinson, acting on behalf of the Dominion. The agreement provided that it should be a particular day. That day has been extented, by mutual consent, by Mr. Mowat and the Minister of Justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you prepared to state whether you substantially concur with the terms, as between Ontario and Manitoba?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The main points of the case, I think, are fairly stated. Perhaps they will be more fully and specifically stated in the case as between Mr. Mowat and the Minister of Justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand the First Minister informs us that he agrees, substantially.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; of course.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume that Bill No. 118, the Insurance Companies Bill, will not be proceeded with.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We will have a discussion on it to-morrow, we have got along so well with the public business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the First Minister now, seeing that both sides of the House have conducted the discussions so admirably to-night, in all respects, state when he will allow the House to go?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know; I dare say the House will be prorogued on Friday afternoon, or if not, Saturday at the latest. I think to-morrow will finish all the business; then we will make the usual arrangement, so as to let some of the hon. members go. There will be no new business at all—that is the usual arrangement on the last day—except what is interchanged between the two Chambers.

Mr. GAULT. I am sorry nothing has been done this Session to bring in a Bill for the distribution of insolvent

estates, and I hope that before the next Session the Minister of Justice will have a Bill prepared to meet the wishes of the country. The commercial people of the country feel that their interests in this respect are not being attended to here at all.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to state that we were promised the matter of the Grand Trunk Company would be proceeded with to-day, and I should like to know what the right hon. gentleman proposes to do in relation to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That item will be dropped. The Government have received assurance from the Grand Trunk Railway Company that they will set aside out of the money £1,000,000 sterling to be applied to no other purpose than the placing of a double track between Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the Government are perfectly satisfied that they have got sufficient assurance of that kind, I am satisfied; and I am satisfied for this reason, that the public interest which I had in view in pressing this matter has now been secured, and the public will get the benefit of the double track. I take this opportunity of resenting some of the imputations cast against me with reference to my actions and motives in endeavouring to get this Bill into a shape that would serve the public interests and protect the rights of those we are here to serve. My actions have been inspired wholly by the public interest and not by private interest, and I think the result of this legislation has fully vindicated my course. With regard to the other point of the insult to Parliament, that is a matter for Parliament and the Government to deal with. I wash my hands clear of it.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS, &c., IN THE N. W. T.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolutions respecting fees and charges to be paid for the registration of deeds and instruments in the North-West Territories:—

That the Governor in Council shall fix, from time to time, the fees and charges to be paid for the registration of deeds and instruments.

That the salaries of Registrars shall be fixed by the Governor in Council, and shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada; but no such salary shall exceed twelve hundred dollars a year.

Whenever the registration fees and charges collected or collectable by any Registrar in any two years consecutively amount to more than fifteen hundred dollars a year, as ascertained by the quarterly returns and Report of Inspector hereinafter mentioned, the salary of such Registrar shall cease to be so payable, and thenceforth he may retain to his own use all the fees and emoluments received by him in each year.

That the salary of the Inspector of Registry Offices shall not exceed twelve hundred dollars a year, and shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

That the Sheriff may, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor, appoint Deputy Sheriffs, who shall be paid such fees as are appointed by a schedule to that effect made from time to time by the Governor General in Council.

That section eighty-nine of the said Act be hereby amended by striking out the following words, "To District Registrars not exceeding $1,000."

He said; the necessity for moving this Resolution arises from this fact that under the present law there is one Chief Registrar with $2,000 a year and several assistants who get $1,000 a year. The fees are funded, and it is thought the sooner these officers should become, like the Registrars in other parts of the Dominion, paid by fees the better. The present salary given for the District Registrars has now stopped and the Registrar in Chief gets $2,000. It so happens that most of the work can be done by the District Registrar and not by the Registrar in Chief. However his salary is preserved as long as the present incumbent holds the office. The Bill provides that, when the fees for two consecutive years amount to a certain sum provided in the Bill, the salary shall cease and he shall receive the fees, putting him in the same position as Registrars elsewhere. Then there is a provision for an Inspector of Registry Offices. Then there was pressure from the different districts—they like to have as many officials as possible—to have more than one Sheriff appointed. The Sheriff has very little to do. He is moved, however, to Regina, and, instead of appointing Sheriffs for each district at present, the Bill provides that he may, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, appoint deputies, to be paid fees fixed by schedule approved by the Governor in Council. The matter can be more fully considered on the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask whether the divisions into districts are mere arbitrary divisions, or are kept as nearly as possible the same size.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have been divided according to population. They are provisional. I do not know when Assiniboia or Alberta will have population enough to become Provinces. Directly they do, they will deal with that as they do in Manitoba. There is a Registrar at Regina, one at Battleford, one at Edmonton, and one at Calgary, and as they are required the number will be increased.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My object in asking is that the hon. gentleman will observe that, if the districts are so cut out now that they will have to be changed very soon, it involves copying the whole of the deeds and documents relating to the territory added from one district to another, and will cause a great deal of trouble. My own impression is that it would be better to make the districts as near as possible uniform in size. Even if it would cause some little trouble in regard to salaries in the meantime, the Government would gain by it in the long run. One of the most serious difficulties in Ontario has been found in cutting up counties into registration districts. We will find the same in the North-West, and it would be better to have districts of the same size, extending over parts of the country which are likely to be settled, than to run the risk of confusion in a few years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite aware of the difficulties the hon. gentleman mentions as having arisen in Ontario in regard to the necessity, when a new registry office is established, of copying all the documents affecting the new district. The attention of the Department has been directed to that subject, and the sub-divisions of townships are so arranged that, in case of any alteration, the whole book can be carried bodily away without the necessity of copying.

Resolutions considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

RAILWAY BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Mr. BOSSE enquired, is it the intention of the Government, either by the granting of a subsidy or by a guarantee of interest on the bonds of an organized company, to assure

the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence near the city of Quebec, to unite the different railroad lines on the south and north sides of the river, and create an uninterrupted line by Quebec to the Atlantic ports?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government recognized the importance of connecting the Intercolonial with the Canadian Pacific Railway by a railway bridge at the city of Quebec, and believe that it must be constructed in the early future, but, until the Pacific Railway is extended to that city and some practical scheme submitted to the Government, they are unable to give any more specific answer to the question.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 143) to amend the Liquor License Act, 1883.

Mr. McCRANEY moved in amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole to insert in sub-section 2 of section 25, after the word "no" the words "hotel or."

He said : The section in the Act of 1883 reads :

"No hotel or saloon shall form part or communicate by any entrance with any shop or store wherein any merchandise is kept for sale."

The object of the amendment is simply to restore the Bill as it was before.

Amendment agreed to on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Dundas,	Mulock,
Allison (Hants),	Fairbank,	O'Brien,
Allison (Lennox),	Farrow,	Ouimet,
Auger,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fortin,	Platt,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Ray,
Béchard,	Gigault,	Reid,
Bell,	Gordon,	Scriver,
Benson,	Gunn,	Somerville (Brant),
Bergeron,	Hall,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bourassa,	Harley,	Springer,
Bourbeau,	Hickey,	Taylor,
Brecken,	Holton,	Thompson,
Bryson,	Homer,	Tilley,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Trow,
Cameron (Inverness),	Irvine,	Tupper (Pictou),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jamieson,	Vail,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Vanasse,
Cartwright,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (Albert),
Casey,	Laurier,	Watson,
Catuual,	Mackenzie,	Wells,
Cochrane,	McCarthy,	Wheler,
Cook,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Davies,	McLelan,	Woodworth,
Dodd,	Mills,	Wright.—75.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Daoust,	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dawson,	Massue,
Belleau,	Desaulniers,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Desjardins,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Dickinson,	Orton,
Billy,	Dupont,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Gault,	Pinsonneault,
Bolduc,	Girouard,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Cameron (Victoria),	Haggart,	Scott,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hay,	Small,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Temple,
Caron,	Langevin,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Chapleau,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Cimon,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Valin,
Costigan,	McDonald (CapeBreton)	Wallace (York),
Coughlin,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Coursol,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Brockville),
Cuthbert,	McCallum,	Wood (West'land) —62.
Daly,	McDougald,	

Mr. Bossé.

Bill, recommitted, amended, and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. GIROUARD moved in amendment thereto, that the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of inserting the following clause after clause 43 :—

43 *a*. Provided always, that in the case of a rural municipality adjoining a town or village municipality, where no shop or hotel license is granted, or where a less number of licenses than is authorized by law is granted, the number of shop and hotel licenses for said village or town, may be increased to the maximum authorized by this Act for the said rural municipality, and town or village, provided that the said increase be permitted by the respective Councils of said rural municipality and town or village by by-laws passed to that effect before the time fixed for the granting of said licenses.

Amendment negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Daly,	McCarthy,
Beaty,	Daoust,	McDougald,
Béchard,	De St. Georges,	McGreevy,
Benoit,	Desjardins,	Massue,
Bergeron,	Dickinson,	Mitchell,
Bergin,	Gault,	Orton,
Billy,	Girouard,	Ouimet,
Cameron (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Campbell (Victoria),	Guilbault,	Riopel,
Carling,	Haggart,	Royal,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Scott,
Chapleau,	Landry (Montmagny),	Small,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Tupper (Pictou),
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Cardwell).—49.
Cuthbert,		

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Allison (Hants),	Forbes,	Pinsonneault,
Allison (Lennox),	Fortin,	Platt,
Armstrong,	Foster,	Ray,
Auger,	Gigault,	Reid,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Robertson (Hastings),
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	Scriver,
Bell,	Gunn,	Somerville (Brant),
Belleau,	Hall,	Somerville (Bruce),
Benson,	Harley,	Springer,
Blondeau,	Hay,	Stairs,
Bourassa,	Hickey,	Taylor,
Bourbeau,	Holton,	Temple,
Bryson,	Innes,	Thompson,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Tilley,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Trow,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Vail,
Cartwright,	Macdonald (Kings),	Vanasse,
Catudal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Cimon,	McDonald(Cape Breton),	Watson,
Cochrane,	Mackenzie,	Wells,
Cockburn,	McCallum,	Wheler,
Cook,	McCraney,	Williams,
Davies,	McLelan,	Wilson,
Dawson,	Mills,	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	Montplaisir,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dodd,	Mulock,	Woodworth,
Dupont,	O'Brien,	Wright.—88.
Fairbank,		

Mr. McCARTHY then moved in amendment thereto, that the said Bill be recommitted for further consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman did not simply move that the House go back into Committee. It is perfectly obvious that if this amendment is adopted, the House will go into Committee and the Committee will not be at liberty to alter or change the proposed new section, which I think will not accomplish what the Government proposed at an earlier period of the Session.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Committee can amend the proposed section.

Mr. MULOCK. If I correctly heard the motion, it provides that the Lieutenant-Governor of each Province

may become a party to the submission of this special case, but the right of appeal is only given to the Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. McCARTHY. To the Governor General or the Lieutenant-Governor. The Lieutenant-Governor represents his Province, and any Province therefore may appeal to the Privy Council just as well as the Governor General.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understand that only the Lieutenant-Governor of such Provinces as become parties to the case can join the appeal.

Mr. McCARTHY. If they will not join in the case to the Supreme Court, they cannot of course be parties to the appeal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is what I object to. They should have the right of appeal whether they appear in the first place or not.

Mr. FLEMING. This amendment, if I understand it aright, provides that a case may be referred by the Government to the Supreme Court, the decision of which shall be final, unless some of the Provinces or the Federal Government itself, expresses a desire to appeal. Now suppose neither of these parties express any desire to appeal from that decision, the decision of the Supreme Court cannot be final as to the constitutionality of the Act. It is not for a Province or for the Federal Government to take up the case in that way, for I as a citizen of Ontario, or any other citizen, have a right as a citizen, to have this case decided by the highest court in the realm. No provision of this kind will deprive any citizen of the right to go to the Privy Council to have a case tested. Unless this Act provides for such a complete reference on a test case, then the constitutionality will not have been finally determined, and their proposed amendment will be a farce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does not see the effect of the amendment. This is not a question of litigation and appeal. It is a proposition that the question as to the constitutionality of the Act shall be submitted, under the provisions of the Supreme Court Act, for its answer. Its opinion will be given to the Crown. There could be no appeal from that, because it is an opinion, not a judgment. This is the only way of doing.

Mr. FLEMING. What will the opinion be worth?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No matter what the answer may be by the Supreme Court, it cannot prevent it arising again. If the Supreme Court should decide tha the Act is constitutional, then the clause which prevents the enforcement of the penalty will be at an end, so far as that opinion goes, and any person can be prosecuted under the Act. Then it comes up legitimately by way of appeal, by way of the Privy Council, and there is no other way of doing it. This provides simply that it shall be submitted by the royal prerogative, and it provides also that in case the Governor General or any Lieutenant-Governor—that is to say his Government—asks that the question should be referred to England, that the Queen should exercise Her prerogative, and submit it to the Privy Council. Then we will have an opinion from the Privy Council, in the same way as from the Supreme Court.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee)

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, looking at the observations which have been made by the First Minister, why we should declare by this Act that the decision of the Supreme Court shall be final. There is no object in retaining that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I suppose it is final so far as the Supreme Court goes, because if the hon. gentleman should desire to try it, it would come before the same tribunal again. Then it would be carried to the Privy Council, and if they decided the question it would be final, so far as it goes, and I know of no higher court. It seems to me, therefore, that the hon. gentleman is merely criticising for the sake of criticism.

Mr. MILLS. If the matter is referred to the Supreme Court, the hon. gentleman says that it will be final so far as they are concerned. I admit that, but why use the words, as they would be misleading, so far as the public are concerned. As I understood the Government, when the motion of the hon. gentleman for Maskinongé was under discussion, the proposition was not to submit an abstract question, under the provisions of the Supreme Court Act, but to provide for referring the case to the Supreme Court in the ordinary form, so that the whole question might be discussed the same as if it were raised by private parties. Otherwise, how can you invite the Government of the Dominion, or of any Province, to become a party to the case? Now, it seems to me that the object which the Government promised, and which I have no doubt they desire to accomplish, and the object which would be most satisfactory would be, that no penalties should be enforced, except for the purpose of raising this particular question; that it should come up in a suit, the same as the Hodge case, and that the Governments of the different Provinces might be invited to become parties. In that case a suit could be taken in appeal from the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But the hon. gentleman will say that if you refer this question you can take it by appeal to the Privy Council. But there is no provision for anything of the sort. The only way it could be taken would be by petition to the Queen, asking Her under the fourth section of the Act——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is provided for.

Mr. MILLS. But that is not what is desired. It is not desirable to multiply litigation, and it is desirable to have the suit discussed, and to have such a decision of the Supreme Court, or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as would render it unnecessary, on the part of any private person, to raise the question in the ordinary way. Now the hon. gentleman can accomplish that without difficulty, by slightly changing the phraseology of this section. Under the section as it stands what we anticipated would be provided will not be accomplished.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman forgets that this section does not cover the whole ground in that respect. The parties might still, if they liked, litigate, and all the hon. gentleman speaks of may be accomplished. But if I understand the feeling of the House it is that provision should be made by this Bill for a question to be raised between the Dominion and the Provinces, and that question shall be whether the Act is or is not constitutional? As I understand, that is the feeling of the House; and if not, there is no object at all in the amendment. My hon. friend and hon. gentlemen beside him the other night insisted upon this, and extracted from the Government a promise that they would bring in such an amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Not that amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Substantially this amendment. How can we provide that the Government shall take up the case of "A" or "B," a tavern-keeper, and carry it through by Act of Parliament? I understand that the desire is that the Federal and Provincial powers shall agree on a simple case, as to the constitutionality of this particular piece of

legislation, and that that question shall be determined by the Supreme Court, with the right of appeal to the Privy Council.

Mr. MILLS. That is not provided for.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I think you should provide for that.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Bill provides that the Governor in Council may, with the consent of any Lieutenant-Governor, or the Lieutenant-Governors of all the Provinces, submit a case to the Supreme Court, and that the Supreme Court's decision shall be final unless any one of the parties desire to appeal to the Privy Council.

Mr. DESJARDINS. But what will be the case?

Mr. McCARTHY. The case will be whether this Act is constitutional?

Mr. COURSOL. Will the Local Governments be a party?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, if they choose. It is provided that any one of the Provinces may be a party, and may be heard before the courts by counsel. So it will be a better representation, perhaps, than any private individual can make, in order to have this important question determined by the very highest tribunals.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was there not a case agreed upon in the matter of the New Brunswick School Law? That was not a matter of opinion, but the Legislature provided for it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think it was provided by legislation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that was an ordinary case of litigation. There were contradictory decisions, and the Government of the Dominion came forward and agreed to pay the expenses on both sides. That was approved by Parliament, and the money was voted afterwards to pay the expenses.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The money was voted in advance.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen will remember that in that case, before any private suit was brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Government here were to obtain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown; and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council advised that they would not express an opinion on a question of law presented in the case, but would only do so if a case came before them in the ordinary way of appeal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason why I stated in the House the other day that in my opinion it would be better not to put in the Act anything about suspending the penalties, but to leave that matter in the hands of the Government, was that the objection which the hon. gentleman has just now raised occurred to me—that if you suspend the penalties, there can be no litigation, and if there is no litigation there can be no appeal. The hon. gentleman now suggests that the penalties shall be suspended, except in the case for trying the question; but the court won't allow any collusive arrangement of that kind. The case must be one of *bonâ fide* litigation. If it is only brought for the purpose of trying the question, the court will refuse to try it. However, the opinion of the House was in favour of having the penalties provided for in the Bill, and I do not think there is any means of satisfactorily altering that provision now. I think it had better be allowed to go, and we shall get the decision of the Supreme Court. If any one of the Provinces desires to have, as well, the opinion of the Privy Council, then, under this clause, the Governor General will ask the Queen by petition to submit the question to that tribunal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They will refuse to give an opinion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the Supreme Court has given an opinion, the Privy Council will certainly give an opinion as well.

Mr. DAVIES. The Committee, I think, understood from the hon. member for North Simcoe, that the intention of his Resolution was that a case should be agreed upon between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments to be submitted to the Supreme Court for their opinion, whether the Bill was constitutional in whole or in part. If that was his intention, the Resolution does not express it. As it stands, the Governor in Council of the Dominion is to submit one single question: is that Act constitutional? That is a very difficult question for the court to answer. There are some parts which I think, very likely, they would answer are constitutional; but there are other parts which I think are not constitutional. I would suggest that you add the words in whole or in part.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no objection.

Mr. DAVIES. The latter part of the Resolution speaks of a case, while there is no case referred to in the previous part of the Resolution. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman incorporate in the first part of the Resolution this expression—that there be submitted a case, agreed upon between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments, as to whether this Act is constitutional in whole or in part, and if so, in what part?

Mr. McCARTHY. Unless one of the Provinces join, there cannot be a case. The Imperial Government may submit a question to the Privy Council, and this Government may submit a question to the Supreme Court; but unless there is some other party there cannot be a case, and there is no doubt that one of the Provinces will join.

Mr. OUIMET. I am very sorry that the reference is not made larger than it is. It will be all very well to know whether or not the Act is constitutional in whole or in part. For myself, I have held the opinion that it is constitutional in part; but as it has been decided, in the case of Hodge *vs.* The Queen, that the Provincial Legislatures have concurrent jurisdiction with this House in the matter, I think it would be better to have the question extended, so as to have a decision on the whole question, not only of the constitutionality of the Federal Act, but of the different Provincial License Acts. In that way we should obtain a determination of the question of the jurisdiction of this Parliament on this subject, and also to what extent the Provincial Legislatures have jurisdiction. My own opinion is, that if the Provincial Legislatures have jurisdiction—and I think they have—we ought to let them exercise that jurisdiction, because I think the Provincial Legislatures are better able to judge what is in the interest of their Provinces in the matter of licenses than the Dominion Parliament. For instance, what will suit a county in Ontario will not suit a county in Lower Canada, and here we are forcing legislation on the different parts of the Dominion, which is against the habits and the principles of certain parts. Prohibition may do very well in certain counties of Ontario—Halton, for instance—but it won't do in certain counties of Lower Canada. We do not believe, in Lower Canada, in legislating people to become moral or virtuous. Although it may suit the majority of the Dominion, I think it is a tyrannical exercise of power to force the same legislation on all parts of the Provinces; and I hold that if the Privy Council or the Supreme Court decided that the Provincial Legislatures have jurisdiction in the matter, it would be much better for us not to touch this subject; it would be much better for us not to encroach on the municipal rights, and I hold this opinion so strongly that I am really very sorry this whole subject should not be made a subject of reference to the Supreme Court and afterwards to

the Privy Council. I think that the different Provincial Governments will refuse to join in a case of the kind proposed; they will refuse to expose themselves to having a test which might be invoked against them, in order to place them in a worse position than that in which they are to-day; because to-day, I hold, that the decision in Hodge *vs.* The Queen is clearly in their favour and they have a perfect right to maintain their exclusive jurisdiction in the matter. When the question comes back before the House, I intend to move to add after the words "referring the said question," the words "together with the constutionality of the License Act in each Province."

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman has confused the question of constitutional law and the question of public policy. I am sorry he did not entertain those very strong views at an earlier period of the Session, but what we have to consider is the section which the hon. member for Simcoe has before the Chair. The hon. First Minister, by this Resolution, as I understand it, proposes to proceed, under the power given by the Act to this House, to refer the question of abstract law to the Supreme Court. My impression is it would be better to bring it under the general jurisdiction of the court, and I hold that by a very slight alteration of the proposed section it could be provided that a case be agreed upon by the Government of the Dominion and any one or more of the Provinces that desire to become a party to it, for the purpose of deciding the question of the jurisdiction of this House over the question involved in this particular law. There would be no difficulty in amending that, so as to accomplish this particular object, and it will be more satisfactory than to deal with the abstract question of law which would not prevent private parties coming forward under Provincial Acts.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let the hon. gentleman write out the amendment he desires to be made. Nothing in this Act will prevent what the hon. gentleman says being accomplished. If a man will only sell liquor without license, he will have an opportunity of carrying his case to the highest court. The words I propose to add, to meet the views of the hon. member for Queen's, refer to the Supreme Court of Canada, for hearing and determining the said question as to the constitutionality of the said Act, in whole or in part; such court shall thereupon hear and determine whether the same is constitutional, wholly or in part, and if in part, in what part, and certify their opinion.

Mr. DAVIES. The only other objection I have to make is that the submission of the question to the Supreme Court should be in a form agreed upon, as a case between the Government of Canada, on one part, and the Provincial Government on the other. I do not understand the Resolution to mean that question shall be submitted in an agreed form.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the effect of it. Nothing will be submitted if they do not agree to submit it. We cannot compel them to agree; it is a matter of negotiation between the two Governments. We say there is to be a case, and there cannot be a case unless they agree on one.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman says there is to be a case at all.

Mr. GIROUARD. In the amendment we should provide for the examination of the constitutional question, as to the local Acts, and I hope the Government will see the propriety of putting the whole legislation both Local and Federal before the court.

Mr. MILLS. That is settled already.

Mr. McCARTHY. The court will have to look at the law of the land. If the Local Legislatures have power, then they have what my hon. friend calls exclusive power, for this Parliament will have no power. If this Parliament has power, under the interpretation of the British North America Act, as I read it, and as I think it has been interpreted in every case, where this Parliament has power the Local Parliaments have not and *vice versa;* and in dealing with the question, no doubt every case that has yet come up will be referred to, as well as the different laws passed by the different Provinces.

Mr. GIROUARD. Suppose a case was put before the Supreme Court, in which both the Federal Parliament and the Local Legislature have concurrent jurisdiction?

Mr. McCARTHY. There can be no such thing.

Mr. GIROUARD. The court can decide that. I would like to see the whole matter brought before the court, and we should have a clause framed to this effect.

Mr. FLEMING. The object of this amendment is this: Last year this Act was introduced under the stern plea of necessity, because the Government must act; now, this amendment appears to be introduced with the object of showing that they will act, whether or no.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would desire to add to the first section, the sections 83, 84, 89, and 91.

Mr. DAVIES. Why not say the sections imposing penalties, and not limit to any particular one.

Mr. McCARTHY. Suppose a license were taken out under this Act, there are special penalties with regard to the keeping of a proper house, and we do not wish to remove those penalties. What we want to add is, that if a man takes a license under a Provincial law, he shall not be prosecuted for having done so, but if he has taken no license we will prosecute him.

Mr. FLEMING. Will he be obliged by this Act to take out a license under a Provincial Act?

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. FLEMING. He is obliged to pay the fee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. FLEMING. If this Act is valid, it is only the Provincial license they are bound by.

Mr. McCARTHY. He comes before the Board; the Board says he must get a license, but before the license issues to him he must bring a receipt from the local authority, and on his payment of the tax imposed by the local authority he gets his license.

Mr. FLEMING. That is the only license they can issue, if this Act is final.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know what they can issue.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand that, if a man possesses a license from the local authorities, and while he possesses that license, the hon. member does not seek to enforce any penalties under that Act?

Mr. McCARTHY. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIES. Why not say, no penalties shall be exacted under this Act against any one holding a license from the local authorities?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what is done.

Mr. DAVIES. You are limiting it to two sections.

Mr. McCARTHY. Four sections. There are no other sections.

Mr. GIROUARD. What is the necessity of mentioning any section of the Act?

Mr. DAVIES. What sections does the hon. gentleman mention?

Mr. McCARTHY. Sections 83, 84, 89, and 91.

Bill reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. IRVINE moved in amendment thereto, that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending it, by adding the following section, viz.:—

That sub-section 3 of section 3 after said Act, which provides that nothing in the said Act shall apply to any person selling liquor in any refreshment room at the Senate or House of Commons, or the Legislative Council or House of Assembly of any of the Provinces, by the permission and under the control of the Senate, House of Commons, Legislative Council or House of Assembly, respectively, is hereby repealed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That affects Provincial rights.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend, by providing that inasmuch as the decision in the case of the Queen against Hodge has established the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures over the subject of the issue of tavern, saloon, and shop licenses, the Liquor License Act, 1883, be repealed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has been decided this Session. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. MILLS. I would say, on the question of order, that the hon. gentleman has remitted to us an Act upon a particular question, and the vote of the House upon a similar question in another Act does not at all interfere with the right of the House to amend this Act in any way that the House may determine. I think it has been over and over again ruled, in the Parliament of United Canada, that while a motion cannot be brought up in the same form in which it was before, it may be brought up in another form. The hon. gentleman knows that the reason given by the Government for inviting the House to vote againt the Resolution of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), was that the Government proposed to deal with the question, that they proposed to bring in a Bill that would content certain classes. Now, if the character of that Bill was not satisfactory to the House, it was open to this House to vote for precisely the same proposition laid down in the Resolution. There can be no doubt whatever that this motion is strictly in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I find that the same question was before the House on the 18th March, last, and the House decided then that the Liquor License Act should not be repealed, and it would not be reconcilable with that previous decision, if the House were now asked to consider the amendment.

Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bill (from the Senate) was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 138) to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

The following Bill (from the Senate) was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 150) to extend the limitation of time under the Act 43 Victoria, chapter 7, intituled: An Act for the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 3.—(Sir John A. Macdonald)

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

On the Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 147) to authorize certain subsidies and grants for and in respect of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned, being read.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the Order be discharged and the Bill be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House, with power to amend the same. He said: My reason for making this motion is that in the course of some remarks to the House in regard to the Pontiac and Pacific Railway I stated that the Resolution provided that the grant would be given to the Railway and not to the Company. I find that the word "company" has been introduced in the Bill, which, in this respect, differs from the Resolution. I propose to make the Bill conform to the Resolution in that particular.

Mr. BRYSON. A comparison of the Bill and Resolution shows that two words, "railway company," have been added.

Bill recommitted, reported, and read the third time and passed, on a division.

DISPUTED TERRITORY BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 144) respecting the Territory in dispute between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Bill now before us, providing as it does for a reference of all matters connected with the territory in dispute between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario, to the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council, and binding the Dominion to abide by the decision, whatever it may be, is perhaps the most important measure that has come before the House during the present Session. The high tribunal—the very highest in the Empire—to which the question is to be submitted can, I apprehend, only decide on the case as submitted, and it behoves the Government of the Dominion to see that it is properly submitted. The Government of Ontario has, for the last eight years, had the ablest counsel to be found engaged in getting up a case for their Province. Volume after volume has been produced until now they have no less than five volumes of arguments and documents upholding their views, together with the most elaborate and carefully prepared maps in readiness to submit, while the Government of the Dominion, in so far as I know, have nothing of any consequence to meet these documents with, except the report of the Select Committee of this House appointed in the Session of 1880 to enquire into all matters connected with the disputed boundaries. That report contains a great deal of valuable information, no doubt, but it is not in a form to render it easily understood, for it was sent to the printers in rather a disconnected shape, at the very close of the Session, when the Committee had no opportunity of supervising its publication, and the documents in the appendix—many of them very valuable—are huddled together in rather a disconnected way, without even so much as an index. Moreover, maps are quite as necessary as written documents to elucidate and explain the different phases of the dispute, and of these there is not so much as one accompanying the report, so that as matters now stand, Ontario will have a great advantage. In view of all the circumstances, I think it would be well that the reference should be postponed to allow time to arrange documents and

prepare maps so as to meet Ontario on equal terms. And yet the case seems simple enough in itself, and it really is so; but it has been so overwhelmed with writings of all kinds and irrelevant documents, that it must take even the learned and accomplished members of the Judicial Committee a considerable length of time to become thoroughly familiar with it in all its bearings. I may say that I was Chairman of the Select Committee of 1880, appointed to investigate this matter, and that a large part of the territory in dispute is within the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and it was my duty to study this matter in all its details. I trust, therefore, that although the Session is so near its close, hon. members will bear with me while I touch, in the briefest manner possible, on the leading facts regarding the northern boundary, which is the chief question in dispute. It will be within the knowledge of many members of this House that the three eminent judges, who were called before the Committee to which I have referred, gave it as their opinion that in defining the northern boundary of Ontario, we must go back to the Act of 1774, commonly known as the Quebec Act. They smiled at the idea of commissions to Governors, or even proclamations being made to supersede, annul or override an Act of the Imperial Parliament, and in this view their opinions were the same as those expressed by the eminent judges who decided the deReinhard case, in 1818. With the leave of the House, I will read the clause of the Act of 1774, defining the boundaries of Quebec, as enlarged by that Act:

"That all the territories, islands and countries in North America, belonging to the Crown of Great Britain, bounded on the south by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the high lands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence, from those which fall into the sea, to a point in forty-five degrees northern latitude, on the eastern bank of the River Connecticut, keeping the same latitude, directly west, through the Lake Champlain, until, in the same latitude, its meets the River St. Lawrence; from thence up the eastern bank of the said river to the Lake Ontario; thence through the Lake Ontario and the river commonly called Niagara; and thence along by the eastern and south-eastern bank of Lake Erie, following the said bank until the same shall be intersected by the northern boundary granted by the charter of the Province of Pennsylvania, in case the same shall be so intersected; and from thence along the said northern and western boundaries of the said Province, until the said western boundary strikes the Ohio; but in case the said bank of the said lake shall not be found to be so intersected, then following the said bank until it shall arrive at that point of the said bank which shall be nearest to the north-western angle of the said Province of Pennsylvania; and thence, by a right line, to the said north-western angle of the said Province; and thence along the western boundary of the said Province until it strikes the River Ohio; and along the bank of the said river, westward, to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England, trading to Hudson's Bay; and also all such territories, islands and countries, which have since the tenth day of February, one thousand seven hundred and sixty-three, been made part of the Government of Newfoundland, be, and they are hereby, during His Majesty's pleasure, annexed to, and made part and parcel of the Province of Quebec as created and established by the said Royal Proclamation of the seventh day of October, one thousand seven hundred and sixty-three."

Surely that is clear and emphatic enough and there can be no doubt as to the northern boundary of Ontario, providing it can be shown what line Parliament had in view or meant as the southern boundary of "the territories of the Merchants Adventurers of England, trading to Hudson's Bay. Where was that boundary recognized to be at the time the Act was passed? That is the question, and after very long and careful study of the matter, I have no hesitation whatever in saying it was the height of land or southern summit of the Hudson's Bay watershed. There was no other boundary possible, none other by which the Act can in any way be construed to refer. On reference to the Cavendish debates—a pet work with the hon. member for Bothwell, for in all his writings and speeches he is sure to quote from it—it will be seen that when the Act came down from the House of Lords, where it originated, and was under discussion in the Commons, the description of the boundary line was very closely debated in all its bearings, except in so far as it related to the southern boundary of the Merchant Adventurers territories; and why was this? Simply because it was a well-recognized boundary beyond cavil or dispute; because it was a natural boundary, a watershed separating the great river systems of the St. Lawrence and Mississippi from that of Hudson's Bay. It matters not, to my argument, whether the Hudson's Bay Company's claims were good or the reverse. All the volumes that have been written against the validity of their charter and in relation to the French occupation are, in this view, of no account. If the Act is to hold good, the question simply is, where was the boundary meant and indicated by that Act; and I shall, by what I conceive to be the most irrefragible evidence, endeavour to show that the height of land was that boundary, and here it is. In the same year that the Act was passed, a commission was issued to the Governor-General, Sir Guy Carleton, bearing date 27th September, 1774, and it is as follows [Page xiii, Boundary Report]:

"And further know you, that we, reposing especial trust and confidence in the prudence, courage and loyalty of you, the said Guy Carleton, of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have thought fit to constitute and appoint you, the said Guy Carleton, to be our Captain General and Governor in Chief in and over our Province of Quebec, in America, comprehending all our territories, islands and countries in North America, bounded on the south by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the high lands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the River St Lawrence from those which fall into the sea, to a point in forty-five degrees of northern latitude, on the eastern bank of the River Connecticut, keeping the same latitude directly west, through the Lake Champlain, until in the same latitude it meets with the River St. Lawrence; from thence up the eastern bank of the said river to the Lake Ontario, thence through the Lake Ontario, and the river commonly called Niagara, and thence along by the eastern and south-eastern bank of Lake Erie, following the said bank until the same shall be intersected by the northern boundary granted by the charter of the Province of Pennsylvania, in case the same shall be so intersected, and from thence along the said northern and western boundaries of the said Province, until the said western boundary strikes the Ohio; but in case the bank of the said lake shall not be found so intersected, then following the said bank until it shall arrive at that point of the said bank which shall be nearest to the north-western angle of the said Province of Pennsylvania, and thence by a right line to the said north-western angle of the said Province, and thence along the western boundary of the said Province, until it strikes the River Ohio, and along the bank of the said river westward to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward along the eastern bank of the said river to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchant Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay."

This commission, issued only three months after the Act had became law, shows very clearly that while the Mississippi was regarded as the western boundary, the northern boundary of Quebec and southern boundary of the territories of the Merchant Adventurers was to be met on the Mississippi. In other words, at the head of that river, on the Hudson's Bay watershed. On 18th September, 1777, some three years afterwards, a commission, word for word the same, was issued to Sir Frederick Haldimand, then Governor General. On 8th January, 1814, Governor McDonell, of the colony of Assiniboia, in which was the Red River settlement, issued the following proclamation—(page 48 Boundary Report).

"Whereas the Governor and Company of Hudson's Bay have ceded to the Right Honorable Thomas, Earl of Selkirk, his heirs and successors, for ever, all that tract of land or territory, bounded by a line running as follows, viz: Beginning on the western shore of Lake Winnipic, at a point fifty-two degrees and thirty minutes north latitude; and thence running due west to Lake Winipigashish, otherwise called Little Winnipic; then in a southerly direction through the said lake, so as to strike its western shore in latitude fifty-two degrees; then due west to the place where the parallel of fifty-two degrees north latitude intersects the western branch of Red River, otherwise called Assiniboine; then due south from that point of intersection to *the height of land which separates the waters running into Hudson's Bay from those of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers; then in an easterly direction along the height of land to the source of the River Winnipic* (meaning by such last-named river the principal branch of the waters which unite in the Lake Saginagas); thence along the main stream of those waters and the middle of the several lakes through which they pass, to the mouth of the Winnipic River; and thence in a northerly direction through the middle of the Lake Winnipic, to the place of beginning; which territory is called Assiniboia, and of which I, the undersigned, have been duly appointed Governor.

"(Signed) MILES McDONELL."

This is valuable in showing that the height of land was a recognized boundary.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DAWSON. In 1809, one Mowat was tried and punished by the courts in Lower Canada for a crime committed some distance to the north of the height of land, under the Act 43, Geo. III., chap. 138, which gave that Province jurisdiction in the Indian territories. In 1818 the highest court in the land, in trying a person arrested for alleged crime within the Indian Territories, declared that the height of land or Hudson's Bay watershed was the northern boundary of Upper Canada. In 1859, Rupert's Land was formed into a bishopric, and letters patent were issued by Her Majesty the Queen, in which the bishopric is described as covering all the territories granted to the Hudson's Bay Company, and the bishops of that diocese have ever since exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction up to the height of land, as will be seen on reference to the Bishop of Ruperts Land's statement, page 145, Boundary Committees' Report. In 1850, the Government of Canada entered into a treaty with the Lake Superior Indians, the preamble of which runs thus—(page, 85, 86 Boundary):

"LAKE SUPERIOR TREATY, 1850.

"This agreement, made and entered into on the seventh day of September, in the year of Our Lord, 1850, at Sault Sainte Marie, in the Province of Canada, between the Honorable William Benjamin Robinson, of the one part, on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen, and Joseph Peaudechat, John Ininway, Mishemuckqua, Totomenai, Chiefs, and Jacob Wasseba, Ahmuchwagabon, Michel Shebagesbick, Manitoshainse and Chigenaus, principal men of the Ogibbeway Indians inhabiting the northern shore of Lake Superior, in the said Province of Canada, from Batchewanaung Bay to Pigeon River, at the western extremity of said lake, and inland throughout that extent to the height of land *which separates the territory covered by the charter of the Honourable the Hudson's Bay Company from the said tract*, and also, the islands in the said lake within the boundaries of the British possessions therein, of the other part."

Here we have an unbroken chain of evidence showing, if it does nothing more, that the height of land was a recognized boundary for at least a period of seventy-six years, or from the year in which the Quebec Act was passed (1774) up to 1850. But the boundary was never seriously disputed by Canada until 1857, so that for a period of upwards of eighty years the height of land, or Hudson's Bay watershed, appears to have been a recognized and accepted boundary. No matter what the claims or titles of the Hudson's Bay Company may actually have been, it is enough for my argument to show that the southern boundary of the territories of the Merchant Adventurers trading into Hudson's Bay, as referred to in the Act of 1774, could have been no other than the summit of the watershed of Hudson's Bay. No matter what the claims of Canada were, here was a natural boundary, and it is clear, to my mind, that no other boundary could have been, or was intended by the framers of the Act, because there was, in those days, no other boundary which they could have had in view, none other so clear and obvious that the description in the Act could have pointed to. The Act of 1774 therefore made the height of land the boundary on the north of the enlarged Province of Quebec, and when that Province was divided into the two Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada by the constitutional Act of 1791, it continued to be the northern boundary, for that Act neither added to nor took from the area of the former Province of Quebec, or at least that part of it which remained to Great Britain after the war of independence, but simply divided the Province in two. That Canada had a fair claim to territories extending far to the north and west of the old Province of Quebec, as constituted by the proclamation of 1763 and enlarged by the Act of 1774, I am not prepared to dispute. But had that claim been made good, which it never was, these territories would not have formed part of Upper Canada. They would have belonged to Canada and would have been as much the property of Lower as of Upper Canada. New Provinces might have been carved out of them, but they could not, without a new Imperial Act, have been made part of Upper Canada. Much has been said about the intention of Parliament in passing the Quebec Act and the debate in the House of Commons, as reported by Sir Henry Cavendish, has been twisted in every possible way. It has been claimed that that intention was to embrace the whole of French Canada in the Province of Quebec, but there is really nothing to support this contention. The Act is very clear and precise in its wording, as regards the boundaries, and far from its having been the intention of the Government of that day to include all Canada, Attorney-General Thurlow stated most emphatically, on the part of the Government, that there was no such intention, he said, page 26, Cavendish *Debates:*

"It is undoubtedly true, if you read the French history, that the bounds prescribed neither are nor ever were the bounds of the Province of Canada, as stated by the French; and therefore the argument itself is not a proper one to proceed upon"

He says also, page 25, Cavendish *Debates:*

"Now the House will remember that the whole of Canada as we allowed it to extend, was not included in the proclamation, that the bounds were not co-equal with it as it stood then, and that it is not included in the present Act of Parliament."

Surely this ought to be conclusive, as to the intentions of Parliament. But the Attorne-yGeneral of Ontario has based his argument in great part on commissions to Governors and in his pleading before the arbitrators, claimed that they were as much law as the Act of 1774 itself. In a former discussion in this House I endeavoured to show where these commissions would land the western boundary of Ontario, and the Attorney-General of that Province has not since mentioned them. If commissions are to be taken at all, the later ones must govern, for they are of equal authority with the earlier ones. The seven last commissions, commencing with that to Lord Durham, in 1838, bring the western boundary of Upper Canada only to the entrance of Lake Superior, and if they are to hold good, as the Hon. Mr. Mowat claims for all the commissions, then, according to his view, his western boundary must be found at the lower end of Lake Superior. Up to 1838, the only commission that carried the boundaries of Upper Canada into the Hudson's Bay watershed was that of 1786, to Sir Guy Carleton (afterwards Lord Dorchester). This commission followed the wording of the Treaty of 1783, with the United States, but it was never repeated and in 1791, on the passing of the Constitutional Act, it was cancelled and revoked in the most absolute way, as will be seen by this extract:

"COMMISSION.

"12TH SEPTEMBER, 1791.

"GUY, LORD DORCHESTER—*Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada.*

"GREETING:

"Whereas, we did by Our Letters Patent, under Our Great Seal of Great Britain, bearing date the twenty-second day of April, in the twenty-sixth year of Our Reign, constitute and appoint you, Guy, Lord Dorchester (then Sir Guy Carleton), to be Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over Our Province of Quebec in America, comprehending all Our Territories, Islands and Countries in North America, then bounded as in Our said recited Letters Patent was mentioned and expressed.

"*Now Know Ye, that We have revoked, determined, and by these presents do revoke and determine, the said recited Letters Patent, and every clause, article or thing therein contained.*

"And whereas, We have thought fit by Our Order, made in Our Privy Council on the nineteenth day of August, one thousand seven hundred hundred and ninety-one, to devide Our said Province of Quebec into two separate Provinces, to be called the Province of Upper Canada and the Province of Lower Canada, by a line to commence at a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis, at the Cove west of the Pointe au Baudet, in the limit between the Township of Lancaster and the Seigneurie of New Longueuil, running along the said limit to the

direction of north thirty-four degrees west of the westernmost angle of the said Seigneurie of New Longueuil; thence along the north-western boundary of the Seigneurie Vaudreuil, running north twenty-five degrees east, until it strikes the Ottawas River, to ascend the said river into the Lake Temiscaming, and from the head of the said lake by a line drawn due north until it strikes the boundary line of Hudson's Bay; *the Province of Upper Canada to comprehend all such lands, territories and islands lying to the westward of the said line of division, as were part of Our said Province of Quebec*, and the Province of Lower Canada to comprehend all such lands, territories and islands lying to the eastward of the said line of division, as were part of Our said Province of Quebec." (Page 21 Boundary Committee's Report.)

Yet it was this commission, thus emphatically revoked, that seems to have given rise to most of the difficulties surrounding this question. Many years ago, the Hon. William McDougall, when employed as counsel by the Government of Ontario, based an argument, written in his usual clever style, on the commission of 1786, claiming the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods as the western and northern limit of Ontario. He was not aware, at that time, that he had rested his argument on a revoked commission. Nevertheless, it was on his judgment, I believe, that the arbitrators, in some measure, based their award. Mr. McDougall has recently revoked his former opinion in a published document, in which the following passage occurs:

"The Dominion Government maintain, and a court of law has decided, that the legal boundary of the Province of Ontario on the west, 'is a line drawn due north from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers.' Therefore, neither Prince Arthur's Landing, nor the settlements between that place and Rat Portage can be legally included in a writ issued for the election of a member for 'the electoral district of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario,"

The Government of Ontario will, from this, be able to judge of the value which should attach to the opinions of their paid advocates. A great deal of importance has been given to General Alured Clark's proclamation by the advocates of Ontario's claims, but as it is published, it is absolutely without meaning, probably arising from a clerical error, and it was in contravention of the instructions to his superior officer, Lord Dorchester, which I shall quote from the Boundary Committee's Report:

"Extract from His Majesty's instructions to His Excellency Lord Dorchester, dated at St. James', the 16th September, 1791, viz.:

"1st. With these Our instructions, you will receive Our Commission under Our Great Seal of Great Britain, constituting you Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over Our Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada, bounded as in Our said Commission is particularly expressed. In the execution, therefore, of so much of the Office and Trust we have reposed in you, as relates to Our Province of Lower Canada, you are to take upon you the Administration of the Government of the said Province, and to do and execute all things belonging to your command, according to the several powers and authorities of Our said Commission under Our Great Seal of Great Britain, and of the Act passed in the present year of Our Reign therein recited, and of these Our instructions to you and according to such further Powers and Instructions as you shall at any time hereafter receive under Our Signet and Sign Manuals or by Our Order in Our Privy Council.

"2nd. And you are with all due solemnity, before the Members of Our Executive Council, *to cause Our said Commission to be read and published*, which being done, you shall then take, and also administer to each of the Members of Our said Executive Council, the oaths mentioned in an Act passed in the first year of His late Majesty King George the First." (Boundary Committee's Report page 21).

These instructions are, I apprehend, clear enough as to what was to be proclaimed, but General Clark may have meant merely to show the extent of the country over which the jurisdiction of the Governor General extended. His proclamation covers the entire portion of Canada which had been made over by the Treaty of 1783, to the United States, and this shows its utter absurdity. The Indian territories, and the Acts of the Imperial Government respecting them, have been entirely ignored by the advocates of the claims of Ontario. These Indian territories were declared by two Imperial Acts to be beyond the limits of Lower Canada and Upper Canada, although adjoining them. In fact, the Province of Quebec, or the portion added to that Province by the Act of 1774, was carved out of the Indian territories. The Act of 1803, 43 Geo., cap. 138, gave the Province of Lower Canada jurisdiction in these Indian territories, and that jurisdiction was exercised for many years in the region immediately to the north and west of the height of land, without cavil or question on the part of Upper Canada. In 1821, the Act was extended to the Hudson's Bay Company's territories, as well as the Indian territories. Lower Canada, before that time, had the superior jurisdiction, but the Act of 1821 gave equal concurrent jurisdiction to the two Provinces. That the country immediately to the north and west of the height of land, at Lake Superior, was Indian territory clearly shown by Governor General Sherbrooke's proclamation, which was a proclamation carefully prepared in England. I shall read it (page 147 Boundary Report):

"By His Excellency SIR JOHN COAPE SHERBROOKE, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honorable Military Order of the Bath, Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over the Provinces of Lower Canada, Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and their several Dependencies, Vice-Admiral of the same, Lieutenant-General and Commander of all His Majesty's Forces in the said Provinces of Lower Canada and Upper Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and their several Dependencies, and in the Islands of Newfoundland, Prince Edward, Cape Breton and Bermuda, &c, &c.

"A PROCLAMATION.

"Whereas, in and by a certain Statute of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, made and passed in the forty-third year of His Majesty's Reign, intituled: 'An Act for extending the Jurisdiction of the Courts of Justice in the Provinces of Lower Canada and Upper Canada to the trial and punishment of persons guilty of crimes and offences within certain parts of North America, adjoining the said Provinces,' it is amongst other things enacted and declared that from and after the passing of the said Statute, 'All offences committed within any of the Indian territories or parts of America, not within the limits of either of the said Provinces of Lower or Upper Canada, or of any Civil Government of the United States of America, shall and be deemed to be offences of the same nature, and shall be tried in the same manner and subject to the same punishment as if the same had been committed within the Provinces of Lower or Upper Canada.'

"And whereas, under and by virtue of the above in part recited Statute, *Justices of the Peace have been duly nominated* and appointed, with power and authority to apprehend within the Indian territories aforesaid, and to convey to this Province of Lower Canada for trial, all and every person and persons guilty of any crime or offence whatever:

"And whereas, there is reason to believe that divers breaches of the peace, by acts of force and violence, have lately been committed within the aforesaid Indian territories, and jurisdiction of the aforesaid Justices of the Peace:

"I have therefor thought fit, and by and with the advice of His Majesty's Executive Council, of and for the Province of Lower Canada, to issue this Proclamation, for the purpose of bringing to punishment all persons who may have been or shall be guilty of any such act or acts of force or violence as aforesaid, and other offence whatever, and to deter all others from following their pernicious example, thereby requiring all His Majesty's subjects and others within the said Indian territories, to avoid and discourage all acts of force and violence whatsoever, and all proceedings whatever tending to produce tumult and riots, or in any way to disturb the public peace.

"And I do hereby strictly charge and command all *Justices of the* Peace as aforesaid, nominated and appointed under and by virtue of the above mentioned Statute, and all Magistrates throughout this Province, and do require all others of His Majesty's subjects generally in their respective stations, to make diligent enquiry and search to discover, apprehend and commit, or cause to be committed to the lawful custody for trial, in due course of Law, pursuant to the provision in the above-mentioned Statute contained, all persons who have been, or shall be guilty of any act or acts of force or violence as aforesaid, or of any other crime or crimes, offence or offences, within the said Indian territories, to the end that the laws may be carried into prompt execution, against all such offenders, for the preservation of peace and good order therein.

"Given under my Hand and Seal at Arms, at the Castle of St. Lewis, in the City of Quebec, in the said Province of Lower Canada, this Sixteenth Day of July, in the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Sixteen, and in the Forty-sixth Year of His Majesty's Reign.

J. C. SHERBROOKE.

"By His Excellency's Command.

"JOHN TAYLOR,

"*Deputy Secretary.*"

Two Commissioners were sent up at the time this proclamation was issued, to investigate and report on the disturbances that had occurred north of the height of land, so that the region immediately north of the watershed was treated as Indian territory, and not as a part of Upper Canada. In regard to the award, I shall say nothing further than that, with the best intentions, the arbitrators made a mistake.

Having passed the height of land, they could find no northern boundary, as one of them (Sir Francis Hincks) has since admitted, and proceeded to make one. The order of reference gave them no power to do this, and a condition of the award was, that it should be accepted by the Dominion Parliament. It has never been so accepted, but, on the contrary, rejected. It would be easy to show how far they erred, as I have done on former occasions in this House. In adopting the Albany boundary, they ignored the tenth article of the Treaty of Utrecht, and the Hudson's Bay Company's long and uninterrupted possession, and in adopting the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, on the west, they ignored the Act of 1774, and made a cancelled and revoked commission to a Governor override it. They ignored, moreover, the old colony of Assiniboia, which had clearly defined boundaries, and had been recognized by the Imperial Government as a colony quite distinct from Upper Canada. I shall detain the House only a short time longer, in referring to the western boundary. My own opinion is, that the Mississippi was intended by the framers of the Act of 1774, but if Parliament used, as it did, the word "northward" instead of Mississippi, then the word "northward" must stand and the position of the western boundary must depend on the interpretation to be given to that word. The experts examined before the Select Committtee, of 1880, gave it as their opinion that it could not be interpreted otherwise than to mean due north. One of these experts was Mr. Lindsay Russell, Surveyor-General of the Dominion, a gentleman whose high character and high attainments should give weight to his opinion. He is at the very head of his profession, has been long accustomed to giving instructions to land surveyors and is perhaps the most accomplished astronomer in the Dominion. He gave his opinion very clearly, in these words:

"TUESDAY, 2nd March, 1880.

"Mr. RUSSELL, Surveyor-General, called and examined.

"*By the Chairman:*

"17. Having regard to the Act of 1774, commonly known as the Quebec Act, and looking at the different rivers and boundary lines as set down on the map recently issued by the Government of Ontario, entitled 'Map of part of North America, designed to illustrate the official reports and discussions relating to the boundaries of the Province of Ontario,' where would you consider the western boundary of the Province of Quebec, as constituted by that Act, to have been?

"In interpreting the clause of the Quebec Act, which describes the boundary, I consider that there are two points of view from which the subject may be treated: first, what the describer intended to do; second, what he has actually done.

"From the limited number of possibilities in this case, to select that intention which is the most probable, is a matter of judgment; what has been done in the description is a matter of fact.

"The effect of the description is to make the western boundary of Ontario a line due north from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

"The word 'northward,' though seemingly lacking in precision, is not really indefinite, and admits of no choice in its interpretation; for, corresponding to the assumption of any direction to one side of north, there is an equal and opposite possibility on the other side thereof, and the two are mutually destructive. Therefore, by exhaustive process, 'northward,' taken by itself, that is, without any conditioning or qualifying word or phrase, can mean nothing else than *north*. In the description under consideration, it stands unconditioned and unqualified.

"If I were asked my opinion as to the intention of the describer, to affirm what he intended to do, not what he has done, I should still say that he meant due *north*.

"When it is a question of his intent, I consider that, in endeavouring to interpret any certain word or expression used by him, due regard should be had to his own phraseology and use of words in the rest of the description; further, to the greater or less precision of thought, indicated throughout in his dealing with the vast circumstances and conditions of the boundary described.

"Had it been his intention to define the boundary as extending northward along the banks of the Mississippi, that idea, I have no doubt, would have been clearly conveyed, for in the several instances occurring previously in the description, where the same condition had to be expressed, there is no mistiness of definition. For example, he uses the words 'thence along the eastern and south-eastern boundary of Lake Erie.' Again, the words 'following the same bank;' further on, immediately before using the word 'northward,' on the application of which so much turns, he employs, when speaking of the Ohio, the expression, 'along the bank of the said river, westward;' this last affirmation being one to express a similar condition, with but a difference of direction, to that which would have obtained had he intended to say, 'along the bank of the Mississippi northward.'

'That he should, in one sentence, so clearly state the special condition under which the boundary was to go 'westward,' and in the very next sentence, while intending to define an equally restrictive and equally important similar condition, should omit to use the least word or phrase to specify how the same boundary was to proceed 'northward,' I cannot conceive. I am, therefore, obliged to hold that by northward he meant north." (Page 11, Boundary Report.)

There is, however, a decision of the highest court existing in Canada, in 1818, and I may as well read it also:

"FRIDAY, 29th MAY, 1818.

"Chief Justice Sewell.—The Court are most distinctly of opinion, on referring both to the Act of 1791 and that of 1774, that the argument on the defence must fail. What was the object of each Act? Amongst others, that of 1774 was to enlarge the Province of Quebec, which had been created in 1763. That of 1791 was to separate or divide the Province of Quebec into two Provinces, to be denominated Upper and Lower Canada, and make each respectively independent of the other, by giving a Legislature to each respectively, but still retaining between or within the two Provinces, the same extent of country, the same space as the one Province contained. What is the Act? What is its object, its avowed object? To repeal certain parts of the Act of 1774; and what is the part repealed? It is that part of it which gives authority to the Council of the Province of Quebec; and what is the reason assigned for so doing? Why, that His Majesty had signified it to be his Royal will and pleasure to divide his Province of Quebec. To assert that he intended by this that the limits of the Province should be extended by the separation, appears to me repugnant to the plainest principles of common sense, and therefore I cannot assent to it. The short history of the Act of 1791 is briefly this: The King signifies to Parliament his Royal intention of dividing his Province of Quebec, and he calls on the Legislature to provide for this alteration by granting an Act adapted to the change. The Legislature pass an Act providing for the due government of the two Provinces, and under the authority of this Act, and the Royal Proclamation, the Province of Quebec was accordingly divided, the Royal Proclamation being an exercise of Sovereign authority. His Majesty in that Act, by and with the consent of his Privy Council, declared what should be the line of separation between Upper and Lower Canada, and how much of the former Province of Quebec shall belong to the one, how much to the other. The object of the Act and the object of the Royal Proclamation are so clearly expressed that we cannot for a moment doubt upon the subject. What says the Act? His Majesty having been pleased to signify his Royal will and pleasure to separate and divide the Province of Quebec. What says the Proclamation? Why, the very same words. To divide the Province of Quebec, not to add to it, any more than to take away from it. Therefore, Upper Canada, in the purview, could include only that part of the Province so divided as was not contained in Lower Canada; but it could not extend beyond these limits which constituted the Province of Quebec, otherwise it would certainly have been an Act to enlarge, rather than an Act to divided. In delivering this opinion I am speaking our unanimous sentiment, for we have consulted our brother Perrault upon the subject, and he clearly concurs with us. According to our understanding of the Act and the Royal Proclamation, we are bound to say that we consider the argument of the gentlemen concerned for the prisoner, though presented with great ability and ingenuity, must fail, because the western boundary of the Province of Upper Canada is 'a line drawn due north from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, till it strikes the boundary territory line of Hudson's Bay.'

"The question of fact will remain with the jury. It is they who are to say, whether this place, the Dalles, is or is not to the west of the line which we now declare to be the western boundary of His Majesty's Province of Upper Canada. If they are of opinion that it is within, or to the east of this western line, then it is in the Province of Uppper Canada and not within our jurisdiction; but, if they are of opinion that it is to the west of this line, then I am giving you our unanimous opinion, when I declare that the Dalles are in the Indian territory, and not within the limits of the Province of Upper or Lower Canada, but clearly within the jurisdiction of this court, by the Act of the 43rd of the King, chapter 138, which extends our power to 'the trial and punishment of persons guilty of offences within certain parts of North America.'"

I shall conclude by saying that the result of all enquiry and investigation is to bring us back to the Act of 1774. Within the four corners of that Act must be found the boundaries of the enlarged Province of Quebec, and consequently of Upper Canada, which was carved out of the Province of Quebec. In further reference to the award, I may say that, the Government of Ontario has practically thrown it aside and shown its willingness to re-open the whole question, perhaps in the hope of getting a still larger slice of Dominion territory, for the Attorney-General of Ontario has inserted, in the joint case, drawn up between himself and Attorney-General Miller, of the Province of Manitoba this clause;—

"The Province of Ontario claims that the westerly boundary of that Province is either the meridian of the most north-westerly angle of the Lake of the Woods, *or is a line west of that point.*"

This is really setting aside the award and re-opening the whole case, and I believe the whole case should and must be re-opened, but I hardly expected that the suggestion should come from the Attorney-General of Ontario. It might rather astonish hon. members if they should awaken some fine morning to find that the whole of the North-West Territories had been decided to be in Ontario. It is quite within the range of possibibity that such a decision should be given, for once admit that Ontario has any territorial rights north of the height of land there is really nothing to stop her, short of the slopes of the Rocky Mountains. Cross the great natural boundary of the height of land and you cannot logically stop short of the sources of the Saskatchewan.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the First Minister what are the provisions of this question between Ontario and the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe a case is being agreed upon between Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson. I do not know that the case has been finally settled yet, but it will be conclusive, as far as Ontario and the Dominion are concerned.

Mr. MILLS. Has that settlement reached such a point that the hon. gentleman is able to tell us, in general terms, what it is? Is the question to be raised as to the limits between Ontario and the Dominion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so, but I cannot speak positively.

Bill read the third time and passed.

INSOLVENT BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES, &c.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 145) further to amend the Act 45 Vic., chap. 23, intituled: An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies, and Trading Corporations. He said: This is a Bill from the Senate. The first section amends the first section of the Act passed in 45 Vic. The only amendment made to this section is the omission of the words, "either under a general Act or a special Act," in the fourth line of the section. The words are omitted to give the section a larger scope, and especially to cover the case of a company being wound up in any manner, such as by order of the Court of Chancery. In sections 2 and 3, where the original Act applied to companies which at the time of the passing of that Act were insolvent, or in the process of being wound up, no procedure was provided, whereby effect could be given to that provision, and in the Bill it is intended to provide for the omission. Section 4 simply makes a verbal change. Of course it is the court that appoints the liquidators and we insert the words, "the court, in making the winding up order, must appoint a liquidator." Section 5 places the liquidators in the same position as the liquidators of the companies. Section 6 makes two changes in the existing law. First, it provides not only that there shall be a meeting of the shareholders to consider the question as to who shall be nominated as liquidator, but there shall be also a meeting of the creditors for the same purpose. Recent proceedings in Montreal show the necessity for this provision. Second, a judge shall not be bound to accept the recommendation of the majority of the shareholders, but he may select from all those nominated such persons as he may think best fitted for the office of liquidators. Those are the alterations in the law.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Do I understand aright, that a demand may be made against a perfectly solvent corporation to wind up? The first section seems to indicate that. The former Act was wholly for insolvent companies, and I don't think it is advisable that this should be made applicable to solvent companies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Act applies to incorporated banks, including savings banks, and to insurance companies, and loan companies, for borrowing purposes, and to incorporated trading companies, which are insolvent or in process of being wound up. It is only with reference to corporations insolvent or in process of being wound up.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But a perfectly solvent company is in process of being wound up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not if they are doing business.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I mean that solvent companies are every day winding up their affairs. It seems application can be made to any one of these.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause is exactly the same as in the old Act of 1882, except that it leaves out the words, "either under a general or a special Act." Action under this Bill can only be taken where the company which is to be wound up is actually insolvent.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

TRANSFER OF PRISONERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 151) to authorize the transfer of prisoners from one gaol to another, in certain cases. He said: The Bill is simply intended to add, after the words "the Governor General in Council," the words, "or the Lieutenant-Governor of any of the Provinces," in the Statute 31 Victoria. It appears that at present there is no law to provide for the removal of prisoners from one county gaol to another, and as this belongs to the criminal law, and as a request has been made by the Attorney General of Ontario to the Minister of Justice here, that such a change should be made, we have thought proper to introduce this Bill.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

Bill (No. 154), to re-adjust the yearly subsidies to be allowed by Canada to the several Provinces now included in the Dominion.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill (No. 156), to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain moneys required for the Public Service.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions from Committee of Supply read the second time and concurred in.

On Resolution 360,

Canadian Pacific Railway.

Amount awarded to Contractors on Section B... $395,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before this Resolution is concurred in, I desire to say a few words to explain the reasons why I think it is inexpedient that this vote should be concurred in, or indeed should have appeared in the

Estimates. Last year, the Minister of Railways, as reported in *Hansard*, declared that as far as he could judge, and as far as the engineers could judge, there was nothing properly due by the Government to these contractors on this particular contract. He certainly declared that no such sum as this, in his judgment, was due. That, however, is only one of the reasons which appears to me to render it inexpedient that this vote should be concurred in. I doubt exceedingly whether this was a case for arbitration at all. It appears to me that of all the cases which have come before us, this was a case which ought to have been dealt with by the Exchequer Court, and it was an unfortunate thing, in the interest of this country, that it was referred to arbitrators. Then, I call the attention of the House to the fact that we have only had the information connected with this large amount of money put before us at an exceedingly late period of the Session, when it has been a matter of extreme difficulty for the members to acquaint themselves either with the ground on which the arbitrators proceeded, or indeed with even the ordinary terms of the submission. Now, Sir, there are circumstances, on which I will not enlarge to-night, connected with the gentlemen who are to receive this award, and connected with their alleged relation with the Government of this country, which make it particularly necessary that care should be taken to see that the rights of the Dominion in the matter of this award are carefully attended to. The Minister of Railways did not deny last night, nor did I understand him to approve of the fact, if it was, as I believe, a fact, that the press were excluded from hearing the evidence which was tendered to the Commissioners, or the discussions which took place before them. It was unfortunate that these proceedings were not conducted with the fullest publicity. As I have already taken occasion to observe, many things have been said with reference to the concessions of the Government to these contractors, and as the hon. Minister well knows, proceedings were taken against a certain influential newspaper in this country, by one of the gentlemen who, if I am correctly informed, is to receive this large sum of money; but although these proceedings were taken, and although there was, in my opinion, very good ground indeed for proceedings being taken, if the allegations made, not merely against the person himself but against the Government, were correct, still those proceedings were abandoned. Under all these circumstances, I think it is not expedient this vote should be pressed; I think we should have had full opportunity to have informed ourselves as to all the facts, so far as they are in the possession of the Government, which led the arbitrators to give this award. Then, too, the Minister himself expressed his opinion that it would be right and proper that this award should not be acted upon, but that this matter should be carried, as I think it ought to have been, in the first instance, to the courts, who would pronounce upon the question whether those persons were or were not entitled to receive $395,000 from us. I feel we ought not at present be called upon to concur; I think this matter should stand over, and I think it might very well stand over for another Session; and then, after fully examining and looking into the matter, we might reasonably be asked to vote whatever sum might then appear proper, particularly if the hon. gentleman's intention is carried out and this matter is appealed to a higher court. As the matter stands, and as I am at present informed, I must, for my own part, refuse to concur in the Resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman commenced by saying that he doubted if this was a case for arbitration. I think he overlooked the statement I made to the House last night, as to the circumstances under which the Government agreed to give this arbitration. A contract was made, a very large and important contract, amounting, at the contract prices, to over $4,000,000, for the construction of 65 miles of very difficult and almost inaccessible work, in the part of the country lying between Lake Superior and the Red River. It was impossible to make available the very large sum of public money that had been expended in constructing the intervening portions of the line; that expenditure would be of no use whatever until this link was put in, and the Government attached the very greatest importance to having that line of communication open at the very earliest possible date. The engineers of the Department, Mr. Fleming, in the first instance, and Mr. Schrieber, who was acting at the time under Mr. Fleming, concurred in the view, a considerable period after this contract was made, that it would be quite impracticable to open that road by the time specified in the contract; that, in fact, at least another year would be consumed, unless a very radical change were made in important structures on the line; that unless we abandoned the intention of having the lakes filled to the water level with a solid rock embankment, and resorted to the easier, less expensive and more practicable mode of getting the road quickly constructed, by substituting piling for this rock embankment, in considerable sections of this road, it would be quite impossible to accomplish the opening of that line without adding another year to the period. The Government considered that a matter of the gravest importance in regard to the progress of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to our communications with the North-West, independently altogether of the great loss it would be to the country to have the entire capital locked up, some $10,000,000, until this road could be made useful by having this link put in. The contractors refused to proceed with the work when this change was made which they declared to be, to use their own language, a revolutionary change in the contract. They demanded that we should pay them for the work they had done and allow them to abandon the contract, because they said it was not the contract they had taken, but another and different contract which had been substituted for it. They claimed we had substituted a class of work on which they would receive comparatively no profit for that portion of the work which, in taking the contract, they regarded as profitable, and upon the execution of which they relied for the profit in their contract—in fact for making their contract practicable at all. In this state of the case, we were in this position: either we must abandon opening that road for another year, we must resort to the mode contemplated when the contract was made, which would involve a much greater expense to the country than the new proposed arrangement by which, through the intervention of piling, we would obtain the accomplishment of the work at a much earlier period, or we must relet the contract at probably a large additional cost to the country and, as I said before, in any case, involving the loss of a year. It was under those circumstances that the Government came to the conclusion to secure the prompt progress of that work, and the opening of it at the time stated in the contract, by giving them an arbitration. They said—and it was not an unreasonable statement: What we ask is this: we have been prevented from having access to this work by the delay which has taken place in the opening of Contract 15; we were led to suppose, we did suppose, when we took our contract, that we would have access, at a much earlier period; we were put to immense loss and inconvenience in regard to that, and we claim heavy damages for the increased costs which have been involved in carrying on our contract, over and above what we had reason to suppose would be involved at the time we took it; we say, in the next place, you have so completely changed the character of the contract as to make what was a fair and reasonable contract one which must involve us in ruinous loss; and we therefore, under those circumstances, refuse to go on unless you submit our claims, as to the loss we have sustained and

the extra cost involved, in consequence of not giving us access to our work by the completion of Section 15, at the time we were led to suppose it would be completed, and consequently to the destruction of a profitable portion of the contract, by changing the item from rock borrowing, on which we relied as the main element of carrying our contract to a successful completement, for one that sweeps all that away. Under these circumstances, the Government agreed not to pay them anything outside of their contract, because we did not recognize; as Head of the Department I denied their right to claim on either ground. I said I recognized the fact that it was quite true that the earlier completion of Section 15 would have saved them a very large sum of money, but I said that was a contingency we had not guaranteed, and therefore I did not consider that we were bound to make good the damage. I said, in the next place, that under the contract I considered the Department were perfectly at liberty to make such changes as they considered in the interest of the public, in carrying out the contract. We therefore joined issue with them on both those points, but in order to secure the prompt construction of the work, and in order to prevent the great loss to the country of having to do without that work for a year longer and the loss of the money which had been put into the other sections of the work for another year, the Government agreed that, on the completion of the work, these two questions in dispute should be submitted to an independent arbitration, composed of an arbitrator selected by the Government on the one side, of an arbitrator selected by the contractors on the other, and that, in case they could not agree upon a third, he should be selected by a judge of the Supreme Court. I think the House will agree with me that, whatever view may be taken as to the character of that award, the position in which the Government were placed and the immense interests that were at stake perfectly justified us in referring a question of that kind to an independent arbiratment, as it would be between any two individuals or between any company and any contractor. In the next place, the hon. gentleman has referred to the alleged relations of these contractors with the Government. I will say, in the most distinct and emphatic terms, that the only relation I have had with these contractors—and I represented the Government in relation to them—is that, from the first day on which they signed the contract down to the time when it was closed, they were complaining of me as administering not only scant justice, but as doing them the grossest injustice. It was against the action of the Chief Engineer and of the Department that they have been complaining and contending from the first, and the Government, in allowing this arbitration, allowed it for the purpose of enabling them to substantiate such claims as they alleged they had pressed ineffectually and uselessly upon the Minister and upon the Chief Engineer. I need not, I think, say more than that on the subject, for the very fact that the arbitrators have awarded this large sum of money is the answer to every person, that they have received no favour or undue consideration at the hands of the Government, under whom they have been engaged as contractors. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the exclusion of the reporters. I said last night that I regretted myself that they had excluded the reporters. It was a matter over which the Government had no control. They had appointed the arbitrators, one of the other two was appointed by Sir Willian Ritchie, the Chief Justice, and the other by the contractors. They were all men of high character and standing and great ability—Judge Clark representing the Government, Mr. C. J. Brydges representing the contractors, and Mr. Light, the Government engineer, of Quebec, having been selected by Chief Justice Sir William Ritchie as the third arbitrator. These gentlemen, in their wisdom, decided not to admit the reporters, and to-day I communicated, indirectly—I have not seen any of them—with one of the arbitrators, to learn the ground of that exclusion, and I am furnished with the following:—

"At one of the hearings, the arbitrators were asked whether newspaper reporters would be admitted, and they answered in the negative. The decision was by the arbitrators, on their own responsibility, and was based on the following reasons:—

"It is not usual for arbitrators to holding their sittings in public as courts do, or to admit anyone beyond those taking part in the proceedings. They have no Ministerial officers to preserve order; they could not insist that a newspaper reporter should publish the whole of their proceedings, nor that he should correct any error in his account of them. Whether right or wrong, in their opinion, they believed that the public interest would be best served by not permitting their proceedings to be published, only so far as might suit the views of any individual reporter, and that is what was virtually requested.

"Messrs. A. & G. Holland, the well-known reporters to the Senate, were engaged to record, in short-hand, accurately and fully, all the evidence *pro* and *con*, and they are officially responsible for its correctness. If at any time it should be considered desirable in the public interest to learn accurately all that took place, these gentlemen can produce their record, and be examined as to its truthfulness, which must give a more complete and reliable view of the proceedings than any partial report by newspapers."

These are the reasons I am furnished with by these gentlemen, as the ground upon which they decided not to admit the presence of reporters.

Mr. DAVIES. Whom did the hon. gentleman say that letter was from?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That letter is signed by Judge Clark, the only one of the arbitrators who, I believe, is in town. The hon. gentleman says it is not proposed that this shall necessarily be acted upon, but that it shall be carried to the courts. Now, that is not strictly what I said last night. What I stated was, that this submission to these gentlemen as arbitrators, and their finding, had been placed before the House. They had found the sum due by the Government of Canada to these contractors of $195,600, and that award had been sent to me by the Minister of Justice. When I say, by the arbitrators, I have of course already stated that the submission provided that any two arbitrators should be competent to make an award, and that award was made by Mr. Brydges, representing the contractors, and by Mr. Light, selected by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Judge Clark dissented from that award, and under these circumstances, that award has been sent to the Department of Justice, and the Government, having considered the question, arrived at the conclusion that they must ask Parliament to appropriate this sum of money which had been found by the award, but that no portion of that money would be paid until the Department of Justice has secured the opinions of the ablest counsel, whose opinions could be obtained as to whether, in the first place, it was competent to challenge the award at all, and if so, what action should be taken and how the matter should be dealt with. The Government asked the appropriation of this money, subject to the statement that I have made, that it shall be ascertained by the ablest counsel whose services the Government can command whether, in the first place, the award can be challenged, and if so, what prospect there would be, in view of the evidence and in view of the opinions of the counsel for the Crown, Messrs. Hogg and Christie, of challenging the validity of that award or the extent of the finding in the courts of justice. That, I think, covers the objections of the hon. gentleman with one exception; that is, the late period of the Session at which this is submitted. My hon. friend will bear in mind my statement, that there was a second matter separately referred to these arbitrators, and that was the question of the measurements, the question of what was termed loose rock and one or two questions of that kind, on which the Chief Engineer and the Department, on the one side, and the contractors, on the other, came to a direct and very strong issue. The Government refused to pay them except upon a certain principle. They contended that principle was not warranted by the specification and the terms

of the contract, and it was decided to refer that matter to arbitrators and to have the ablest engineers, contractors, and experts in the country brought before them and the evidence submitted for their consideration. Under that award, they found about $44,000, if I remember aright, as the balance that they were entitled to be paid, over and above what the engineer or the Department was willing to pay them It was proposed to postpone the matter for some time, owing, I believe, to its being inconvenient for Mr. Brydges to attend. I expressed, myself, a very strong opinion that they should proceed and bring this matter to a conclusion, and I did that, I may state, for the information of the hon. gentleman, on the ground that I was anxious that the whole question, and everything in relation to it, should be submitted to Parliament before it rose. All the pressure that could be brought to bear to expedite matters and bring this to a conclusion, so as to lay it before Parliament at the earliest possible moment, was brought, and, as I have said before, the whole matter has been submitted for the consideration of Parliament without any delay whatever.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood, some day last week, from the hon. gentleman that, of this award, $275,000 was given on account of the road westward not being finished, and $120,000 for damages and something else. Will the hon. gentleman now state the sub-divisions of the amount?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, on that point, that I found that a letter which had been addressed to me by Judge Clark was marked private and confidential, and I was directed to return it, on the ground that it is not competent for a dissenting arbitrator to make a separate report, where the submission is to three arbitrators, with the understanding that the finding shall be given by two arbitrators; there being no information whatever, except a bulk sum of $395,600 as their finding. The communication, as I said, being private and confidential, I am advised it is not open to me to use that information or to make any statement in regard to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But the hon. gentleman has used it and he cannot withdraw his statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not withdraw anything, but I am not able to submit the matter further.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the statement the hon. gentleman made was correct, I presume.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not in the habit of making incorrect statements.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not so sure about it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not say the hon. gentleman does it wilfully. I think we ought to have more substantial information on this matter now.

Mr. DAVIES. I think it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman, in view of all the circumstances, should press the House to an immediate decision upon this very large sum of money. With regard to the award of $44,000, which was made some time since and for which the hon. gentlemen obtained a vote, I do not understand the hon. member for South Huron to call that in question at all. The item we are now asked to concur in is the vote of $395,000 for damages, and I will venture the assertion that outside the Minister of Railways, and possibly the hon. member for East York, there is hardly a gentleman in this House, beyond the counsel who were engaged in the cause, who has any idea of what this money was awarded for, or who is able to obtain, from the papers before the House, the slightest idea of what the award was made up. That amount of $44,273, which the hon. gentleman has referred to, as I infer from the papers, was an amount awarded for specific damages, in reference to specific items, breach of contract, or changes in the contract with reference to loose rock, rock of a certain prism, or cross-logging, as they are termed. I submit to the House that we ought not to be asked to vote this large sum of money without further information. In the first place, we have not the contract brought down at all; we do not know what the contract was. In the second place, the submission to the arbitration which has been laid before the House is so vague——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will find that that contract was not only brought down, but it has been published *verbatim* in the Sessional Papers.

Mr. DAVIES. It may have been. I am speaking of the papers the hon. gentleman brought down here since he has asked the House to vote this money, which is the only information. The hon. gentleman has brought down certain papers having reference to this award; amongst these papers I find the submission, and I complain now that the submission is so loose that it is impossible to ascertain, from reading it, what was referred to the arbitrators and what was withheld from them. I ventured the assertion that no lawyer will read that submission without coming to the conclusion that it was not inartificially drawn for the purpose of raising legal disputes afterwards. It almost looks as if the gentleman who drew it out drew it for the purpose of allowing matters to be referred to the arbitrators, which no Minister of Railways would have allowed to be referred to them, had he kept them within the compass of that submission. The hon. gentleman will see that the submission, after reciting that a claim has been made by these contractors, says:

"It is agreed by and between the parties, and they do hereby agree to refer the claims of the contractors in connection with that contract, and all matters arising thereunder, to the extent mentioned, and such as provided for by the said Orders in Council, dated 28th March, 1881, and 2nd April, 1883."

So that, on the face of the submission to the arbitration, there is nothing referred, and anyone who wishes to construe what was referred to the arbitrators by this submission must go back to the Orders in Council. The hon. gentleman has not brought down those Orders in Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; only one of them has been brought down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. DAVIES. I have gone over it three or four times, and find only one; so that the limitation placed upon the submission, or key to the meaning of that, has not been supplied. Before you can understand what has been referred, you must turn to the Orders in Council. But the hon. Minister has only brought down one of the Orders in Council, that of March 28th, 1881. That merely reports to the Minister that this would be the most fair and satisfactory mode of arriving at a settlement of the question at issue, and recommends, accordingly, that authority be given for a reference of their claims to arbitration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask the hon. gentleman whether the Order in Council of February 18th, 1884, is not there also?

Mr. DAVIES. It is not referred to in the submission at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is it not there among the papers?

Mr. DAVIES. It may be, but I do not see it. But February, 1884, is long after the submission was made. The submission was made in 1883, and it refers to certain Orders in Council which contain the matters to be referred to the

arbitrators, and of these Orders in Council only one is before the House. So I say, that at the present time this House is asked to vote this enormous amount of $395,000, and the Order in Council containing the statement of what was referred to these arbitrators to adjudicate upon has not been brought down at all; and so, I think, I have substantiated the position I took, that no member of this House is in a position, from the evidence before us, to say whether this vote should be given or not. I would be very sorry to pass any opinion upon it; I do not think anybody could pass an opinion upon it, until he had first seen what had been referred to the arbitrators, and then had seen, read and digested, the evidence given before them. Now, on referring to certain correspondence which the hon. gentleman has brought down here, and which took place between these contractors and the Government, in 1881, I find they make a claim, and that the main portion of that claim was on the ground that the Government had not constructed the railway under contract No. 15. But, I find that under the terms of their contract, the Government were not bound to build that road, so that they are making a claim against the Government for not having done that which, by the terms of the contract, the Government were not bound to do—they had no claim at all, then. On what do they base their claim? They say they are advised that the Government were bound, sometime thereafter to build—literally, "we are advised within a reasonable time thereafter." I say the terms of the contract made between Manning & Co. and the Government, as construed by the Chief Engineer of the Government, as construed by the Minister of Railways himself, last Session, and repeated by him last night and to-day, the terms of that contract do not bind the Government to provide these gentlemen a ready access by rail to their Section B; it is because they were not provided with that access by rail that they claimed this enormous amount of damages. There is nothing in the claim made—and I have read the papers twice—in the absence of the Minute of Council, to enable the House to understand whether the award was found within the terms of the arbitration or outside of them. There are other grounds why this payment should not be made. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has referred to the relations between those now notorious contractors and the Government. The Minister of Railways has stated there were no improper relations, and of course the House is bound to accept his statement. Very serious charges were made against those contractors by a very prominent newspaper, a short time ago, and although an action for libel was commenced, it was dropped. The inference drawn by the public was that the accusation was true. It, therefore, behooves the hon. Minister to be more than usually cautious. First, because the hon. gentleman did not allow that there was any claim, because a reading of the papers shows that their claim was more than doubtful; and, second, because the award was not a unanimous award of the arbitrators. A very experienced arbitrator, Judge Clarke, who is employed very largely by the Government, dissents absolutely from this award. There is still an additional reason why the hon. gentleman should be cautious in asking this House to vote the amount stated. The hon. Minister says he does not intend to pay the award until he has taken the opinion of very eminent counsel on two points: First, as to whether the Government can appeal from the award at all; and second, whether having the legal right, there is sufficient probability of upsetting the award to justify such action being taken. I hope the hon. Minister will obtain such legal opinion. The country will not begrudge any reasonable outlay for the opinion of very eminent lawyers, because hon. members on both sides of the House will reluctantly vote this exorbitant amount of damages to these men for a claim which the Minister of Railways assured the House last year did not exist. I agree with the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), that in the face of all the facts, in the absence of the Minute of Council to which I have referred, in view of Judge Clarke's dissent from the award, and all the circumstances surrounding the making of this award, the hon. Minister of Railways should not ask the House to vote this money until he has had the opinion of eminent counsel that the Government cannot appeal from it, and that there is no fair chance of upsetting the award, if a legal right to appeal exists. It is time to ask the House to vote this money after we have exhausted the legal rights we possess to test whether the award is legal.

Mr. ALLISON (Hants). I think hon. gentlemen opposite have rather short memories in dealing with this railway question. They seem to ignore or forget the fact that the Government have taken the greatest possible precaution in this matter; that they have submitted to an independent arbitration and have guarded every step with the greatest possible care and consideration. Hon. gentlemen opposite fail to tell the House that which many hon. members cannot fail to remember, namely, that not very far from the location of this contract there was expended, under the *régime* of the hon. member for East York, in connection with his own Department, and contrary to the wishes of many leading friends and engineers, no less than $250,000, on a work which is unfinished and abandoned—the Fort Frances lock.

Mr. DAVIES. Is that any reason why this amount should be paid to these railway contractors?

Mr. ALLISON. It is no reason. But it is a very good reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should be a little more cautious in making charges against the Government, in connection with this contract under consideration. Anyone who has heard the discussion must be convinced that the Government, and especially the Minister of Railways, have taken the greatest possible precautions to guard the interests of the country at every step.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have only to say to the hon. gentleman that there is no reason why hon. members should cease to discuss the question before the House, in consequence of the matters to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I am prepared to defend the Fort Frances lock, as I have done before; and whenever the hon. member is prepared to open a debate on it, he may depend that he will be met. But that is no reason why this vote should be allowed to pass, even supposing that the building of the Fort Frances lock was wrong, which was not the case. The hon. Minister of Railways gave, as a reason for not bringing down the specifications, that they were printed in the Sessional Papers. He was right, to a certain extent, but they do not appear in the bound volumes. The hon. gentleman printed them in pamphlet form; but they were out of print long ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were printed by Order of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I looked for the particulars in the Sessional Papers, but they were not there. Where the hon. Minister and the Government erred was, in allowing a submission to be made, which enabled the contractors to press the question of damages, which the Minister believed did not exist, and to base their case on the fact that the adjoining section had not been finished. But there was no obligation on the part of the Government to have that section finished at the specified time. The contractors for Section 15, raised this very same point at the time they sent in tenders. Messrs. Kane & Macdonald were the lowest tenderers for Section 15. and they wanted an assurance from the Government that the time for finishing the section from Selkirk to Cross Lake would be adhered to. I declined to give any such assurance, although I had no reason to doubt that the contract would be finished within the time; but as a matter of public policy, I declined to give any assurance to any party tendering.

I said: here are the specifications, there are the quantities; make your calculations as you please, tenders will be received, and the lowest tenderer will get the contract; but we entered into no obligation of any kind. The hon. gentleman said, the other night, that because Section 15 was not finished, the arbitrators awarded $275,000 of damages to this firm. Now, it must be quite apparent to any person that there was no claim whatever upon the Government, and that the course of the Government was to decline to make any such submission as was made. I have not been able to see the papers, as I was not aware, until to-day, that they were brought down, and therefore, I am not prepared to discuss the matter; but I understand that the hon. gentleman stated last night, in addition to what I have already said, that the difference between the amount of the original contract, as estimated, and that of the contract, as degraded by the change of work, was $800,000. I would ask the hon. gentleman if those figures are right, because he stated, on a former occasion, that the amount was about $600,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman the information, as furnished to-day by the Chief Engineer. This is a memorandum of saving in connection with the modification of design: Rock borrow base, with structures thereon, as originally designed, $960,477; rock borrow and pile foundations, with structures thereon, of modified design, $449,106; saving, $511,371. The saving made by the change of location is not yet finally made up, but it will probably amount to from $500,000 to $600,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the statement made last night was a mistake. Another point to which I desire to call the attention of the House, is this: there were $275,000 damages awarded because Section 15 was not completed in time to suit these gentlemen; there were $120,000 awarded as damages for work which they did not do, but which was originally contemplated in the contract. Now, Sir, the contract was not for a lump quantity of work at all; it was for certain articles at certain prices. I find that there was clearing, close cutting, grubbing, platform of logs across muskegs, average sixteen inches deep, covered with brush; fencing, solid rock excavation, loose rock excavation, earth excavation, including borrowing; earth borrowing, with haul of one to one and three-quarter miles; off-take ditches, outside railway limits; under drains, bridge masonry, paving, concrete, crib-work in abutment and piers of bridges, rip-rap, cast iron pipes laid in concrete, bridge superstructure, &c. I need not go over all the items, but I may say that they are all very particular in detail as to sizes, quantities, qualities, &c. Therefore, everything was given entering into the construction of the road, and the tenders were offered at fixed prices. They knew that they would have to take the materials 172 miles, and it was their business to consider how they were to take them. If they did loose rock work, then the schedule for loose rock work would apply—if they did more, it would apply for additions, and if they did less, for reductions. But all conditions are set aside and the arbitrators declare that they are entitled to $120,000 damages, because they did not have as much rock work as they expected. The Government were only bound to give approximate quantities for this class of work, and to dispense with all or any portion of that work, in any of the places and under whatever description. The power taken was as complete as it could be, especially in that district of the country, and now, Sir, we have, as a result of all this, that these gentlemen are awarded $120,000, because the materials they had to deal with were changed from the contract, and they are awarded $275,000 because another contract was not finished, which the Government here to-night admitted they were under no obligation at all to finish. They had to take their chances, and I have only to say that I am utterly unable to conceive how such a verdict was arrived at by any sensible man, unless the Government desired it in the terms of their submission. I say I cannot conceive how it can be done. I do not like to pass any hasty opinion until I have seen and read the documents. I have not been able to do so yet, and I do not believe that half a dozen members have been able to read them; but it is impossible that anyone can come deliberately to the conclusion that this is just and equitable, under any circumstances. I must, in self-defence, vote against this item, as I have no reason to believe that a single dollar of it represents damages fairly accruing through default of the Dominion.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that there was no ground whatever to send this case to arbitrators, when we have an Exchequer Court especially created to deal with cases in which certain parties have claims against the Government. I observe, Sir, that in this case one of the best known principles in the administration of the law was violated. We have at least two great authorities for saying that no enquiry into the rights of parties should take place in secret. Both Mr. Burke and Mr. Bentham, distinguished writers on that subject, have laid it down that no secret investigation of the rights of any party should be had by any regularly constituted tribunal. We have no means of knowing whether there was any conspiracy, any secret understanding between the Administration and those gentlemen, entering into the contract. We know that before the arbitration was created, before the arbitrators were called upon to adjudicate between these parties and the Government, these men were charged with contributing very large sums of their own means, in aid of the Conservative party, in the elections in the Province of Ontario. We know that it was said over and over again, in the public press and elsewhere, that those parties would look to the Administration here to recoup them for the expenditure they made in the interests of the party, and in the interest of the lieutenant of the First Minister, in the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, if there ever was a case in which it was necessary that the Government should have taken special care against leaving themselves open to a charge of this sort, this was the case. If ever there was a case which they ought not to have submitted to a tribunal agreed upon between themselves and the contractors, this was such a case. I have looked at these papers, and it is impossible to say from them what was the particular order of subjects referred to these arbitrators. The papers are not all brought down; and from those which are here, it is impossible to say what the precise claims made by these contractors against the Administration were. It was not only desirable that the Government should have submitted these papers early, but that they should have brought them down in a complete form, so that there would have been an opportunity, not only for the members of this House, but for the press and public, to consider them. So far as we can judge from the papers, these parties were not entitled to the moneys that have been awarded to them. That being the case, I do not think this large amount should be voted. I think this question should still go to a properly constituted court, that the investigation should take place in public, so that the people may know how well those who are entrusted with their affairs are guarding their rights and interests. We have no means of knowing how far the Administration have defended the rights of the public in this matter of dispute between themselves and the contractors. For aught we know, there may have been an understanding between the Adminstration and those contractors; and if there was any foundation for the statements that have gone abroad, it would be a case in which it would be highly probable that there was such an understanding. Under these circumstances, it was a most improper proceeding on the part of the Administration to refer this dispute to arbitration at all, and it was equally improper

for the investigation to be held in secret. What was the object in having it secret? Was it for the purpose of concealing the facts? Was it for the purpose of conducting a sham enquiry, and conducting it in a way that would not bear the light of day? If the Administration wished to create suspicion against themselves, if they wished to convince the public that the rumours that have gone abroad are well founded, they could not have done so more effectually than they did in the manner in which they have proceeded. Then the hon. Minister has intimated that it is not improbable that the Government may appeal from the decision of these arbitrators. If so, is it right to anticipate what the judgment of the superior tribunal would be? It will be time enough for the Government to ask for an appropriation to be made when a properly constituted tribunal, after a full, fair, and open enquiry, shall decide that these parties have a just claim against the Administration. But until then, I think this money ought not to be voted, and I, for one, will vote against this motion for concurrence.

Resolution concurred in on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dupont,	McDougald,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	McGreevy,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,
Bell,	Fortin,	Massue,
Benoit,	Foster,	Mitchell,
Benson,	Gault,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Billy,	Girouard,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Bolduc,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Hay,	Stairs,
Burns,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Carling,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tilley,
Caron,	Langevin,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Chapleau,	Lesage,	Tupper (Pictou),
Cochrane,	Macdonald (Kings),	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville)
Desaulniers,	McCallum,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Woodworth.—82.
Dodd,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Davies,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	De St. Georges,	Mills,
Auger,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Thompson,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Trow,
Cartwright,	Laurier,	Vail,
Casey,	Mackenzie,	Wells,
Catudal,	McCraney,	Yeo.—34.
Cook,		

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES' ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 152) to amend The North-West Territories' Act, 1880 (from the Senate), said: One of the clauses of this Bill, as I have already explained, provides that sheriffs may, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, appoint deputy sheriffs, as there is a demand for a sheriff in each district. There are clauses altering, in some degree, the practices of stipendiary magistrates. There is a provision for an appeal from the stipendiary magistrates to the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba. I propose to move an amendment allowing an appeal from the judgment of a justice of the peace, other than a stipendiary magistrate, to the stipendiary magistrate. As a doubt has been raised as to the power of the North-West Council to impose taxation for school purposes, I am going to propose a clause that will enable it to do so.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved:

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1884, the sum of $1,762,967.65 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution agreed to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved:

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1885, the sum of $30,304,459.07 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution agreed to; and Resolutions reported and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 155), for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1884, and the 30th June, 1885, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

Bill read the first time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman will now close, practically?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we ought to make the same arrangement as is always customary, that when we adjourn to-night, we meet to-morrow at 3 o'clock, for the purpose of finishing the business that is now current between the two Houses, and for no other purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No other business?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No other business whatever, so that hon. members who are obliged to go may leave, without feeling that they have neglected some duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, will you prorogue to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the Upper House will not be through.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought they were going to sacrifice themselves by meeting at half-past ten.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am cognizant that there are some measures that will be amended in the other House, that will prevent our proroguing until Saturday.

Mr. MILLS. Those amendments may necessitate further action here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course the House will deal with all matters between the two Houses *ex necessitate*, but no new business will be taken up, and no business on our paper.

Bill read the second and third times and passed.

BILL DISCHARGED.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I had hoped that we might have had time and a sufficient number of members present

to discuss and dispose of Bill (No. 118), to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877; but I think, under the circumstances, I would consult the wishes of the House by asking for its discharge.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 10.45 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th April, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter from the Secretary to His Excellency the Governor-General :—

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the present Session of the Dominion Parliament on Saturday, the 19th instant, at three o'clock.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
MELGUND,
Governor-General's Secretary.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU, in moving that the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 130) to amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883, said: The first clause of the old Act was repealed, and a complete new clause proposed in its place. That section provided for an addition to the money to be paid to the examiners and the time for which they should be paid, but, as no resolution had been proposed for that, it had to be dropped, but, in dropping it, the whole of the salary of the commissioners was dropped with it. So that that part of the Act has been restored to the same position as it was in 1882.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope in connection with this Civil Service Act that something will be done to secure, at any rate, examiners of some little common sense in regard to the examinations to take place under the Act. The matter has just been brought to my own notice by a letter which I will gladly show to any one as indicating the attainments of the writer. A young man in one of the Departments in Toronto goes up for examination and passes on all the subjects except composition, obtaining over 70 per cent. of the marks, 30 being the necessary number to entitle him to promotion, but who, with respect to composition, is found to have obtained only 20 marks. Now, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say without any disparagement to the members of this House or to gentlemen generally, that the letter which he writes me, and another letter which I know is an official letter to the Head of the Department, will do credit to any gentleman, and the whole substance of the letter indicates a man of more than ordinary intelligence; and yet by some catch question put in on the subject of composition, instead of the party being asked to write an ordinary letter to show what his general intelligence is, he is asked a question on which he finds himself plucked, although he has, as I say, obtained on all the other subjects in his Department, 70 per cent. of the marks. I think the subject is one that ought to engage the attention of the Government with a view of appointing as examiners persons who will at least have ordinary common sense.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend does not know, perhaps, that his remarks apply more to the Government than to the Civil Service Board of Examiners. An Order in Council has been passed that a certain number of points must be obtained by the candidate on each subject. On different subjects a candidate might obtain more than the necessary number of points, but if on one subject he has not obtained the minimum number he cannot pass the examination. This is what the Civil Service Board of Examiners have to require of candidates. With respect to the case of the young man referred to, I have seen the letter he has written and it certainly proves that he should have obtained the necessary number of points in composition, but he might have had a failing, a circumstance which occurs sometimes, not only in examinations for the Civil Service, but in University examinations where the best scholars, through a mistake or through nervousness, fail in one subject. In the case of the young man referred to I think there must have been some accident which prevented him from passing, and for which the Board of Examiners cannot be blamed. The Board of Examiners have themselves proposed, and I think the suggestion will be adopted, that when a candidate has a large number of points in excess of the minimum on all subjects, an accidental deficiency on any one subject shall not deprive him from securing the benefit of a successful examination; but under the existing Order in Council they cannot do otherwise than they have done.

Mr. WHITE. That is doubtless quite true, but it does seem to me that in the subject, for instance, of composition what is wanted in the Civil Service is ability to write an intelligent letter, and that is all that is in that particular respect wanted. But that is certainly not the examination to which he was subjected; he was subjected to an examination in which a certain phrase was given, and he was asked to put that into better form. Well, composition is now coming to be much a matter of taste, and he might not happen to please one of the examiners who may have particular views on the subject, and the young man finds himself stopped in his progress in the Public Service simply by the peculiar disposition of the examiner. I think the matter is really of some hardship in a case where the practical subjects have all been so well passed as to give him 70 per cent. of the marks when only 30 were required.

Mr. COOK. Perhaps he is a Grit.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was not a literary composition but an ordinary letter, and there might have been an accident.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) There is another little matter that occurred among my own constituents. Two officers of the Customs Department applied for promotion, one to be surveyor and the other to be appraiser, but their promotion was contingent on their passing the Civil Service promotion examination. They were ready and willing to pass the examination, and had so expressed themselves, and I believe departmental instructions had been given to that effect. The usual questions had been drawn up by the Minister of the Department for the Civil Service examination, and yet after twelve months have passed no examination has been held, and I am at a loss to understand why a day should not have been named for special examination in these foreign and far off parts, so to speak. These gentlemen have been in the service a good many years; they have laboured very industriously and have been recommended by the Head of the Department who acquiesced in the suggestions made that they should be promoted and that their salaries should be increased. Now, however, their salary cannot be increased and their commissions cannot be issued until this Civil Service examination is held. I would like in that respect to impress upon the Secretary of State the necessity of seeing that this

friction between the Civil Service Examiners and the Department is removed so that the individual officers who are meritorious should not be prevented from doing their duty.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If there is a grievance I have not heard of it before. I am sure that the examiners have not been remiss in their duty. At all events, the examiners will advertise that next month they will proceed to British Columbia where an examination will be held.

Mr. BAKER. The point is plain that the Civil Service examiners seem to override the Head of the Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Oh, no.

Mr. BAKER. I have seen correspondence from which it appears to me that they are, so to speak, kicking against the pricks, and in that case it is they, and not the Head of the Department who ought to submit.

Amendments concurred in.

INDIAN ACT, 1880, AMENDMENTS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving that the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 143) further to amend the Indian Act, 1880, said: When the Bill left this House it provided that any person who excites or stirs up any Indian or half breed to make any request or demand on any agent or employé in the service of the Government, which leads to a breach of the peace, or to any act calculated to cause a breach of the peace, shall be guilty of misdemeanour and be liable to imprisonment in the penitentiary for a term not exceeding five years nor less than two. This has been qualified in the sense suggested by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the punishment has been reduced to a term not exceeding two years with or without hard labour. The last clause is amended by inserting that the Act shall go into force on 1st January, 1885, instead of 1st January next. I rather regret this amendment, which involves such a waste of time; but as the Senate in its wisdom has so amended the clause, I move that it be concurred in.

Amendments concurred in.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY, in moving that the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 143) to amend the Liquor License Act, 1883, said: The first amendment is to clause 25 of the Bill. This is the clause we had under discussion yesterday as to an hotel being separated from any place or shop where merchandise is sold; and the Senate have amended it so that the law will stand with respect to all places except in cities and towns; that is to say that shops and hotels must be separated in all places except cities and towns, but in cities and towns the Board has discretion to have endorsed on the license that the section is not applicable thereto. Therefore, such hotels as the Rossin and Windsor will be allowed to remain as they are.

Amendments concurred in.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Finance Minister say whether or not he has any further information as to the progress of negotiations with Newfoundland?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have received no answer yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when this House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until Saturday at a quarter to three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 4:50 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, April 19th, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ABANDONED GOVERNMENT MEASURES.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. Prime Minister and the Finance Minister ought to take this opportunity of pronouncing a funeral eulogy upon their legislative children who have perished during the Session. The First Minister introduced the Franchise Bill this Session for the fourth or fifth time; he promised that it should be carried through the House, and declared that it was absolutely necessary that a measure of this sort should receive the attention of Parliament. But the hon. gentleman has abandoned his favourite offspring to perish, and the Finance Minister has been guilty of the same heartlessness. I noticed the hon. gentleman introduced the Factory Bill early in the Session—in fact, these were the only two measures the Government really did introduce at an early period; they referred to them in the Speech from the Throne, they called the attention of Parliament to the importance of these measures, but before the Session was over, both were abandoned. The hon. gentlemen have succeeded in suddenly bringing before us and carrying through the House a number of measures which they had not announced at all; and I apprehend, to-day, that if they did not anounce them it was because they did not attach any special importance to them. This Session seems to have been very extraordinary in that particular, because there is scarcely a measure which was referred to in the Speech from the Throne which the Government have seen proper to carry through Parliament. What they declared to be of great public importance they have abandoned. They have had new light since the Session began, and what they considered matters of very little consequence then, they have pressed upon our attention at the very last moment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think this is a breach of the arrangement made, that nothing should be said except in regard to communications from the other House. That was the arrangement made, but the hon. gentleman has no leader now, and I suppose he is his own leader.

Mr. MILLS. This is not a new matter; this is an old matter—in fact, we are speaking of the dead offspring of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have not, Sir, been guilty of any breach of arrangement; I have not proposed any new measures; I have not proposed to deal with anything that has not been on the Notice Paper, or with anything that we have not reached; it is with what we have reached, and with what the hon. gentlemen, after having reached, have seen proper to abandon, to which I have been inviting the attention of the House at this particular moment. Then, Sir, I observe that the hon. gentlemen have introduced all those measures which they have carried through this House during the past ten days. I believe that three-fourths of the Government measures have been carried through during the present week. This, Sir, is a very extraordinary condition of things. Now, in England, I have taken care to look over the important measures introduced by different Administrations since 1881, and I do not find a single instance of an important measure introduced by the Administration after the first five weeks of the Session had gone

by. All their important Government measures, although the Sessions there last for half a year, are introduced at a very early period in the Session, and are submitted to the attention of the House and of the country; because the rule there recognized is, not that the entire wisdom of the country is concentrated in Parliament, but that the wisdom of the country is fairly represented in Parliament, and measures are introduced at such a period that it is possible for the public to consider them, and advise their representatives upon them. Now, we have over and over again observed, in the history of legislation in England, in respect to the important measures introduced to Parliament, that in every instance the Government have announced, in introducing those measures, that sufficient time would elapse to allow the representatives of the people an opportunity of consulting those whom they represented, and that gentlemen of experience in the various Departments of private industry might have an opportunity of consulting those who were likely to be affected by the measures which were submitted to Parliament. In this way, not only have those who represent the people an opportunity of discussing and fully considering those measures and bringing to light any latent defects that may be discovered, but they have an opportunity of bringing to bear upon them the intelligence of the entire country. Now, Sir, no such opportunity is afforded us. It is supposed that legislation is under the control of Parliament; it is supposed that Ministers will only seek to direct legislation as far as it affects the general administration of the affairs of the country. If important measures are introduced, that are likely to affect the general well-being of the country, and in regard to which any particular Department could not be efficiently administered, then it is proper that Ministers should seek to direct and control legislation on that particular subject; because they are responsible for the ordinary administration of the affairs of the country, it is only right and proper that they should have an opportunity of promoting legislation. But that really does not apply nor is it recognized as applying to the general legislation of the country, in which members of the House are supposed to stand on an equal footing, and the Government are supposed to assist in promoting legislation on the various subjects. The Government have not only undertaken to control legislation but they have systematically, during the whole period they have administered public affairs, sought to suppress the action of Parliament until the last few days of every Session. If we look at the history of Parliament in England, we find this to be the case: at an early period the representatives of the people took no part in directing the legislation of the country. They only could control legislation as they could control supplies, and they made it a condition, on which they granted subsidies, that redress should be given in regard to certain matters in the public interest. In that way the people acquired, through their representatives, a share in the legislation of the country.

Mr. HAGGART. I rise to a point of order. What is the motion to which the hon. gentleman is speaking?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to conclude with a motion. Does the hon. member for Bothwell intend to conclude with a motion.

Mr. MILLS. I have not yet made up my mind; but if the hon. gentleman will permit me, I will proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order unless he intends to conclude with a motion.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to proceed, I shall feel inclined to conclude with a motion of want of confidence.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman should thank the Government for the course they have taken in withholding public measures until he became a member of the House; and, as they supposed he would be here, the Government, no doubt, thought they would keep important measures back in order that he might criticise them. But does the hon. gentleman forget everything that occurred from 1874 to 1878, when he, with his colleagues, were responsible for the administration of the affairs of the country?

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

MR. SPEAKER,

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate presence of this House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to grant certain powers to the Commercial Cable Company.

An Act further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Pictou Marine Insurance Company (Limited).

An Act to amalgamate the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto and the Toronto Corn Exchange Association.

An Act to authorize a further advance to the Province of Manitoba in aid of the Public Schools therein.

An Act to provide for the salary and travelling allowances of the Judge of the County Court of Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

An Act further to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the International Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Commercial Bank of Manitoba.

An Act respecting the winding up of the Spring Hill and Parrsborough Coal and Railway Company, and the sale of the property thereof to the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate The Atlantic Marine Insurance Company (Limited).

An Act to extend to the Dominion of Canada the powers of the Corporation called "De Nederlandsch-Amerikaansche Land Maatschappy" (The Netherlands-American Land Company.)

An Act to incorporate the Nova Scotia Marine Insurance Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate The Provincial Bank

An Act to incorporate the Halifax Marine Insurance Company (Limited).

An Act to empower the Sovereign Fire Insurance Company to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.

An Act to incorporate the Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Union Trust Corporation of Canada.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Owen Sound Dry Dock Shipbuilding and Navigation Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate the Live Stock Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Halifax Steam Navigation Company (Limited).

An Act for the relief of John Graham.

An Act to incorporate the Temperance and General Life Assurance Company of North America.

An Act to incorporate the Traders' Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Union of certain Methodist Churches therein named.

An Act to incorporate the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.

An Act to empower The North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited), to construct and work a line of railway between Medicine Hat and the Company's mines on the Belly River, and for other purposes.

An Act to prevent fraud in the manufacture and sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.
An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company and to change the name thereof to the "Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company."
An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac.
An Act to authorize the transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and for other purposes.
An Act relating to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa.
An Act respecting the Erie and Huron Railway.
An Act to amend the several Acts relating to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.
An Act to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882," by reducing the fees payable on renewal of Engineers' Licenses.
An Act to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.
An Act relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company, and to the Railways leased to the said Company.
An Act respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the St. Clair Frontier Tunnel Company.
An Act to empower the bondholders of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company to vote at meetings of the Company, and for other purposes.
An Act for the better prevention of Fraud in connection with the sale of Patent Rights.
An Act respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Saskatoon and Northern Railway Company.
An Act further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The North-West Central Railway Company."
An Act to incorporate the Quebec Railway Bridge Company.
An Act respecting The Real Estate Loan Company of Canada (Limited).
An Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.
An Act to amend the Acts fortieth Victoria, chapter forty-nine, and forty-fifth Victoria, chapter twenty-four, being Acts relating to Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in Ontario.
An Act to incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.
An Act to amend "An Act respecting inquiries and investigation into Shipwrecks, and other matters," as to the powers of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.
An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.
An Act respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, the Esquimalt Graving Dock, and certain Railway Lands of the Province of British Columbia, granted to the Dominion.
An Act to amend "The Customs Act, 1883."
An Act to amend "An Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships," and "The Seamen's Act, 1873."
An Act respecting Fortifications and Military Buildings and their maintenance and repair.
An Act for giving effect to an agreement therein mentioned between the Government of the Dominion and that of Nova Scotia.
An Act respecting The Central Ontario Railway.
An Act in further amendment of "An Act respecting the treatment and relief of sick and distressed Mariners."
An Act to reduce the capital stock of the Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, and to make other provisions respecting the said Bank.
An Act respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.
An Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.
An Act to amend the Act thirty-eighth Victoria, chapter fifty-four, intituled: "An Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba the 'Act for the more speedy trial, in certain cases, of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors, in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.'"
An Act to amend the Act thirty-seventh Victoria, chapter forty-two, intituled: "An Act to extend to the Province of British Columbia certain of the Criminal Laws now in force in the other Provinces of the Dominion."
An Act further to amend the Act thirty-first Victoria, chapter twelve, intituled: "An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada."
An Act respecting the Independence of Parliament Act, 1878, forty-first Victoria, chapter five.
An Act respecting a Reformatory for certain Juvenile Offenders in the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia.
An Act to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."
An Act to further amend "An Act respecting the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, in relation to summary convictions and orders."
An Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company."
An Act to provide for the salary and travelling allowances of an additional Puisné Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Manitoba.
An Act to make further provision towards the completion of the Tidal Dock in the Harbour of Quebec.
An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.
An Act to authorize the advance of a further sum for completing the Graving Dock in the Harbour of Quebec.
An Act further to amend the present Tariff of Duties of Customs.
An Act respecting the Territory in dispute between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario.
An Act to authorize the transfer of prisoners from one gaol to another in certain cases.
An Act to extend the limitation of time under the Act forty-third Victoria, chapter seven, intituled "An Act for the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act thirty-third Victoria, chapter three."
An Act to amend and to consolidate as amended the several Acts respecting the Adulteration of Food and Drugs.
An Act to amend the "Weights and Measures Act of 1879."
An Act further to amend "The General Inspection Act, 1874."
An Act to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain moneys required for the Public Service.
An Act to amend "The North-West Territories Act, 1880."
An Act further to amend the Act forty-fifth Victoria, chapter twenty-three, intituled. "An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations."
An Act to amend "The Dominion Landst Act, 1883."
An Act to re-adjust the yearly subsidies to be allowed by Canada to the several Provinces now included in the Dominion.
An Act to authorize certain subsidies and grants for and in respect for the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.
An Act to amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883.
An Act further to amend "The Indian Act, 1880."
An Act for conferring certain privileges on the more advanced Bands of the Indians of Canada, with the view of training them for the exercise of municipal powers.

Then the Honourable the SPEAKER of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency a Bill intituled: An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending respectively the 30th June, 1884, and the 30th June, 1885, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service,—to which I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL thanks Her Loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Second Session of the Fifth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The assiduity and zeal shown by you in the performance of your important duties deserve my best thanks, and I desire to convey them to you.

There is every reason to anticipate that the liberal aid given by the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway will secure the speedy and satisfactory completion of that great national work.

I congratulate you on the adjustment of all matters of difference between the Dominion and the Province of British Columbia by the legislation of this Session.

The larger appropriations made for the furtherance of railway construction may be expected to assist materially in the development of our commerce, both foreign and domestic, as well as to open up for settlement extensive fertile districts hitherto almost inaccessible.

The several measures for the benefit of the Indian communities and for their encouragement to assume the responsibilities of self-government are

well adapted for the purpose, and the amendments of the laws relating to the Dominion lands will give additional facilities and advantages to settlers in the North-West Territories.

The re-adjustment of the annual subsidies to the several Provinces, while adding to their resources, will place their pecuniary relations with the Dominion on a satisfactory and permanent basis.

The several important measures which occupied your attention, and will now become law, must all tend to the benefit and improvement of the country, and the numerous Private Bills with industrial objects, submitted to me, indicate the existence of a healthy spirit of enterprise among our people.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you in Her Majesty's name for the supplies you have granted for the Public Service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In bidding you now farewell until next Session I trust that when we next meet I may be able to congratulate you on the continuing prosperity of our country.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Thursday, the twenty-ninth day of May next to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Thursday, the twenty-ninth day of May next.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to the 29th day of May next.

INDEX.

SECOND SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1884.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; Intercol., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; W. & M., Ways and Means; Wthdn., Withdrawn, Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y., N., Yeas and Nays; Names in italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

Abbott, Hon. J. J. C., *Argenteuil*

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291.

De Nederlandsch-Americansche Land Maalschappij (B. 30, 1°*) 83.

Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. Lease (B. 32, 1°*) 83; M. for Com., 810.

Allen, Mr. B., *West Grey*

Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) Amt., 1285.

Fishery Act Amt., Pets. praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 299.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 609.

Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction (B. 70, 1°*) 162; 2° m., 461.

Owen Sound Dry Dock, Ship-building and Nav. Co. incorp. (B. 45, 1°*) 131.

Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.

SUPPLY:

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1008.

Miscellaneous (British Association Meeting) 1311.

Allison, Mr. W. H., *Hants*

SUPPLY:

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) conc., 1649.

Allison, Mr. D. W., *Lennox*

Collector of Customs at Napanee, Appointment of (M. for Papers and Cor.) 208.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1225.

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse*

Beaumont, Expropriation of (M. for Ret.*) 1200.

Certificates to Masters and Mates and Seamen's Acts Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1057.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1102; (Amt.) to Fifth Rep., 1272.

Dominion Arbitrators, Complaints or Pets. of Messrs. Gosselin and Chabot (Louis and Charles) of St. Charles, Bellechasse, presented to (M. for copies*) 28.

Government Lands in Richelieu Co., Sale of (Ques.) 1109; (M. for Ret.*) 1126.

Governor General's Commission, &c., on M. for copies, 521.

Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 964.

License Commissioners, Que., furnishing of blank forms, &c. (Ques.) 966.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 938.

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Pilots for and above Harbour of Quebec, Acts respecting (Ques.) 655.
Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, incorp. (B. 18, 1°*) 67; M. to discharge Order referring B. to Sel. Com. on Banking and Commerce and to ref. B. to Com. on Miscellaneous Private Bills, 131.
St. Charles Branch, Expropriation of Beaumont (M. for Ret.*) 1200.
St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1493.
School of Navigation, Quebec (M. for Cor.) 200.
Statutes, Dom., Distribution of (Ques.) 797.
Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment of, on M. for Cor., 154.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1493, 1495; in Com. on B., 1624.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries, 1467.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1193.

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 373.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 986.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 690.
Ways and Means—on conc., 787.

Auger, Mr. M., *Shefford*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 430
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 1271.
Lachine Canal, Wharfingers on (Ques) 1387.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.
Subsidies to Rys. B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 1552.

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth*
Hunter's Island, Sales of Land or Timber on (Ques.) 1054.
SUPPLY:
Immigration: (Salaries, &c.) 1404, 1407, 1413, 1414, 1418.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1197.
Quarantine, 1012.

Baker, Mr. E. C., *Victoria, B. C.*
A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Adjournment of the House (m.) 513.
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1034; on Amt. (*Mr. Reid*) 1039; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3° of B., 1173.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Rep. from Com., 494.

Baker, Mr. E. C.—*Continued.*
Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) M. to adjn. deb., 976; (Ques. of Priv.) 977; on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1282; on M. to adjn. deb., 1285.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1392; on M. to conc. in Sen Amts., 1652.
Dominion Employés in B. C. (M. for Stmnt.) 514.
Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1094.
Emigrant Sheds at Victoria (Ques.) 336.
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Reimbursements for outlay (M. for O. C.) 514.
Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1317.
Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1235.
Geological Survey, conc., 1452.
Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.
Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com. (withdrl. of name from Com.) 208.
Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer, Duties and Salary of, Vancouver Island (Ques.) 336; Delay in Appointment (Ques.) 1736.
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1608.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1340.
Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1233.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597, 1599.
Mail Service in B. C. (M. for Ret.) 605.
Masters and Mates Certificates (M. for Ret.) 606.
Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 1229.
Meterological Observations, in Com. of Sup., 1255.
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1022.
Mounted Police for B. C. (Ques.) 336.
Naval Brigade and Torpedo Corps (Ques.) 285.
Naval Station at Esquimalt (Ques.) 285; (M. for Ret.) 515.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 928.
Point Escuminac Breakwater, on M. for Papers (remarks) 515.
Postmaster for Victoria (M. for Ret.) 605.
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1320.
Public Works, Agents and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1319.
Public Works, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1198, 1606.
Publishing Debates, in Com. of Sup., 1340.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1012.
Rifle Associations, further aid to (Ques.) 285.
School of Gunnery, Fortifications and Militia (Ques.) 285.
Schools of Gunnery, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Sir James Douglas, Steamer, Expenditure on (Ms. for Stmnts.) 514; Officers and Crew.: Rank, Pay, &c.,

Baker, Mr. E. C.—*Continued.*
514; Repairs, hauling out, and launching, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1200.
Steamboat Inspection, 1256.
SUPPLY:—
Arts, Agriculture, and Statistics (Dominion Exhibition) 1094; (Health Statistics) 1095.
Collection of Revenues: Excise, 1317; Post Office, 1320; Public Works (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1318, (Agent and Contingencies, B.C.) 1319; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1318.
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1235.
Geological Survey: conc., 1452.
Indians: Annual Grant (B.C.) 1266; (Printing Vocabularies of Dialects, B.C.) 1608.
Legislation: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1233.
Militia (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164; (Clothing, &c.) 1022.
Ocean and River Service (Government Steamers) 1227; (Masters and Mates, Examination of) 1229.
Public Works—Income: (Buildings, B.C.) 1198; (Repairs, &c.) 1198. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 1606.
Quarantine, 1012.
Scientific Institutions (Metereological Observations) 1255.
Steamboat Inspection, 1256.
Telegraph Lines, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Baker, Mr. G. B., *Missisquoi*
Judicial Salaries, Readjustment of (Ques.) 1387.

Barnard, Mr. F. J., *Yale*
Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.

Beaty, Mr. J. jun., *West Toronto*
Battleford and Peace River Ry. Co. *See* "Souris" below.
Civil Service Board, in Com of Sup., 989.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1579; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1594.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb., 668.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 865.
Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of (B. 79, 1°*) 198.
London Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 139) Petition presented, 1290; 1°* of B., 1386; M. to suspend Rule 65, 1511; M. for Com., 1515; in Com., 1516.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 925.
Parkdale Village and G. T. R. legalization of Agreement B. 82 (*Mr. Wallace*) 504.
Private Bills, Petitions for (Ms. to extend time) 40; Presentation of, 162, 1240, 1359.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1114.
Real Estate Loan Co. of Canada (B. 88, 1°*) 285.
San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co. incorp. B. 83 (*Mr. Royal*) on M. for 2°, 505.

Beaty, Mr. J., jun.—*Continued.*
Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 81, 1°*) 231.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 989.
Militia (Construction and Repairs) 1162.
Toronto Board of Trade and Corn Exchange Association amalg. (B. 14, 1°*) 43.
Traders' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 92, 1°*) 304.

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville*
Copyrights Act Amt. (B. 113, 1°*) 655.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1104.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.
St. Césaire Postmaster, Charges against (M. for Ret.*) 1199.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc in Res., 1558.

Belleau, Mr. J. N., *Lévis*
Address, The (sec.) 6.
Arbitrators, Dom., Claims of Messrs. Dorion and Leclerc, of the Village of Lauzon (M. for copies*) 88.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1575; in Com., 1626.

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington*
Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 80, 1°*) 231; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1176
Rideau Canal Water Supply (M. for Cor.*) 1200.

Benson, Mr. W. T., *South Grenville*
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 679.

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois*
Lavallière Bay, Yamaska River, Explorations on (M for Rep.) 820.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 293.
Question of Privilege, inaccurate newspaper correspondence (remarks) 469.
St. Francis River, Explorations on (M. for Rep.) 820.

Bergin, Mr. D., *Stormont and Cornwall*
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1247.
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1017, 1018.
Civil Service Board, in Com of Sup., 991.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1104; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to Fifth Rep., 1272.
McCourt, Daniel, Dismissal of (remarks) 885.

Bergin, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 67, 1°*) 162.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Res. (M. to adjn. deb.) 986.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 819.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014–1016.
Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 766.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income: Cornwall (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053.
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 991.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.,) 1005.
Militia (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1017, 1018.
Quarantine (Public Health) 1014–1016.
Welland Ry. and G. T. R., Transfer authorization (B. 44, 1°*) 89; M. for Com., 860; M. to recom., 886.

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe*
Montreal Drill Shed, Contracts for Rebuilding (Ques.) 966; (M. for copies*) 1201.
St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of (Ques.) 966.

Billy, Mr. L. A., *Rimouski*
D'Anjou, Joseph, Claim of (Ques.) 798.
Lavoie, Geo., Claim of (Ques.) 797.
Skiffington, Detective, Action of, against Messrs. Michaud and Dumais of St. Paschal, on M. for copies of Reps., 622.
Survey Contract No. 10, Transfer of (M. for Ret.*) 1201.

Blake, Hon. E., *West Durham*
Address, on the, 9.
Adelaide, Scow, compensation for loss, in Com. of Sup. 1365.
Adjournment for Easter (Ques.) 1422.
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 994–997, 1474.
Administrator of the Govt. of the N.W.T., on M. for O. C. &c., 518.
Adulteration of Food and Drugs Acts Amt. and Consol. B. 109 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. to introd., 598; B. 114, on M. for 2°, 1137; in Com on Res., 1244; on M. for Com. (Ques. of Order) 1244; in Com., 1246, 1294.
Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.
Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of, on M. for Sel. Com., 74.
Agriculture and Immigration, Rep. of Minister (Ques.) 709.
Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1337.
Allan, W. F., Allowance in lieu of Board, in Com. of Sup., 1381.
Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by C. P. R. (M. for Cor.) 53.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Analysts, Public, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1244.
Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.
Armouries, Public, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1088, 1091–1094.
Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.
Banking Facilities for Agriculturists Provision B. 105 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. to introduce (Ques. of Order) 524; on M. (*Mr. Orton*) to conc. in Res., 763.
Boucher, de la Bruère, Payment to, for type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1375.
Boundaries between Man. and Ont. (M. for Ret.*) 88.
Bounty on Manufactures of Iron (M. for O. C., &c.) 70.
British Association Meeting, in Com. of Sup., 1310.
British Columbia, Agreement with, on prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 68; B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1030; in Com. on B., 1138; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1174.
B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under, Publication of, in Com. of Sup., 1378.
Canadian Immigration (Ques.) 44.
Canals, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1050–1052, 1350–1352; Income, 1053, 1352–1354; conc., 1464.
Cariboo County Court Judge, Salary of, on prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 69.
Census, in Com. of Sup., 1092.
Census, remaining Volume (Ques.) 72, 766.
Central Ontario Ry. B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175; in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202.
Certificates of Masters and Mates, Refusal of Board of Examiners to grant (Ques.) 1444; non-enforcement of Act (Ques.) 85.
Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 830, 831.
Chinese Immigration into B. C., on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 977.
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 832–837, 1334–1366, 1466, 1468, 1474.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 1360; in Com. on B., 1388, 1394, 1422.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 1336; conc., 1459.
Coal Lands in the N.W., Sales and Leases (M. for Stmnt.*) 71.
Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1058.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1316, 1382.
Commercial Treaties, Negotiations of (M. for O.C., &c., touching) 57.
Compensation for Injuries on P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1348.
Concurrence—Civil Service Board, 1459; Customs, 1456; Dominion Statutes (Consolidation) 1453; Geological Survey, 1452; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 1440; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner) 1461; Mail Subsidies (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1453, (Lakes

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

Huron and Superior) 1452; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1464; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I., 1454; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1459; *St. Andrews* (Schooner) 1461.

Construction Account, Intercol. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1345.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 294; on non-meeting of Sel. Com., 654; in Com. of W., 818, 819; Mr. Fortin's Vote, on point of Order, 81.

Cotton, in Com. on W. & M., 696.

C. P. R., in Com. of Sup., 1047–1049.

——— Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by (M. for Cor.) 53.

——— Contracts made by Co. for construction of any part of line (M. for Address*) 66.

——— Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 71.

——— Co.'s Cash Deposit with Govt. (Ques.) 72; as to Deposit of Securities (Ques.) 72.

——— Co's Steamers from Owen Sound (Ques.) 458

——— Cost of (Ques.) 603.

——— Further information *re* Construction Co. &c. (Ms.) 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224.

——— Guarantee to Co. (Ques.) 72; as to further Reps. on same (Ques.) 72; (M. for copies of Cor., &c.*) 79.

——— Information respecting Guarantee, purchase of Securities, &c., of other Rys., Expenditure and Receipts of Co., &c. (M. for Ret. and Stmnts.*) 66.

——— Information respecting subscribed Stock of Co. (M. for Address*) 66.

——— Lake Superior and Nipissing Divisions, Cost of (Ques.) 458.

——— Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. (reply) 113–131; on Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 6 m. h., 415; in Com., 454–456; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence, 468; respecting further Amts., 503; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for B. to take precedence, 524; on M. for 2°, 525; on M. for Com., 536; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 568; (Amt.) 568.

——— Location of (M. for Maps, &c.) 53.

——— Modification of arrangement between Co. and Govt. (Ques.) 72.

——— Payments on Construction, Contract and Subsidy Accounts (Ques.) 1055.

——— Payments or Advances to Co. (M. for O. C., &c.) 1055.

——— Payments to Co. on account of Floating Debt (Ques.) 1054.

——— Postal Subsidy to (Ques.) 72; (M. for Papers) 79.

——— Rumours of inadequacy of arrangements (Ques.) 1273.

——— Summit of Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, Cost of (Ques.) 458.

——— Tariff of Rates on (Ques.) 79.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 279; on M. for Com. to rise' 671.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 289; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667; on name of Member being omitted from Div. on B., 709.

Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091.

Cumberland, Seat for (Ques. of Priv. 542; (Res.) 547; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 561.

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1457.

Debate, Past, reference to (Ques. of Order) 1544.

Debates, Official Rep., on M. to add names to Sp. Com. 43; on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 260; Second Rep., 883; Third Rep., 1100; Fourth Rep., 1103, 1105; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to Fifth Rep., 1272; in Com. of Sup., 1340.

Departmental Reps., Publication of, in Newspapers (remarks) 141.

Disallowance of Provincial Acts, on M. for copies of O.C., &c., 42.

Disputed Territory between Man. and Ont. (M. for Ret.*) 88.

Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093.

Dominion Lands, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1384; Income, 1385.

Dry Dock, B. C., Estimated net cost (M. for Ret.*) 79.

Dual Representation B. 13 (*Mr. Ouimet*) on. M for 2°, 144.

Duty on Freight Charges (M. for O.C.) 82.

Eastern Extension Ry., acquisition of, B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 882; on M. for 3°, 1131.

Electoral Franchise B. 7 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 31.

Erthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 696–698, 701, 702, 704; (Amt.) 796.

Escheat (Queen and Mercer) Proceedings before Judicial Com. of Privy Council (M. for copies of shorthand writer's notes, &c.) 74.

Exchange Bank Notes, Instructions to Intercol. Ry. Officers respecting (Ques.) 1055.

Exchange Bank of Canada, on M. for Stmnt., 35.

Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1382.

Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1305, 1308.

Factories, definition of Offences against Persons employed in, B. 106 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 1°, 524; (Ques.) 1241.

Factory B. and Manufacturers' Association (M. for Ret.) 82.

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1370.

Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1061.

Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contracts B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.

French Translation, in Com. of Sup., 1340.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1056; in Com., 1129.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.
Geological Survey, conc., 1452.
Geological Surveys, Mining and Metallurgy, on M. for Sel. Com., 515.
Government Business, on M. for C. P. R. Res. to take precedence, 198; (remarks) 469; on M. to take in Thursdays, 625; on M. to take in Mondays, 1023; State of, 1170.
Governor General's Sec's. Office, in Com. of Sup., 832.
Great Britain and Germany, Treaty between respecting Immigrants (M. for copies of despatches, &c.) 800.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 890, 894; on M. for Com., 978; Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1513.
Grinding in Bond (M. for O.C., &c.) 53.
Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 1049.
Halifax Street Railway Co. *vs.* The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1365.
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094.
High Commissioner and Immigration, Letter and Cablegrams of Minister of Agriculture (M. for copies) 799.
High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987; suppl., 1336; conc., 1440; (House and Furniture for) in Com. of Sup., 1367.
High Commissioner for Canada (Sir Charles Tupper) Appointment of (M. for O.C., &c.) 53, 56.
High Commissioner, Reps. respecting Commercial Treaties (M. for O. C., &c.) 57.
High Commissioner (Sir A. T. Galt) payments on account of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 56.
High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper) on Emigration (M. for copies of Reps.) 49.
High Commissioner to England, on Res. (*Mr. Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1043.
Hodge *vs.* The Queen, Judgements, &c., respecting (M. for copies*) 43.
Holden, Clara, Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1352.
Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1379.
Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 207.
Hughes, Judge, Charges against, on M. for copies of Pets., 59.
Immigrants, Applications for Services of, on M. for Ret., 511.
Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1078.
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1404, 1408, 1411, 1412.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for leave to introduce (Amt.) 624; in Com., 1423; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1446.
Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1063; in Com., 1397, 1399.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841; suppl., 1336.
Indian Islands in Lake Ontario, on M. for Ret., 87.
Indian Lands, Fort William, Cancellation of Timber Licenses (M. for copies of O.C.) 51, 52.
Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 67; in Com., 541; on M. for 3°, 625.
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1372, 1373.
Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
Inland Revenue Act, non-enforcement of (Ques.) 85.
Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
Inland Revenue, Resignation of Minister of (Ques.) 506; on correction, 513; (Explanations asked) 525.
Intercol. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1345, 1346.
Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1466.
Iron, Bounties on Manufactures of (M. for O. C., &c.) 70.
Jeans and Coutilles, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
Jennie Graham, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461.
Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) in Com. of Sup., 833.
Lands Sales within limits of C. P. R. and price realized, on M. for Ret., 77.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1009, 1339, 1340, 1475.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 1167; on presentation of Third Rep., 1413.
Licenses for Sale of Liquor in the N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 73.
Liquor License Act, Expense in putting Act into operation, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1476.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take precedence (Amt.) 823; on point of Order, 825.
London Life Insurance Co.'s B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for leave to present Pet., 1290; on M. for Com., 1515; in Com., 1516.
Lottery Firm at St. Stephen, N.B., on M. for Stmnt. of Receipts of P.O., 614.
MacDonell, Alex. & Co., Arbitrators Award to, in Com. of Sup., 1346.
Mail Subsidies, conc., 1452, 1453.
Manitoba and Hudson Bay Ry. Land Grant, on prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1590.
Manitoba Judiciary B. 146 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1478.
Manitoba, Persons entering by Rail, Number of (M. for Stmnt.) 49, 50.
Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to, Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for conc., 68; in Com., 69.
Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1464.
Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1468.
McCourt, Daniel, Dismissal of (M. for Cor.) 516.
McLaughlin, Geo. E., Gratuity to family of, in Com. of Sup., 1373.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Miall, E., Commissioner of Standards, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 834–837; suppl., 1334.
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
Mining Regulations for the N.W., on M. for Ret., 512.
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 29.
Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
Money Order Regulations (M. for copies) 613.
Mounted Police Barracks, in Com. of Sup., 1378.
Naval Station at Esquimalt, on M. for Ret., 516.
Newspaper Correspondence, on personal Explanation (*Mr. Ouimet*) 457.
North American Construction Co., Instrument of Incorp., Names of Shareholders, &c. (M. for copies*) 66.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts. 1547.
North-West Coal and Nav. Co.'s B. 33 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 1°, 84.
Nova Scotia Coal Importation into U. S. (M. for copies of despatches, &c.) 70.
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1369.
O'Connor, Hon. John, Sums paid to (M. for Stmnt.) 70.
Ontario and Quebec in account with Canada (Ques.) 72; (M. for Stmnts.*) 79.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on unparliamentary language, 888.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. to change name of mover, 843; in Com., 857; on M. for 3°, 859, on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 860.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America, B. 93, (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 904–919.
Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*) in Com., 889.
Page, John, payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1351.
Parliamentary Practice, on *Mr. Speaker's* Ruling on Members being called on to vote, 458.
Parry Sound P. O., Postal Thefts at (Ques.) 1109.
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1339.
Perley, H. F., Services of, on St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
Personal Explanation respecting newspaper article, 736.
Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, incorp. B. 18 (*Mr. Amyot*) on M. to discharge Order referring B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 152.
Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of, B. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) in Com., 888.
Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1336.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 806.
P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1348.
Prince Arthur's Landing and Kaministiquia Ry. Co., Bonuses to, by inhabitants of Neebing (M. for copy of Memorial to His Ex.*) 523.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Prince Leopold, Death of, Resolution of Condolence to Her Majesty, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 1293.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1007; conc., 1440.
Private Bills, Petitions for, on Ms. to Extend time, 40; Presentation of, 1359.
Privileges and Elections, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 1291.
Privy Council, Judicial Com. of, Judgment of, *re* Hodge and the Queen (M. for copies*) 43.
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1334, 1336.
Provincial Subsidies, B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.
Public Buildings, Heating of, Cost (M. for Stmnt.) 83.
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1355, 1359, 1362.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 294; on non-meeting of Sel. Com., 654; in Com. of W., 818, 819; Mr. Fortin's Vote, on point of Order, 821.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2° (Ques. of Order) 1445; on M. for 2°, 1586.
Question of Privilege, Minister of Rys. and High Commissionership (speech) 543; (Res.) 547; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 581.
Quotations from newspapers, incorrect, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 616.
Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1047–1049, 1345–1348.
Railways, Subsidies to. *See* "Subsidies."
Redemption of Small Loans B. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1589.
Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1312, 1314; conc., 1454.
Reid, W. G., Refund to, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
Repairs, Heating, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1359, 1362.
Returning Officers, Claims of, in Com. of Sup., 1341; conc., 1459.
Returns, Imperfect (remarks) 198; *re* High Commissioner (remarks) 459; respecting drawbacks on Sugar Refining Machinery, 671; production of (remarks) 1128; preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
Robertson, John, Claims of (M. for Ret.) 614.
Rochette, Fabien, Claim of, for Land, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 202.
Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 1474.
Seizures, &c., at Ports of Entry (M. for Stmnt.) 71.
Select Standing Committees, on M. for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 28.
Self-Government among the Indians B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 67; in Com., 541; on M. for 3°, 625.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339; suppl., 1475.

Sessional Returns, Expenditure on (M. for Stmnt.) 83.

Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 764; on M. for 2°, 1131; in Com., 1132; on M. for 3°, 1170, 1293.

Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. B. 129 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1360.

Soap Powders, in Com. on W. & M., 728.

Statutes, Consolidating, in Com. of Sup., 1303; purchase of type, &c., 1379, conc., 1453.

Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 729; Needles, &c., 730.

St. Andrew's, Schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461.

St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1345.

St. Croix Cotton Factory, importation of machinery for, on M. for Stmnt., 808.

St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry., Expenditure by C.P. R. Co. in connection with (M. for Stmnts.) 516.

St. Patrick's Day, on M. for adjournment, 885.

Subsidies to Man. (M. for Ret.*) 88.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1486–1492, 1496–1500, 1502–1504, 1507–1511; on M to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt., 1530; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1568–1572.

Subsidies to Rys. (M. for O. C., &c.*) 88.

Subsides to Provinces B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.

Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 733.

Superannuation Fund (M. for Stmnts. respecting*) 43.

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice, 994–997, 1474.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics,) 1094; (Archives, Care of) 1088; (Census, revote) 1092; (Criminal Statistics) 1091; (Dom. Exhibition) 1093; (Health Statistics) 1094.

Canals—Capital: Carillon (Dam and Approaches) 1052; (John Page, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1351; Cornwall, 1050; Murray, 1051; St. Peter's (H. F. Perley, Services) 1350; Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) 1052; Welland (unpaid labourers) 1350; Williamsburg: Rapide Plat Division (Clara Holden, Compensation) to 1352. *Income:* Cornwall (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053; Rideau (Land Damages between Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills) 1354; Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352, conc., 1461.

Charges of Management, 830, 831.

Civil Government: Agriculture, 1337; Civil Service Board, 1336, conc., 1459; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987, suppl., 1336, conc., 1440; Indian Affairs, 841, suppl., 1336; Inland Revenue, 1334; Interior, 1466; Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) 833; Marine and Fisheries, 1468; Militia, 834–837, suppl., 1334; Post Office Dept., 1336; Privy Council Office, 1334, 1336; Railways and Canals, 1334; Secretary of State's Office, 1474.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1316, conc., 1457; Excise (Refund to W. G. Reid) 1382; Liquor License Act (Expense of putting Act into operation) 1382; Weights and Measures (E. Miall, Commissioner of Standards, Allowance to) 1382.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY.—*Continued.*

Dominion Lands—Capital (Examination of Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes) 1384. *Income* (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.

Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 1370.

Geological Survey, conc., 1452.

Immigration (Salaries, &c.) 1404–1408, 1411, 1412.

Indians (B. C.) 1372; (Man. and N. W. T.) 1373.

Legislation: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Returning Officers, Claims of) 1341, conc., 1459. Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007, conc., 1440; (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009; (Sessional Indemnities) 1339, suppl., 1475; (French Translation) 1340.

Mail Subsidies (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1453; (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1452.

Militia (Public Armouries, care of) 1344.

Miscellaneous (Allan, W. F., Allowance in lieu of Board) 1381; (British Association Meeting) 1310; (B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under, Publication of) 1378; (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1375; (Consolidating Statutes) 1303, (Purchase of Type, &c.) 1379; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1379; (McLaughlin, Geo. E., Gratuity to family of) 1373; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1378; (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 1305, 1308; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) 1312, 1314, conc., 1454; (Returns, preparation of) 1382; (Marchand, L. W., Professional Services) 1007, conc., 1464.

Ocean and River Service (Quebec Water and River Police) 1 69.

Penitentiaries (Man.) 1339.

Public Works—Income; Buildings (Ont.) 1355; (Repairs, Heating, &c.) 1359, 1362; Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1365; (Man., scow *Adelaide*) 1365. Miscellaneous (Infantry Schools) 1366; (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367.

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (B. C.) 1048; (Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c.) 1348; (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1047; (Subsidy) 1049; Thomas Temple, Patent Flanger, 1349. Intercol. Ry. (Alex. MacDonell & Co., Arbitrators' Award to) 1346; (Construction Account) 1345; (Fabien Rochette, for land) 1345; (Halifax Extension) 1049; (Halifax Street Ry. Co. *vs.* The Queen) 1345; (St. Charles Branch) 1049, suppl., 1345. P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1348.

Supply Farm, No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47.

Supreme Court Judgments *re* Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (M. for copies*) 43.

Temple, Mr. T., M. P., Protest against (Ques.) 1110.

Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger, in Com. of Sup., 1349.

Timber Licenses, Cancellation of (M. for copies of O.C.) 51, 52.

Volunteers of 1837-38, Surviving, on M. to ascertain number, &c., 89.

Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 1 (Free List) 653. On Res. 2 (jeans and coutilles) 696; (cotton) 696; (earthenware) 696–698, 701, 702, 704; (soap powders) 728; (steel, ingots, &c.) 729; (steel, needles, &c.) 730; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 733. On Res. 3, 735. On conc. (Amt.) respecting duty on crockery and earthenware, 796.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1242.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1382.

Wheatley, Postmaster at, on M. for Rep., 604.

Wilkinson, J. A., promise of Appointment to (Ques.) 1054; Payments to, 1055.

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Windsor Custom House, Appointments in (Ques.) 261.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 1281.

Blondeau, Mr. C. B., *Kamouraska*
Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries (M. for Stmnt.) 972.
Caron, Clovis, complaints against, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1200.
Intercol. Ry. between Hadlow and Rivière du Loup, Sale of buildings on (M. for Stmnt.) 624.
Porpoise Fishing at River Ouelle (M. for Reps.) 86.
Skiffington, Mr., employment of (Ques.) 603; Action of, against Messrs. Michaud and Dumais, of St. Paschal, &c. (M. for copies of Reps., &c.) 621.
Ste. Anne and St. André, Surveys in (M. for Ret.*) 1199.

Bolduc, Mr. J., *Beauce*
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.

Bossé, Mr. J. G., *Centre Quebec*
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 278; M. for Com. to rise, 671.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) M. for Com. to rise, 286; M. wthdn., 289; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 980.
Great Northern Ry. Co. (B. 90, 1°*) 285.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 943.
Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. for 3°, 890.
Quebec Ry. Bridge Co. incorp. (B. 69, 1°*) 162.
Railway Bridge at Quebec (Ques.) 1635.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1557.

Bourassa, Mr. F., *St. Johns, Q.*
Isle-aux-Noix, completion of Works at (Ques.) 966.

Bourbeau, Mr. D. O., *Drummond and Arthabaska*
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1599.

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings*
Acetic Acid, in Com. on W. & M., 695.
Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by C.P. R., on M. for Cor., 53.
Caplins, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
Carpeting, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 696.
Cast Iron Forks, in Com. on W. & M., 704.
Celluloid, in Com. on W. & M., 696,
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1204, 1213; 3° objected to, 1214.

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
Collector of Customs at Napanee, Appointment of, on M. for Ret., 208.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 818.
Cotton, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
Customs Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 123, 1°) 885; 2° m., 1059; in Com., 1060.
Customs Appraisers (Ans.) 285.
Customs Dept. at Windsor, Employment of Officers, on M. for Ret., 509.
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 841, 842.
Customs Officers in Inverness County, on M. for Ret. 466.
Debates, Official Rep. (M. for Sel. Com.) 28; (M. to add names to Com.) 43; Translation (Ans.) 86.
Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export, on M. for copies of Claims, 39.
Duty on Freight Charges, on M. for O.C., 82.
Grinding in Bond, on M. for O.C., &c., 53; (Personal Explanation) 57.
Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer in Vancouver Island, Delay in Appointment (Ans.) 736.
Immigrants, Applications for Services of, on M. for Ret., 510.
Imports, Statement of, on M. for Ret., 28.
Jeans and Coutilles, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
Labels, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 704.
Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1003.
Message from His Excellency (presented) 1240.
Personal Explanation, Ques. misunderstood, 57.
Pine and Spruce Logs, Export Duty on (Ans.) 655.
Port Mulgrave, N.B., as an Out-port (Ans.) 285.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005, 1007.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) to prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1121.
Quebec, Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for copies, 522.
St. Croix Cotton Factory, Importation of Machinery for, on M. for Stmnt., 808.
Soap Powders, in Com. on W. & M., 728.
Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 733.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs, 841, 842.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Salaries, &c., Library) 1003; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005, 1007.
Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 27.
United States Customs Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret., 520.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 1 (Free List) 695; On Res. 2 (acetic acid) 695; (caplins) 696; (celluloid) 696; (carpeting, &c.) 696; (jeans and coutilles) 696; (cotton) 696; (cotton warp) 696; (earthenware) 696, 698; (india rubber) 704; (cast iron forks) 704; (labels, &c.) 704; (pins) 704; (soap powders) 728; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 733. On Res. 3, 734.
Windsor Custom House, Appointments in (Ans.) 261.

Brecken, Mr. F. De. St. C., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 331.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6, m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 95.
Customs Officers in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 466.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 613.
Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1277.
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (*Glendon*, steamer to replace) 1229; (Life-boats, Stations, Life Preservers, &c.) 1229.
Railways—Capital: P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1348.

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac*
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1498, 1499.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1225; (Que.) 1223.

Burpee, Mr. C., *Sunbury*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 502.
Committee on Agricultural Interests, 1882, Expenses (M. for Stmnt.) 132.
Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry. (M. for Cor.) 736.
Intercol. Ry. between Rivière du Loup and Moncton, original cost of (M. for Ret.*) 623.
New Brunswick Ry. Co. (B. 54, 1°*) 141; 2° m., 504.
Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 617.
Swan Creek, N.B., Surveys (M. for Reps.) 605.

Burpee, Hon. J., *St. John, N.B. (City and County)*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1257.

Cameron, Mr. Hector, *North Victoria*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co. incorp. (B. 34, 1°*) 83.
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (Amt.) 1621.
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1204, 1210.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1578–1581.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. to restore B. to Order Paper, 707.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) Ques. of Order, 666; on Amt. 667.

Cameron, Mr. Hector—*Continued.*
Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 890, 896; Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1513.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 863.
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1497.
Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 31, 1°*) 83.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 1168.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take precedence, 824.
Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada Acts Amt. (B. 64, 1°*) 162.
Methodist Churches Union, Pets. against (M. to read and receive) 335.
Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. Acts Amt. B. 80 (*Mr. Bell*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1176.
Niagara Frontier Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 91, 1°*) 285; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1548.
North-Western Coal and Nav. Co.'s (B. 33, 1°) 84.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. (B. 93, 1°*) 304; 2° m., 897, 929.
Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 122, 1°*) 822; 2° m., 986.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1116, 1118.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on non-meeting of Sel. Com., 654.
St. Patrick's Day, on M. for adjournment, 884.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1497.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) 1051, 1052.
Welland Ry. and G. T. R. Transfer authorization B. 44 (*Mr. Bergin*) in Com., 860; 3° objected to, 861.
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. (B. 131) Petition read and received, 1201; Rule suspended and 1°* of B., 1241; 2° m., 1281.

Cameron, Mr. Hugh, *Inverness*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 491.
Customs Officials in Inverness County, increase of (M. for Ret.) 462.
Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1189.
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for Stmnt., 264.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1574.

Cameron, Mr. Hugh—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Oversers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1218.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1191.
Ways and Means—conc., 790.

Cameron, Mr. D. M., *West Middlesex*
A, B, and C Batteries, and Cavalry and Infantry Schools, Officers of (M. for Ret.) 808.
Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Co. incorp. (B. 28, 1°*) 83.
London Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for Com., 1516.
Smith, H. H., Employment of (Ques.) 261, 457.
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1020-1022; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1019; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Drill Instruction) 1096; (Military Properties, care of) 1161, suppl., 1344; (Royal Military College) 1163.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1197.
Wilkinson, J. A., Employment of (Ques.) 966.

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron*
Administrator of the Govt. of the N. W. T., Appointment of (M. for O. C., &c.) 517.
Assiniboia and Calgary, Land Agents for (Ques.) 27.
Bell Telephone Co. of Canada Act Amt. (B. 51, 1°*) 131.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. 347; (Amt.) 359.
Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge (Ques.) 86; Appointment of as Sheriff (M. for O. C., &c.) 145.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in (B. 3, 1°*) 27; 2° m., 93; M. for Com., 271; in Com., 277, on M. for Com. to rise, 671; M. to restore B. to Order Paper, 705.
Criminal Law Amt., Incest, &c. (B. 2, 1°*) 27; 2° m., 79; on M. for 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 292.
Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 549.
Dredges and Tug, construction of (Ques.) 603.
Election Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°*) 28; B. wthdn., 1290.
Fort MacLeod, Public Buildings at (M. for O. C., &c.) 619.
Government Herd in the N. W. (M. for Ret.) 618.
Government Mills in N. W. T., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 199; (M. for Ret.) 507.
Home and Indian Instruction Farms (M. for Ret.) 59.
Homestead and Preemption Lands, withdrawal of, &c. (M. for O. C.*) 79.
House of Commons, Election of Members to (B. 5, 1°*) 28; B. wthdn., 1290.
House of Commons, Representation of Territories in (B. 110, 1°) 598.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 844.

Cameron, Mr. M. C.—*Continued.*
Intoxicating Liquors Act Repeal (B. 17, 1°*) 57.
Land Agents for Assiniboia and Calgary (Ques.) 27.
Lands within Mile Belt, withdrawal of from Homestead and Preemption, &c. (M. for O. C.*) 79.
Liquor License Act, 1883 (M. for Cor.) 618.
Mining Regulations for the N. W., on M. for Ret., 513.
North-West Grievances (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1138-1147.
North-West Territorial Administration (M. for Ret.) 75.
Ontario and Quebec and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. for Com. (Ques. of Priv.) 810; on M. to change name of mover (Ques. of Order) 843; (Ques. of Priv.) 857.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America, B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 898.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to (B. 12, 1°) 40; on Order for 2°, 80; in Com., 818.
Regina, Location of N. W. Capital at (M. for Cor., &c.) 37.
Squatters, Claims of, on Homestead Lands (M. for O. C.*) 79.
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings (N. W. T.) 1198; (Ont.) 1196; Dredging (new plant) 1225. *Harbours and Rivers* (Ont.) 1224.
Supply Farm No. 20, Fish Creek (Ques.) 27; (Ms. for Rets.) 44, 48; (Ques.) 285.
Supply Farm on Pincher Creek, Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 200; (M. for O. C.) 617.
Town Reserves on line of C. P. R. (M. for Ret.) 75.
Town Site at Fort MacLeod, Reservation of (M. for O. C., &c.*) 624.
Volunteers of 1837 (Ques.) 57.

Campbell, Mr. C. J., *Victoria, N.S.*
Ingonish Breakwater (M. for Cor.) 89.

Carling, Hon. J., *London*
Concurrence—Mail Subsidies (Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth) 1453, (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1452 Post Office, 1458.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 1360.
Duart, Postmaster at, on M. for Ret., 510; (Ans.) 1053.
Fort MacLeod and Medicine Hat Mail Service (Ans.) 506.
Governmental Express System (Ans.) 57.
Lansdowne, Post Office at (Ans.) 336.
Letter Postage Rate, Amt. of Existing Law (Ans.) 89.
Letter Postage, Reduction of to two cents (Ans.) 57.
Lottery Firm at St. Stephen, N. B., on M. for Stmnt. of receipts of P.O., 613.
Mail Service in New Brunswick, on M. for Ret., 78.
Mail Service North of Palmerston, Ont. (Ans.) 89.
Money Order Regulations, on M. for copies, 614.
Montreal Post Office Service (Ans.) 797.
Newspaper Mail Service, Delays in Transmission, on M. for Cor., 216.

Carling, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Parry Sound P. O., Postal Thefts at (Ans.) 1109.
Postage Stamps, Sale of, at Windsor (Ans.) 655.
Postal Orders, France and Canada (Ans.) 967.
Stayner, Ont., Postmaster at (Ans.) 1109.
St. Clotilde Post Office, establishment of (Ans.) 1273.
St. Gilles, Daily Mail for (Ans.) 73.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office Dept., 842; suppl., 1627.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1319; conc., 1458.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth) 1299, conc., 1453; (Lakes Huron and Superior) conc., 1453; (U. S. and Victoria, B.C.) 1298.
Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against, on M. for Rep., 604.

Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A., *Quebec County*
A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1246.
Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1019-1022, 1343.
Artillery competition at Shoeburyness, in Com. of Sup., 1166.
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018, 1019.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1382.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 991.
Concurrence—Militia (Dept. of) 1440; (Military Properties, care of) 1441.
Contingencies, Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1343.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 816, 818.
Construction and Repairs, in Com, of Sup., 1158, 1343.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1104.
Departmental Reps., Publication of, in newspapers (remarks) 141,
Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1602.
Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1096.
Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1098.
Drill Sheds, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1160.
Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1062.
Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.
Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 1162.
Luard, Major General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 753; (Personal Explanation) 757.
Manitoba, Increase of Force in, in Com. of Sup., 1343.
Militia and Defence, Annual Report (presented) 98.
Militia Matters, Returns respecting (remarks) 1127.
Militia Tents, Manufacture of (Ans.) 506.
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 833, 1334; conc., 1440.

Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—*Continued.*
Military Properties, &c., care of, in Com. of Sup., 1060, 1602; conc., 1441.
Naval Brigade and Torpedo Corps for B. C. (Ans.) 285.
Ottawa Rifle Range, in Com. of Sup., 1602.
Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of, B. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) in Com., 888.
Public Armouries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1343, 1602,
Rifle Associations, B. C., further aid to (Ans.) 285.
Rifled Ordnance, in Com. of Sup., 1166.
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.
Russian Leather Permeator, in Com. of Sup., 1165.
School of Gunnery, Fortifications, and Militia, B. C. (Ans.) 285.
Smith, H. H., Employment of (Ans.) 261, 458.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 991; Militia Dept., 833, suppl., 1331, conc., 1440.
Militia: (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164; (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1019–1022, suppl., 1343; (Artillery competition at Shoeburyness) 1166; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018, 1019; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Contingencies) 1158, suppl., 1343; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1159, suppl., 1602; (Drill Instruction) 1096; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1098; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1160; (Militia Force, Man.) 1343; (Military Properties, care of) 1060, conc., 1441, suppl., 1602; (Ottawa Rifle Range) 1602; (Public Armouries, &c.) 1095, suppl., 1343, 1602; (Rifled Ordnance, improved) 1166; (Royal Military College) 1163; (Russian Leather Permeator) 1165.
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1016, 1017.
Public Works—Income: Miscellaneous (Infantry Schools) 1366.
Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1017.
Volunteers of 1837 (Ans.) 57.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, *South Huron*
Acetic Acid, in Com. on W. & M., 695.
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 994.
Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1318.
Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 842.
America, Works on, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1020.
Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1088–1091; conc., 1440.
Auditor General's Office, in Com. of Sup., 841.
Bayfield Harbour, damage to by Storms (Ques.) 40.
Biography of Sir Charles Tupper, in Com. of Sup., 1439.
Boucher de la Bruère, payment to, for type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1374; conc., 1464.
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018, 1019.
Canadian Pacific Ry., Bridge across Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1348.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 173; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence (Amt.) 304; in Com., 455; (Personal Explanation) 491, 493.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—*Continued.*
Canadian Pacific Ry., on Ms. (*Mr. Blake*) for further information, 221, 229.
Canals, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1050–1052, 1351; Income, 1352–1354; conc., 1461.
Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Carpeting, &c., in Com. on W & M., 696.
Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1165.
Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1091; conc., 1440.
Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 825–832.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1390–1392.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 988–990, 1337.
Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 765.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1256, 1261, 1317–1319; conc., 1449, 1456, 1458, 1464.
Concurrence—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 1440; Bocuher de la Bruère (Payment to, for type, &c.) 1464; Civil Service Board, 1458; Culling Timber, 1458; Customs, 1456, 1464; Excisemen (Promotion of) 1617; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; Immigration, 1464; Indians (B.C.) 1617; Intercol. Ry., 1449; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner) 1461, 1613; Mail Subsidies (Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth) 1453, (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1452; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1463; Military Properties (Care of) 1440; N.W.T. (Expense of Govt. in) 1611; Page, John (Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1618; Port Arthur Harbour, 1616; Post Office, 1458; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1455; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1611; Temple, Thos. (Patent Flanger) 1460; Waterhen River (Man.) 1616.
Confederation, Historical Picture, in Com. of Sup., 1309.
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to (Ms. for Rets.*) 28, 140; (M. for Stmnt.*) 1200.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461; on M. to withdraw B. 987.
Consolidating Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 815, 818.
Cotton, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 286, 289; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667.
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.
Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1317; conc., 1458.
Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841–842.
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.
Departmental Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 843.
Deposits of Govt. money in Banks (M. for Stmnt.*) 28.
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1622.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—*Continued.*
Dominion Lands, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1384, 1423; Income, 1385, 1427–1429, 1435.
Dominion Police, in Com. of Sup., 997.
Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1159.
Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1098.
Drill Sheds, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1160.
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 702.
Estimates, Suppl., 1883–84, on being communicated to the Press before laying on Table (remarks) 1240.
Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1617.
Exchange Bank of Canada (M. for Stmnt.) 35; (Res.) 155.
Exports and Imports, distinguishing products of Canada from other countries (M. for Ret.*) 28.
Exports and Imports to 1st March, 1883 and 1884 (M. for Ret.*) 1200.
Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 841.
Finance Minister's Mission to England (M. for Papers) 86.
Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1234.
Fort MacLeod, Public Buildings at, on M. for O.C., &c., 620.
Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1130.
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1261.
Governor General's Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup. 832.
Health Statistics, conc, 1440.
High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987, 1336; (House and Furniture for) 1367, conc., 1615.
Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1607, 1617.
Immigrants settled in Ontario (M. for Ret.*) 28.
Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1404, 1407, 1410, 1412, 1414, 1416; conc., 1464.
Imports, Statement of (M. for Ret.*) 28.
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 840, 841.
Indian Islands in Lake Ont., on M. for Ret., 87, 88.
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1269, 1372, 1373.
India Rubber, in Com. on W. & M., 704.
Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841, 1335.
Intercol. Ry., Refund to N. B. Govt., in Com. of Sup., 1628; Award of Commissioners, 1629.
Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 838–840, 1646.
Jennie Graham, schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1613.
Justice, Dept. of (Penitentiaries Branch) in Com. of Sup., 833.
Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1003–1007, 1339, 1439, 1611.
Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004.
Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1230.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—*Continued.*
Life Insurance Co.'s, Co-operative, &c., B. 118 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for Com. on Res., 765.
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1232–1234.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 757.
Loan of $4,000,000 (M. for Deptl. Orders, &c.*) 40.
Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1607.
Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to, Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 68.
Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1353.
Marine and Fisheries Dept. B. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1609.
Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1468.
Meteorological Observations, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161; conc., 1440.
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 833–837.
Militia Matters, Returns respecting (remarks) 1128.
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1018–1020, 1093, 1159–1166; conc., 1440.
Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1294.
Newfoundland, Trade with (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1361; (Ques.) 1653.
Niagara Falls Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1303.
North-West Grievances (Ques.) 766; on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1152.
N. W. T., Expenses of Govt. in, conc., 1611.
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1230, 1232.
Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1351; conc., 1618.
Patent Record, in Com. of Sup., 1089.
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 998–1002.
Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1017.
Personal Explanation respecting Liberal press, in deb. on C.P.R. Loan B., 491.
Port Arthur Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603; conc., 1616.
Post Office and Finance Depts. (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987.
Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 842.
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1319, 1383; conc., 1458.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.
Printing and Advertising, Cost of, on M. for Ret., 303.
Printing Com., on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Mess. to Sen., 31.
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004, 1005, 1007; conc., 1440.
Private Bills, Presentation of, on M. to extend time,
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 833, 1333, 1359.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—*Continued.*
Provincial Subsidies B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 815, 818.
Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1328.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1013.
Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 843.
Public Works, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1603; Income, 1190, 1191, 1193, 1194, 1198, 1218, 1222, 1223, 1226, 1354, 1355, 1362, 1604, 1606,
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1013.
Railway Act, Consolidated, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461.
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 843.
Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1064, 1347–1350, 1628–1630.
Redemption of Small Loans B. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1588.
Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1455.
Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1611.
Return, Missing, *re* Timber Licenses (remarks) 460.
Rifled Ordnance, improved, in Com. of Sup., 1166.
Robertson, John, Claims of, on M. for Ret., 615.
Rolling Stock, P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1347.
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1162–1164.
Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 837.
Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1645.
Senate, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1627.
Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339.
Sifton, Ward & Co., Claim of, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
St. Andrew's, schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1613.
Stationery Office, in Com. of Sup., 987.
Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 765.
Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1255.
Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1299.
Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 728; Needles, &c., 730.
Subsidies to Provinces B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.
Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 731.
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, 994.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, care of) 1033; (Census revote) 1091, conc., 1440; (Criminal Statistics) 1090; (Health Statistics) conc., 1440; (*Patent Record*) 1089.
Canals—Capital: Carillon (John Page, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1351, conc., 1618; Cornwall, 1050; Lachine, 1050; Murray, 1051; Ste. Anne's, 1052; Welland, 1051, suppl. (Unpaid Labourers) 1350; Williamsburgh (Lock at Rapide Plat Canal) 1051. *Income:* Beauharnois (L. W. Marchand, Professional Services) 1353, conc., 1463; Rideau (Land Damages) 1354;

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Welland (Schooners *St. Andrew's* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352, conc., 1461, 1613.

Charges of Management, 825–832.

Civil Government: Agriculture, 842; Auditor General's Office, 841; Civil Service Board, 988–990, suppl., 1337, conc., 1458; Customs, 841, 842; Departmental Contingencies, 843; Finance and Treasury Board, 841; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987, suppl., 1336; Indian Affairs, 840, 841; Inland Revenue, 841, suppl., 1335; Interior, 838–840, suppl., 1466; Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) 833; Marine and Fisheries, 1468; Militia Dept., 833–837, conc., 1440; Post Office and Finance Depts. (Contingencies) 987; Post Office Dept., 842; Privy Council Office, 833, suppl., 1333; Public Works, 843; Railways and Canals, 843; Secretary of State's Office, 837; Stationery Office, 987.

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 1318; Canals (Maintenance, &c., Salaries, &c.) 1261; Culling Timber, 1317, conc., 1458; Customs, 1316, conc., 1456, 1464; Excise (Salaries, increased) 1316, conc., 1617; Post Office, 1319, 1383, conc., 1458; Public Works (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1318, (Agent and Contingencies, B.C.) 1319. Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1256, conc., 1449; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1318.

Dominion Lands—Capital (Examination of Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1423. *Income* (Outside Service) 1427–1429, 1435; (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.

Dominion Police, 997.

Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234.

Geological Survey, 1261.

Immigration (Salaries, &c.) 1404, 1407, 1410, 1412, 1414, 1416; conc., 1464.

Indians: Annual Grant (B. C.) 1266, suppl, 1372, conc., 1617; (Man. and N. W.) 1269, suppl, 1373; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1263; (P. E. I.) 1266.

Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1611; (Sessional Indemnities) 1339. Miscellaneous (Biography of Sir Charles Tupper) 1439; (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1040; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1004, 1005, 1007, conc., 1440; (Works on America) 1009. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 1627.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Agencies, Rents, &c.) 1232; (Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c.) 1232; (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1233; (Signal Stations) 1234.

Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1019, 1020; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018, 1019; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Contingencies, &c.) 1158; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1159; (Drill Pay and Incidental Expenses) 1098; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1160; (Military Properties, care of) 1161, conc., 1440; (Rifled Ordnance) 1166; (Royal Military College) 1162–1164.

Miscellaneous (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for type, &c.) 1374, conc., 1464; (Confederation, Historical Picture) 1309; (Consolidating Statutes) 1302; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to 1607, suppl., 1617; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1607; (Niagara Falls Commission) 1303; (N. W. T., Expenses of Govt. in) conc., 1611; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) 1455.

North-West Mounted Police (Pay of Force, &c.) 1294.

Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1230; (Obstructions in Navigable Rivers) 1232.

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 1002; (Dorchester) 1000; (Kingston) 998; (Man.) 1000; (St. Vincent de Paul) 999.

Pensions (Compensation in lieu of land) 1017; (Veterans of 1812) 1016, 1017.

Public Works—Capital: N. B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1603; Port Arthur (Construction of Harbour) 1603, conc., 1616. *Income:* Buildings (N. W. T.) 1198; (N. S.) 1190, suppl., 1604; (Ont.) 1194, suppl., 1355; (P. E. I.) 1191; (Que.) 1193, suppl., 1354; (Repairs, &c.) 1198, suppl., 1362. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 1365, conc., 1616; (N. B.) 1222; (N. S.) 1218; (Ont.) 1223, suppl., 1606; (P. E. I.) 1362; (Que.) 1223. Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367, conc., 1615; (Infantry Schools) 1366; (Telegraph Lines) 1226.

Quarantine (Pictou Cattle Disease) 1010; (Public Health) 1013; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Bridge across Red River) 1348; (Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c.) 1348; (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1064; (Section B., Award of Arbitrators) 1630, conc., 1645; (Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake) 1350; (Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger) 1394, conc., 1416. Intercol. Ry. (Claims arising out of construction, Award of Commissioners) 1629; (Expenditure on by Govt. of N.B.) 1628; (St. Charles Branch) 1049. P. E. I. Ry. (Rolling Stock) 1347.

Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Observations) 1254.

Steamboat Inspection, 1255.

Steamship Subventions (Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth) 1299.

Unprovided Items, 1383.

Supply Farm, No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47, 48.

Surveys chargeable to Capital in Public Accounts (M. to ref. to Com. on Pub. Accts.) 303.

Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 727.

Telegraph Lines, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger, in Com. of Sup., 1349; conc., 1460.

Town Reserves on line of C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 77.

Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.

Unprovided Items, in Com. of Sup., 1383.

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1017.

Ways and Means—Budget Speech (reply to) 584; in Com.: on Res. 2 (acetic acid) 695; (carpeting, &c.) 696; (cotton) 696; (earthenware) 702; (india rubber) 704; (steel, ingots, &c.) 728; (steel, needles, &c.) 730; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 731, 733. On conc., 767.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin*

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1251.

Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1020–1022.

Audet, Alphonse, appointment of (M. for O. C.*) 1201.

Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018, 1019.

Britton, Ephraim, Postmaster at, Complaints against appointment (M. for Pet.*) 1201.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 477.

Canadian Pacific Railway, Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1048.

Cattle, Live, Trade with Great Britain, restrictions on (M. for O. C., &c.*) 1200.

Cattle Stations, Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1012.

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge, further appointment (Ques.) 1387.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 990–994, 1337.
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.
Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 556.
Dominion Grange and Farming Legislation (M. for Ret.*) 1201.
Dominion Lands, Capital (Surveys) in Com. of Sup., 1424.
Dominion Police, in Com. of Sup., 1338.
Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1096.
Duart, Postmaster at (M. for Ret.) 509; (Ques.) 1053; Complaints against appointment (M. for Pet.*) 1201.
Harbours and Rivers, Ont., in Com. of Sup., 1244.
Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 206.
Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1232.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1600.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 754.
Morpeth Harbour, Construction of Works at (Ques.) 1054.
Mounted Police Supplies, Tenders and Advertisements for (M. for copies*) 1200.
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1338.
Public Armouries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1095.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for Com., 814; in Com., 815.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1013–1015.
Section B, C. P. R., Transfer of Contract (M. for Ret.) 77; further Sums paid to Contractors (M. for Estimate) 77; Award of Arbitrators, &c. (M. for copy*) 1200; in Com. of Sup., 1631.
Secretary of State, Dept. of, Chief Clerks (Ques.) 797.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Crimimal Statistics) 1090.
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 990–994; suppl., 1337.
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys 1424.)
Dominion Police, 1338.
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1020–1022; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018, 1019; (Drill Instruction) 1096; (Public Armouries, &c.) 1095.
Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1232.
Penitentiaries, 1338.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1224.
Quarantine (Cattle Stations) 1012; (Public Health) 1013–1015.
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1048; (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) 1631.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 672.
Thames and Lake Erie Canal (Ques.) 797.
Whitcher, W. F., Complaints, &c., against, and retirement of (M. for O. C., &c.*) 1200.

Casgrain, Mr. P. P., *L'Islet*
Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries, on M. for Stmnt., 974.

Casgrain, Mr. P. P.—*Continued.*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 186.
Crane Island Wharf (M. for Ret.) 516; (Ques.) 736.
Elgin Road Station, L'Islet (Ques.) 199.
Fabre, Hon. Hector, retention of services (Ques.) 337.
Governor General's Commission, &c. (M. for copies) 521.
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 29.
Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 137.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) attention of *Mr. Speaker* called to expiration of hour for Private Bills, 811.
Porpoise Fishing at River Ouelle, on M. for Reps., 86.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to (B. 12) 2° m., 292; ref. to Sel. Com., 294; on reducing quorum of Sel. Com. (remarks) 624; non-meeting of Sel. Com. (remarks) 654; M. for Com. of W., 813–819; M. to restore to Order Paper, 820; Mr. Fortin's Vote, on point of Order, 821.
Quebec, Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c. (M. for copies) 522.
St. Jean Port Joli Wharf (M. for Ret.) 517.

Catudal, Mr. M., *Napierville*
United States Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret., 520.

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne*
Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of, on M. for Sel. Com., 74.
Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c., Salaries (prop. Res.) 1215; in Com., 1360; incorp. with B. 130, 1388.
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 837, 988–993, 1336.
Civil Service Act Amt. (Ans.) 655.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. (B. 130, 1°) 1169; prop. Res. (Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c.) 1215; in Com., 1360; ref. to Com. on B., 1388; in Com. on B. 1388–1394, 1422; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1652.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 988–993; suppl., 1336.
Concurrence—Returning Officers, Claims of, 1611.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron Huron*) on M. for Com., 281; on M. to restore to Order Paper, 707.
Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 554.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com., 1272.
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1304, 1306.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 872.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1004, 1005, 1341.
Luard, Major-General, complaints against, on M. for copies, 757.

Chapleau, Hon. J. C.—*Continued.*
Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocease of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*) in Com., 890.
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 818, 819.
Returning Officers, Claims of, in Com. of Sup., 1341; conc., 1611.
Returns, Missing and Imperfect (Explanations) 459, 460.
School of Navigation at Quebec, on M. for Cor., 203.
Scott Act in Cumberland Co., N. S. (Ans.) 736.
Secretary of State, Dept. of, Chief Clerks (Ans.) 797, vol. ii; in Com. of Sup., 837.
Statutes, Dom., Distribution of (Ans.) 797.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1530–1539; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 988-993, suppl., 1336; Secretary of State's Office, 837.
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) 1341; conc., 1611. Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005.
Miscellaneous (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 1304, 1306.

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1093.
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for 3°, 1175.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 379; in Com., 456; on M. for Com. on B., 537.
Canals, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1052.
Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1604.
Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1093.
Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge, further appointment of (Ques.) 1387.
C.P.R., Station Accommodation, conc., 1449.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. (B. 6, 1°*) 28; 2° m., 141; M. for Com., 286; in Com., 290; on Ques. of Order, 667; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 668; on reprint of Amts., 812; on M. to adjn. deb., 813.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com., 1272; in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1340.
Deserters from American Army, Arrest of, in Can. Territory (M. for Cor.*) 1200.
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1623.
Dominion Lands, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1428, 1429.
Emigration Statistics, Can. and U. S. (M. for Cor.*) 1199.
Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1061.
Geological Survey, conc., 1450.

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Homesteads and Preemptions, Number of acres entered for (M. for Ret.*) 78.
Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1086.
Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 539.
Intercol. Ry. (Miscellaneous) in Com. of Sup., 1050.
Lands sold under Regulations and price per acre (M. for Ret.*) 78.
Lands Surveyed in Manitoba and the N. W., number of acres and cost (M. for Ret.*) 78.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1003, 1005, 1009, 1340.
Letter Postage, Reduction on (M. for copies of Cor.) 87.
Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1003
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1599.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take precedence, 824.
Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1607.
Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 1298.
Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1607.
Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1297.
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1230.
Pasture Land Leases (M. for Ret.) 73.
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1002.
Port Arthur Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1003.
Public Debt of the Dominion (Ques.) 736.
Public Expenditure (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1322.
Public Works, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1603, 1604; Income, 1199.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1050, 1449.
Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1184.
Returns, Imperfect, in reference to Timber Leases (remarks) 766.
Returns, Production of (remarks) 1128.
Sale and Management of Lands in N. W., Regulations respecting (M. for copies*) 78.
Statistics, Emigration, Can. and U. S. (M. for Cor.*) 1199.
St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1049.
Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1256.
Sunday Excursions, Prevention (B. 112, 1°*) 655.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census, revote) 1093.
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav. Locks, &c.) 1052.
Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1428, 1429.
Geological Survey, conc., 1450.
Legislation: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1002, suppl., 1340. Miscellaneous (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009;

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

(Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005; (Salaries, &c., Library) 1003.

Mail Subsidies (U. S. and Victoria, B.C.) 1298.

Miscellaneous (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1607.

North-West Mounted Police (Pay of Force, &c.) 1297.

Ocean and River Service (Lifeboats, Stations, Life Preservers, &c.) 1230.

Penitentiaries (B. C.) 1002.

Public Works—Capital: N. B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1604; Port Arthur, 1603. *Income:* Buildings (Repairs, &c.) 1199.

Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Station Accommodation) conc., 1449; (Subsidy) 1049. Intercol. Ry. (Miscellaneous, not provided for) 1050; (St. Charles Branch) 1049.

Steamboat Inspection, 1256.

Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 709.

Timber Licenses and Permits (M. for Ret.*) 78.

Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.

Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1052.

United States Army, Deserters from, arrest of on Canadian Territory (M. for Cor.*) 1200.

Ways and Means—conc., 771.

Cockburn, Mr. A. P., *North Ontario*

Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.

Gravenhurst and Callander Ry. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 40.

Hunter's Island, Land or Timber Sales (Ques.) 965, 1054.

Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 766.

St. Lawrence Canals, Enlargement of, Rapide Plat and Cornwall, Tenders for (M. for copies*) 1200.

Superior, Lake, North of, character and resources of land, on M. for Ret., 971.

SUPPLY:

Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1433.

Militia (Formation of new Companies) 1343.

Public Works—Income: Dredging (new plant) 1226.

Steamboat Inspection, 1256.

Colby, Mr. C. C., *Stanstead*

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1208.

SUPPLY:

Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1438.

Cook, Mr. H. H., *East Simcoe*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 448.

Government Mills in the N. W., Disposal of, on M. for Ret., 508.

Indian Agent at Penetanguishene (Ques.) 31.

Indian Agent's Office, Toronto, closing of (M. for O. C.) 269, 294.

Leamington, Post Office at, on M. for Cor., 802.

Public Buildings of the Dom., on M. for Ret., 41.

Cook, Mr. H. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1429-1433.

Supply Farm, No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47.

Timber Licenses, cancellation of, on M. for Ret., 52.

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N. B.*

Adulteration of Food and Drugs Acts Amt. and Consol. (B. 109, 1°) 598; Order dschgd., 1057; Prevention (B. 114, 1°*) 655; 2° m., 1132; (Explanations) 1137; prop. Res. (Public Analysts) 1215; Res. in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; in Com., 1246, 1249, 1294.

Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Adulteration of Food Rep. (presented) 1321.

Analysts, Public (prop. Res.) 1215; in Com. on Res., 1244; incorp. with B. 114, 1294.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B.101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. (M. to adjn. deb.) 414; (Explanation) 415.

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1394.

Coal, Sale and Delivery of (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., in Com. and 1°* of B., 765; 2° m., 1058; Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 1618.

Concurrence—Culling Timber, 1457; Customs, 1457; Excise, 1617.

Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1317; conc., 1457.

Customs, conc., 1457.

Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1316, 1383; conc., 1617.

Excise Officers at Perth and Quebec (Ans.) 132.

Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. (B. 108, 1°*) 598; 2° m., 1056; in Com., 1129.

Gas Inspection in B. C. (Ans.) 506.

General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 128) Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1°* of B., 1056; in Com., 1394.

Inland Revenue Act, non-enforcement of (Ans.) 85.

Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841, 1335.

Inland Revenue Rep., Rets. and States. (presented) 27.

Inland Revenue Warehouse at St. John, N. B. (Ans.) 1212.

License Commissioners, Que., furnishing blank forms, &c. (Ans.) 966.

Liquor License Act, Expense of putting Act into operation, in Com. of Sup., 1383.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598.

Logs and Lumber, Measurement of (Ans.) 337.

Minor Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Public Analysts, prop. Res., 1215; in Com. on Res., 1244; incorp. with B. 114, 1294.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 841; suppl., 1335.

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 1318; Culling Timber, 1317, conc., 1457; Customs, conc., 1457; Excise, 1316, suppl., 1383, conc., 1617; Liquor License Act, 1383; Minor Revenues, 1318; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1318, suppl., 1382.

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 120) M. for Com. on Res., in Com., and 1°* of B., 765; 2° m., 1050; in Com., 1242, 1294.
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318, 1382.
Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 1321.

Coughlin, Mr. T., *North Middlesex*
Carriers by Land, Liability of (B. 103, 1°*) 504.

Coursol, Mr. C. J., *East Montreal*
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 287.
Debates, Official Rep., on M., to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 1101.
License Act, 1883, Police organization under (Ques.) 505.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 749.
Private Bills, Presentation of (M. to extend time) 71.
Quebec, Claims of Province against Dominion (M. for Cor.*) 79.
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Mr. Fabre's salary, &c.) 1307.

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 305.
Concurrence—Returning Officers, Claims of, 1612.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 286.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 21, 1°*) 67; 2° m., 890, 891.
Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1077.
Insolvent Debtors Assets, Distribution of (B. 71, 1°*) 162.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 923.
Superannuation Contributions, Refund of (Ques.) 285.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) 1612.
Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal (M. for Cor.) 798.

Daly, Mr. M. P., *Halifax*
Atlantic Mutual Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 48, 1°*) 131.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 502.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 95.
Customs Offices at Halifax, on M. for Ret., 466.
Halifax Mutual Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 27, 1°*) 83.
Nova Scotia Mutual Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 49, 1°*) 131.
St. Patrick's Day, adjournment (M.) 884.

Daly, Mr. M. P.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management, 829.
Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries, 1471.
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237.
Militia (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165.

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P. E. I.*
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1254.
Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1089.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1089, 1091–1093.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 10 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 231.
Canals, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1614.
Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603; conc., 1616.
Census, in Com. of Sup., 1092.
Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 826, 829.
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 1457, 1470.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1390.
Collection of Revenues (Railways) in Com. of Sup., 1258.
Compensation Claims for repairing Piers, &c. (M. for O. C.) 1169.
Concurrence—Cape Tormentine Harbour (N. B.) 1616; Harbours and Rivers (P. E. I.) 1443, 1464; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner,) 1614; Public Buildings (Charlottetown) 1604; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1455.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 818, 819.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 283.
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091.
Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093.
Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1236, 1369.
Freight Charges on Intercol. Ry., on M. for Stmnt., 808.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.
Glendon, steamer to replace, in Com. of Sup., 1228.
Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Halifax Street Ry. Co. *vs.* The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Harbours and Rivers, P. E. I., conc., 1443, 1464.
Hudson Bay, Expedition to, conc., 1617.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 868.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 610.
Intercol. Ry., Claims arising out of construction, in Com. of Sup., 1630.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1343.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 965.
Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1229.

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1234.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1599, 1638.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 949.

Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1607.

Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction, B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 461.

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1166.

Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1303, 1312, 1315, 1607, 1617.

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1227-1229.

Piers in P.E.I., payments for repairs on (Ques.) 1054; (M. for copies of O. C.) 1169.

P. E. I. and the Fishery Award (Res.) 1273.

P. E. I. Ry., Payment of Labourers on (Ques.) 965.

P. E. I. Salaries of Employés (M. for Stmnt.) 298, 299.

P. E. I. Steamboats, Inspection of (M. for Papers) 59, 63.

Public Buildings (Charlottetown) conc., 1604.

Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.

Public Works, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1603; Income, 1221, 1355, 1362, 1366, 1604.

Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1586; in Com., 1588; on M. for 3°, 1609.

Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1345, 1347, 1630, 1648.

Reciprocity (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1176.

Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1312, 1315; conc., 1455.

Returns, production of (remarks) 1128.

Rifled Ordnance, improved, in Com. of Sup., 1166.

Section B, Award of Arbitrators, conc., 1648.

Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 5°, 1170, 1293.

St. Andrews and *Jennie Graham*, Schooners, conc., 1614.

Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1255.

Steamboat Inspectors' Rep. (Ques.) 460.

Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior, in Com. of Sup., 1303.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, Care of) 1089; (Census, revote) 1092; (Criminal Statistics) 1091; (Dominion Exhibition) 1093.

Canals—Income: Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) conc., 1614.

Charges of Management, 826, 829.

Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries, 1467-1470.

Collection of Revenues: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1258.

Fisheries (Fishing Bounty, distribution of) 1369; (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c) 1236.

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Indemnities) 1343.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1234.

Militia (Rifled Ordnance, improved) 1166.

Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) conc., 1617; (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1607; (Refund of

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) 1312, 1315, conc., 1455; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 1303.

Ocean and River Service (*Glendon*, steamer to replace) 1228; (Government Steamers) 1227; (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229.

Public Works—Capital: N. B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1603; conc., 1616. *Income:* Buildings (P. E. I.) conc., 1604. Harbours and Rivers (Man., scow *Adelaide*) 1366; (Ont.) 1355; (P. E. I.) 1221, suppl., 1362, conc., 1443, 1464.

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) conc., 1648. Intercol. Ry. (Claims arising out of construction, Award of Commissioners) 1630; (Halifax Street Ry. *vs.* The Queen) 1345; P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1347.

Steamboat Inspection, 1255.

Washington Treaty, Fishery Clauses, termination of (M. for Ret.*) 1200.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1243.

Wharves and Piers in N. B. (Ques.) 458.

Wharves and Piers in P. E. I., Inspection of (Ques.) 261.

Dawson, Mr. S.J., *Algoma*

Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with, in Com. of Sup., 1379.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 392.

Concurrence—Geological Survey, 1452.

Disputed Territory B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3°, 1640.

Fisheries in Com. of Sup., 1236, 1371.

Geological Survey, conc., 1452.

Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 204.

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1417.

Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1402.

Indians, Annual Grant, in Com. of Sup., 1265.

Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 541.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior (M. for Ret.) 606, 613.

Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.

Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1229.

Mission School at Fort William, in Com. of Sup., 1608.

Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 766.

Superior, Lake, North of, character and resources of land (M. for Ret.) 967.

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1236; (Fishing Bounty) 1371.

Geological Survey, conc., 1452.

Immigration (Salaries, &c.) 1417.

Indians: Annual Grant (Mission School at Fort William) 608; (Ont. Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1265.

Miscellaneous (Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with) 1379; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 1303.

Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229.

Dawson, Mr. S. J.—*Continued.*
Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior, in Com of Sup., 1303.
Timber Licenses, Cancellation of, on M. for Ret., 52.

De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., *Portneuf*
Subsidies to Rys. authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1627.

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga*
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1248.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com. to rise, 671.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 288; on reprint of Amts., 812; on M. to adjn. deb., 813.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1102, 1106.
French Translation, in Com. of Sup., 1340.
Governor General's Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 833.
Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal (Ques.) 1387.
Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1003.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596.
Newfoundland Prohibitive Duty (Ques.) 1214.
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1319.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1012.
Railway Crossings on Roads and Streets (Ques.) 1273.
Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1300.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Governor General's Secretary's Office, 833.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1319.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (French Translation) 1340; (Salaries, &c., Library) 1003.
Quarantine (Public Health) 1012.
Steamship Subventions (France and Quebec) 1300.

Dundas, Mr. J. R., *South Victoria*
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 717.
Wheat and Wheat Flour, Imported and Duty collected, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 66.

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot*
Subsidies to Ry. Companies, Amounts paid under (M. for Stmnt.) 261.

Fairbank, Mr. J. H., *East Lambton*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 255.
Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr Houde*) 963.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007, 1008.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1021.

Farrow, Mr. T., *East Huron*
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461.
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 704.
Governmental Express System (Ques.) 57.
Moneys paid by Dom. to Local Govts. since Confederation (M. for Stmnt.*) 1200.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 924.
Payments on Settlers' Lands (Ques.) 57.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.
Two cent Letter Postage (Ques.) 57.
Ways and Means—in Com., on Res. (earthenware) 702.

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *North Leeds and Grenville*
Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for. Sel. Com., 800.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 486; on challenged quotation, 492.
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 704.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1016.
Quebec Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for copies, 522.
SUPPLY:
Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1435.
Legislation (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005, 1006, 1009.
Immigration (Salaries, &c.) 1422.
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1016.
Quarantine (Public Health) 1016.
Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016.
Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. (earthenware) 704.

Ferguson, Mr. J., *Welland*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 32).
Saskatoon and Northern Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 41, 1°*) 89.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Welland (Unpaid Labourers) 1351.

Fisher, Mr., S. A., *Brome*
Beemer, H. J., Claim of, for work on Gates, &c., Quebec (Ques.) 604.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com., on Res., 309.
Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1097.
Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1449.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596; in Com., 1597.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 980.
Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1189.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1563.

Fisher, Mr. S. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Instruction) 1097.
Public Works—Income; Buildings (Que.) 1605.

Fleming, Mr. J., *Peel*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 317.
Goodwin Jas., Claim of, for erecting Wall around Parliament Grounds (Ques.) 604.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598, 1602; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1637; in Com., 1639.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 940.

Fortin, Mr. P., *Gaspé*
Bounty to Fishermen, Claims paid and amount (M. for Stmnt.*) 140.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056; in Com. on B., 1395.
International Fisheries Exhibition (M. for copies of Reps.) 80.
Newfoundland Herring, Inspection of (M. for Ret.) 31.
Personal Explanation, mis-statement of fact by Member, 808.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) Vote challenged after div., 821.
School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 202, 203.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1626.

Foster, Mr. G. E., *King's, N. B.*
Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of, on M. for Sel. Com., 74.
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 1620.
Canadian Pacific Railway Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 242.
Chinese Immigration into B. C, Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com. 287; (Amt.) 291; (Amt.) 666, neg., 980.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1599.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 927.
Personal Explanation on newspaper paragraph, 763.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic (Res.) 656; deb. rsmd., 980; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1119; (Personal Explanation) 1122.

Gault, Mr. M. H., *West Montreal*
British Association Meeting, in Com. of Sup., 1310.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 989.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1318, 1320.
Concurrence—Military Properties (Care of) 1441; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1459; Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*, 1614.

Gault, Mr. M. H.—*Continued.*
Customs Appraisers (Ques.) 285.
Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 842.
Customs Officers in Montreal, on M. for Ret., 466.
Dominion Exhibition (Ques.) 1215.
General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1395.
Lachine Canal, Contract for New Basins (Ques.) 1215.
Military Properties, Care of, conc., 1441.
Montreal Carnival, Adjournment for (Ques.) 83.
Post Office, in Com of Sup., 1320.
Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1459.
St. Andrews and *Jennie Graham*, Schooners, in Com. of Sup., 1614.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income: Welland (Shooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) 1614.
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 989; Customs, 842.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1320; Public Works (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1318.
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of), conc., 1459.
Militia (Military Properties, Care of) conc. 1441.
Miscellaneous (British Association Meeting) 1310.
Telegraph Lines, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Gigault, Mr. G. A., *Rouville*
Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of (M. for Sel. Com.) 74; Rep. of Com. (Ques.) 1337.
Agricultural Industry and Mechanical Arts, Essays, &c., on (M. for copies of Pets.) 33.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1601.

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 442.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1055.
Mail Service in New Brunswick (M. for Cor.) 78.
Reciprocity, on Res (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1188.
Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. B. 129 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1360.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1486.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 1371.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B) 1192; Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 1222.

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 315.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 851.

Girouard, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598, 1599; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1636; in Com., 1639.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 947.
Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 139.
Privileges and Elections, First Rep. of Com. (presented) 1270; M. to conc. in, 1291.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Chales Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1549; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1553, 1556.
Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C.P. Ry., on M. for Cor., 42.

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island*
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1027; on Amt. (*Mr. Reid*) 1038; on M. for 3°, 1171; (Amt.) 1172.
Chinese Immigration into B.C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 976; on M. to adjn. deb., 1285, 1288.
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. (Ques.) 85.
Nanaimo Post Office, on M. for Cor., 805.
SUPPLY:
Indian Affairs: Annual Grant (B.C.) 1266.

Grandbois, Mr. P. E., *Témiscouata*
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1576.

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland*
Committee on Agricultural Interests, 1882, Expenses, on M. for Stmnt., 132.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 610.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 750.
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Maritime Court of Ont.) 996.
Civil Government: Customs, 842.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007.
United States Deserters, Arrest of (M. for Ret.) 86.

Gunn, Mr. A., *Kingston*
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 68, 1°*) 162.

Hackett, Mr. E., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1280.
Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 63.
Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1182.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1260.
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234, 1237.

Haggart, Mr. J. G., *South Lanark*
Frontier Police, South-Western Ontario (Ques.) 1054.
Government Mills in the N. W., Disposal of, on M. for Ret., 508.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. and Amts. made by Sen., on Ques. of Priv., 1512.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 743; Explanation of reference in deb. to Mr. Fortin, 809.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to M. that B. pass, 888.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) M. for Com., 810; M. to change name of mover, 843; in Com., 857; 3° m., 859; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1281.

Hall, Mr. R. M., *Sherbrooke*
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1017.
Concurrence—Geological Survey, 1451.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593.
Geological Surveys, Mining and Metallurgy (M. for Sel. Com.) 515.
International Ry. Co.'s (B. 5[illegible], 1°*) 131.
Life Annuities, Sale of (Ques.) 199.
Logs and Lumber, Measurement of (Ques.) 337.
London Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for Com., 1516.
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1492.
River St. Clair Tunnel Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (*Mr. Macmaster*) M. for Com., 603.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1492.
SUPPLY:
Geological Survey, 1261; conc., 1451.
Militia (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1017.
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1242.

Hesson, Mr. S. R., *North Perth*
Banking Facilities for Agriculturists, on M. for Sel. Com., 213.
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1030.
Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 989.
Concurrence—Returning Officers, Claims of, 1460.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb., 669; on Name being omitted from div. on B., 709.
Customs Examination of Baggage at St. Vincent (Ques.) 1444.
Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1094.

Hesson, Mr. S. R.—*Continued.*
Duval, Geo., Précis Writer, Supreme Court, Statutory increase, in Com. of Sup., 1474.
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 699, 702; conc., 782.
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1308.
Government Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 1023.
Intercol. Ry., Coal carried by, on M. for Ret., 65.
Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1407, 1413, 1414, 1420.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 759.
Land Improvement Fund, Ont. (Ques.) 1215.
Ontario and Que. Accounts and Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 73.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.
Postal Statistics (M. for Stmnt.) 90.
Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod, on M. for O. C., &c., 620.
Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 842.
Quebec, Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for copies, 523.
Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1460.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dom. Exhibition 1094).
Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (Statutory increase to Précis Writer) 1474.
Charges of Management, 829, 839, 832.
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 989; Post Office, 842.
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1260.
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1460.
Miscellaneous (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 1308.
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1017.
Union Trust Corporation of Can. incorp. (B. 43, 1°*) 89.
Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1017.
Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (earthenware) 699, 702; on conc., 782.

Hickey, Mr. C. E., *Dundas*
Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 40, 1°*) 89.
Sanitary Journals, Subsidies to (Ques.) 1387.

Holton, Mr. E., *Chateauguay*
Exchange Bank, Security for Advance to (Ques.) 199.
Montreal Post Office Service (Ques.) 797.
Ogilvie and Buntin, Messrs., as security for Exchange Bank (Ques.) 261, 336.
St. Clotilde Post Office, Establishment of (Ques.) 1273.

Homer, Mr. J. A. R., *New Westminster*
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1026; (Amt.) 1027, 1037; in Com. on B., 1138; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1173; (Amt. 6 m. h.) 1176.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 448.
Chinese Immigration into B.C., Prohibition of, on Amt. (*Mr. Allen*) to Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1285.

Houde, Mr. F., *Maskinongé*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 441.
Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal (Ques.) 1387.
Kazubazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1500.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal (B. 25, 1°) 71; Res., 932.
North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec (Ques.) 1388.
Postal Orders, France and Canada (Ques.) 967.
St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1493.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1490, 1493, 1499, 1500; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1552-1556.
Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C. P. R. (M. for Cor.) 41.

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington*
Freight Charges on Intercolonial Ry. (M. for Stmnt.) 807.
Guelph Junction Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 72, 1°*) 198.
St. Croix Cotton Factory, Importation of Machinery for (M. for Stmnt.) 808.

Irvine, Mr. D., *Carleton, N.B.*
Concurrence—Customs, 1457.
Customs Officers in Carleton County, on M. for Ret., 466.
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1417.
Kearney and Jacques, Messrs., Appointment of (M. for Cor.) 218.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1640.
Liquor License Inspectors, Payment of (Ques.) 337.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1125.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1316; conc., 1457.
Immigration (Salaries, &c.) 1417.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 695.
United States Customs Duties on Hay (M. for Ret.) 519.

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Richmond and Wolfe*
Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1034.
Canada Temperace Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 104, 1°*) 504; B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (Amt.) 1619, 1620; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1621.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 163.

Ives, Mr. W. B.—*Continued.*
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 94; on M. for Com. to rise, 671.
Immigrants, Applications for Services of, on M. for Ret., 511.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.

Jackson, Mr. J., *South Norfolk,*
Lansdowne, Post Office at (Ques.) 336.
Morpeth Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 132.
Port Rowan Life-saving Station (M. for Cor.) 521.
Steam Tugs, Dredges and Dumping Scows, purchase of (M. for Ret.*) 1201.
Timber Land, Sale of, in the N. W. (Ques.) 73; (M. for Ret.) 90.

Jamieson, Mr. J., *North Lanark*
Graham, John, Relief (B. 107, 1°*) 580; 2° m., 665; 3° m., 979.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1117.

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg*
Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1237.
General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1397.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 1448.
International Fisheries Exhibition, on M. for Reps., 81.
Newfoundland Herring, Inspection of, on M. for Ret., 33.
Sick and Distressed Mariners, Exemption of Fishing Vessels from Paying Duties to Fund (Ques.) 199; (M. for O. C., &c.) 216.
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Vice-Admiralty Courts) 997
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237.
Vice-Admiralty Courts, in Com. of Sup., 997.

Kilvert, Mr. F. E., *Hamilton*
Hamilton and North-Western Ry. Co. (B. 65, 1°*) 162.
South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 10, 1°*) 40.
Toronto, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°*) 40.

King, Mr. G. G., *Queen's, N.B.*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 498.
Dredging at Jemseg (M. for copies of Rep.) 295
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res. 1510.

Kirk, Mr. J. A., *Guysborough*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 494.
Drawback on Cotton used for Sails, to whom paid, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 624.
Elevator at Halifax (Ques.) 603.
Fishing Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1370.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.
Goose Island, Lighthouse on (Ques.) 655.
Harbours and Rivers, N. S., in Com. of Sup., 1220.
Hearn, James, Superannuation of (M. for Cor.) 1110.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Commissioners under (Ques.) 458.
New Harbour and Indian Harbour (Ques.) 132.
Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ques.) 798, 965.
Oyster Pond Breakwater (Ques.) 132.
Port Mulgrave as a sub-port (Ques.) 285.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1122.
Public Buildings, N. S., in Com. of Sup., 1191.
Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1189.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 1370; Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 1220.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1006, 1008.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1191.
Ways and Means—conc., 793.

Kirkpatrick Hon. G. A., *Frontenac*
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (French Translation) 1340; (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Salaries, Increase of) 1476; (Sessional Indemnities) 1476.
[*See* SPEAKER, *Mr.*]

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 328.
Concurrence—Military Properties, Care of, 1441.
Landry's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.
Mail Service North of Palmerston (Ques.) 89.
Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 1229.
Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1441.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incop. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 903
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1319.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1006.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1015.
Railway Bonuses given by Townships, &c., and Prov. Govts. (M. for Stmnt.*) 1200.

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1319.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1006.
Militia (Military Properties, Care of) conc., 1441.
Ocean and River Service (Masters and Mates, Examination of) 1229.
Quarantine (Public Health) 1015.

Landry, Mr. A. C. P. R., *Montmagny*
Agricultural Industry and Mechanical Arts, Essays, &c., on M. for copies of Pets., 34.
Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries, on M. for Stmnt., 972.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for Com., 814.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of B. (M. to adjn. deb.) 812.
Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 1271.
European Immigrants, Port of Landing (Ques.) 89.
Excise Officers at Perth and Quebec (Ques.) 132.
Intercol. Ry., Claims for Losses on (Ques.) 655; Ferry or Bridge at Quebec, 86; Office at Quebec, 86; Tariff between Quebec and St. Charles, 260; Officials (M. for Stmnt.) 303.
International Forestry Exhibition (Ques.) 260.
Lislois, C. J., Claim of, before Dom. Arbitrators (Ques.) 260, 965.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 751.
Oaths, Governor-General's and Lieut.-Governors' of Quebec (M. for copies*) 79.
Ontario's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ques.) 199.
Petroleum in Montmagny and St. Maurice (Ques.) 85.
Public Works in the different Provinces, Expenditure on since Confederation (M. for Stmnt.) 161.
Quebec Central Ry. and Intercol. Ry., Arrangements between (M. for copies*) 230.
Quebec's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ques.) 199.
St. Charles Branch (Ques.) 260.
School of Navigation at Quebec (Ques.) 141; on M. for Cor., 202.
Statutes, Consolidation of, Appointment of a French Canadian (Ques.) 73.
Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment of, on M. for Cor., 152.
Supreme Court in Appeal, limitation of Jurisdiction (B. 15, 1°*) 43.
Traverse, Union Station at the (Ques.) 260.

Landry, Mr. P. A., *Kent, N.B.*
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 274; in Com., 669.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1106; in Com. of Sup., 1341.

Landry, Mr. P. A.—*Continued.*
Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1506.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Re ., 1506.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1341.

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector, *Three Rivers*
Adjournment for Good Friday (M.) 1476.
Agent and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.
Agricultural Industries, Rep. of Com. (Ans.) 1387.
Agricultural Industry and Mechanical Arts, Essays, &c., on M. for copies of Pets., 35.
Amherstburg Public Buildings (Ans.) 79; on M. for Ret., 298.
Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries, on M. for Stmnt., 973, 974.
Bayfield Harbour, damage to by storms (Ans.) 40.
Beemer, H. J., Claim of, for work on Gates, &c., at Quebec (Ans.) 604.
Belle River, Essex County, Pier in (Ans.) 655.
Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1374; conc., 1464.
Boularderie Wharf, N.S., conc., 1618.
Canadian Pacific Ry., Further aid to, on statement in *Globe* (contradiction) 1321; Tariff of Rates on (Ans.) 79.
Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Carleton, N.B., Post Office (Ans.) 966.
Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge, further appointment of (Ans.) 1387.
Cheticamp Harbour, N.S., Dredging entrance (Ans.) 967.
Chinese Immigration into B. C., on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 977.
Civil Service Board, conc., 1458.
Concurrence—Boularderie Wharf (N.S.) 1618; Civil Service Board, 1458; Consolidating Statutes (Purchase of Type) 1464; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 1616, (P. E. I.) 1464; Moncton Post Office (N. B.) 1616; *Newfield* (Cost of Working) 1458; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1460.
Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type for, conc., 1464.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 294; on M. to reduce quorum of Sel. Com., 624; on complaints of non-meeting of Com., 654; on M. for Com. of W., 813, 818.
Crane Island Wharf, on M. for Ret., 516; (Ans.) 736.
Criminal Law Amt., Incest, &c. B. 2 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 80.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of Amts., 812; on M. to adjn. deb., 813.
Criminal Laws, Extension to B. C. (B. 132, 1°*) 1320.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Coursol) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1103, 1106.
Dominion Employés in B. C., on M. for Stmnt., 514.

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—*Continued.*
Dredges and Tug, construction of (Ans.) 603.
Dredging at Jemseg, N.B., on M. for Rep., 296.
Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1225; suppl., 1365.
Emigrant Sheds at Victoria, B. C. (Ans.) 336.
Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1303.
Fairford River, Man., Improvements, on M. for Rep., 210.
Felonies and Misdemeanours, Speedy Trial of, Extension to B. C. (B. 133, 1°*) 1321.
Floating Gas Lights on the St. Lawrence, on M. for Cor., 217.
Fortifications and Military Buildings (B. 124, 1°) 965; 2° m., 1061.
Goodwin, Jas., Claim of, for Walls, &c., around Parliament Grounds (Ans.) 604.
Government Lands in Richelieu Co., Sale of (Ans.) 1109.
Graham, John, Relief B. 107 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for Com., 979.
Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1218–1224; conc., 1464, 1616, 1618.
High Commissioner. House and Furniture for, in Com. of Sup., 1367.
Hudson Bay and Straits, Exploratory Expedition to (Ans.) 132.
Hughes, Judge, Charges against (Ans.) 1109.
Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1071.
Indian Agent's Office, Toronto, closing of, on M. for O. C., 295.
Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
Ingonish Breakwater, on M. for Ret., 90.
Isle-aux-Noix, completion of Works at (Ans.) 966.
Judges, Equalization of Salaries of (Ans.) 40.
Kingsville Harbour, Ont., Works (Ans.) 86.
Lachine Canal, contract for new Basins (Ans.) 1215.
Lévis Graving Dock further Provision (B. 149, 1°*) 1581; in Com., 1618.
Lights on the St. Lawrence, North of Island of Orleans, on M. for Ret., 218.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596; in Com., 1598.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 936; (Amt.) 937.
Lotbinière, construction of Wharf at (Ans.) 1054.
McLaughlin, Geo. E., Gratuity to family of, in Com. of Sup., 1373.
Methot, Mr., M.P. for Nicolet, on resignation of seat, 1108.
Michaud and Dumais, Skiffington *vs.*, on M. for copies of Reps., &c., 622.
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 837.
Moncton Post Office, N.B., conc., 1616.
Montreal Drill Shed, Contract for Rebuilding (Ans.) 966.
Morpeth Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 132, 1054.

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—*Continued.*
Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 137.
Naval Station at Esquimalt (Ans.) 285.
Newfield, Steamer, Cost of Working, in Com. of Sup., 1318; conc., 1458.
New Harbour and Indian Harbour (Ans.) 132.
North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec (Ans.) 1388.
Ottawa, Additional Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1190.
Ottawa Gas Co., Claim of, for Leakage (Ans.) 604.
Oyster Pond, N.S., Breakwater (Ans.) 132.
P. E. I., Piers in, Payments for repairs on (Ans.) 1054; on M. for O. C., 1169.
P. E. I., Wharves and Piers in, Inspection of (Ans.) 261.
Perley, H. F., Services of, in connection with St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
Personal Explanation on article in *Globe* newspaper, 1465.
Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, incorp. B. 18 (*Mr. Amyot*) on M. to dschrg. Order ref. B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 132.
Port Arthur Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Port Stanley Harbour Revenue, on M. for Stmnt., 295.
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1320, 1383.
Post Offices and Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.
Printing and Advertising, Cost of, on M. for Ret., 303.
Printing of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1108.
Private Bills, Reception of Reps. from Com. (Ms. to extend time) 567, 1100; on M. to extend time for Presentation, 1354.
Privileges and Elections Com. (M. to add name) 569.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 986.
Public Buildings, Cost of Heating, on M. for Stmnt., 83.
Public Buildings of the Dom., on M. for Ret., 41.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 294; on reducing quorum of Sel. Com., 624; on non-meeting of Com., 654; on M. for Com. of W., 813, 818.
Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1190–1198, 1218–1226, 1354–1366, 1603–1606; conc., 1458, 1464, 1616, 1618.
Public Works Dept., Extra Clerks in, on M. for Stmnt., 82.
Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 843.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. (B. 134, 1°*) 1321; 2° m., 1445, 1586.
Public Works Rep. (presented) 27.
Quebec Tidal Dock further provision (B. 148, 1°*) 1581; 2° m., 1618.
Return, Imperfect, respecting Drawback on Machinery for Sugar Refining (remarks) 672.
Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1460.
School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 202.
Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 1474.

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—*Continued.*
Skiffington *vs.* Messrs. Michaud and Dumais, on M. for copies of Reps., &c., 622.
St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of (Ans.) 966.
St Jean Port Joli Wharf, on M. for Ret., 517.
St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, on M. for. Ret., 92.
Standing Committees (M. to add names) 569.
Stone for New Departmental Building (Ans.) 736.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1493, 1495, 1511; in Com. of W., 1624.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: St. Peter's (H. F. Perley, Services of) 1350.
Civil Government: Civil Service Board, conc., 1458; Militia, 837; Public Works, 843; Secretary of State's Office, 1474.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1320, 1383; Public Works (Steamer *Newfield*, Cost of Working) 1318; (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1318; (Agent and Contingencies, B.C.) 1318.
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1460.
Miscellaneous (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1374, conc., 1464; (Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type for) conc., 1464; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1303; (McLaughlin' Geo. E., Gratuity to family of) 1373.
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 1000; (Kingston) 998; (Manitoba) 1001, suppl., 1338; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1000.
Public Works—Capital: B.C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1603; N.B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1603; Ottawa (Additional Buildings) 1190; Port Arthur (Construction of Harbour) 1603.
Income: Buildings (B.C.) 1198; (Man.) 1198; (N.B.) 1191, suppl.,1604, conc., 1616; (N.S.) 1190, suppl., 1604; (N.W.T.) 1198; (Ont.) 1193–1197, suppl., 1335, 1605; (P.E.I.) 1191, suppl., 1604; (Que.) 1193, suppl., 1354, 1605; (Repairs, &c.) 1198, suppl., 1358, 1362. Dredging, 1225, suppl., 1365. Harbours and Rivers (B. C.) 1606; (Man.) 1365, conc., 1616; (N.B.) 1221, conc., 1442, 1616; (N.S.) 1605, conc., 1618; (N.W.T.) 1606; (Ont.) 1223, suppl., 1365, 1606; (P.E.I.) 1220, suppl., 1362, conc., 1464; (Que.) 1222, suppl., 1365. Miscellaneous, 1226, suppl.; (Infantry Schools) 1363; (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367; (*Newfield*, Steamer, Cost of Working) conc., 1458. Telegraph Lines, 1226, suppl., 1366.
Talbot, Achille, Employment and Salary of (Ans.) 966.
Telegraph Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1318; suppl., 1366.
Thames and Lake Erie Canal (Ans.) 797.
Wharves and Piers in N. B. (Ans.) 458.

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 411.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1581.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 283.
Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1317.
Dominion Subsidy to Que., Readjustment of (M. for Ret.*) 1200.
Emigrant Buildings at Lévis, Removal of (M. for Cor.)90.
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1303, 1307.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 964.

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.
Liquor License Act., 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 914.
Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench (M. for Ret.) 133, 139.
Subsidies to Rys. B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1539–1543; on Main Motion, 1573; (Amt.) 1574.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 1317.
Miscellaneous (Mr. Fabre's Salary and Contingencies) 1303, 1307.

Lesage, Mr. C. A., *Dorchester*
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1132.
Debates, Official Rep. of, Translation (Ques.) 86.

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton*
A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Amherstburg Public Buildings (Ques.) 79; Land purchased for (M. for Ret.*) 83.
Belle River, Pier on (Ques.) 655.
Benefit Mutual Insurance Societies (Ques.) 337.
Canadian Pacific Railway Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 337.
Colchester Reef Lighthouse (Ques.) 86, 199.
Corbett, John, Employment of (Ques.) 199.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 93; on M. for Com., 275.
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.
Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1160.
Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1098.
Fishery Act Amt., Petitions praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 300.
Gold Mining in the N.W., Act relating to (Ques.) 43.
Goodwin, James, Claims of, for Fence around Parliament Grounds (M. for Rep.*) 1199.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 853.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 609.
Kingsville Harbour Works (Ques.) 86; (M. for Ret.) 216.
Leamington, Post Office at (M. for Cor.) 800; (reply) 807.
Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 461.
Maritime Court of Ont., in Com. of Sup., 996.
Militia Contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1158.
Mining Licenses in the N.W., Baker Creek (Ques.) 44.
Mining Regulations for the N.W. (M. for Ret.) 512.
Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
Ottawa Gas Co., Claim of, for Leakage (Ques.) 604.
Pelée Island, Long Point and Rondeau Lighthouses, Repairs on (M. for Ret.*) 230.

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Postage Stamps, Sale of, at Windsor (Ques.) 655.
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
Printing Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1007.
Public Buildings of the Dominion (M. for Ret.) 41.
Public Works Department, Extra Clerks in (M. for Stmnt.) 82.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Schools of Gunnery, in Com. of Sup., 1164.
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Mar. Court of Ont.) 996.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Criminal Statistics) 1090; (Health Statistics) 1094.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004; (Printing Paper, &c.) 1007.
Militia (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164; (Contingencies, &c.) 1158; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1160; Drill Pay, &c.) 1898.
Quarantine, 1010.
Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against (M. for Rep.) 604.

Livingstone, Mr. J., *South Waterloo*
Land Sales in the N. W., Names of Purchasers and Amounts of rebate (M. for Ret.*) 523.

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 62.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1239.
Ocean and River Service (*Glendon*, steamer to replace) 1228; (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1233.

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., *Carleton, O.*
Address, on The, 20; M. for Com. to draft, 27; draft rep. 28; His Excellency's reply, 304.
Adjournments (Ms.) Ash Wednesday, 524; Annunciation Day, 1053; Easter, 1422.
Adjournment of the House, on M. for (remarks) 514.
Administrator of the Govt. of the N. W. T., on M. for O.C. &c., 517.
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 994, 997.
Administration of Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 2.
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1245; in Com., 1246.
Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1337.
Agriculture and Immigration, Rep. of Minister (Ans.) 709.
Alberta Bridge Co. incorp. B. 76 (*Mr. Ross*) on M. for 2°, 504.
Allan, W. F., allowance in lieu of Board, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1381.
America, Works on, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
Amero, Roger, Case of, on M. for Ret., 623
Archives, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.
Assiniboia, Land Agent for (Ans.) 27.
Ballot Box, New Model, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.
Banking Facilities for Agriculturists Provision B. 10[illegible] (*Mr. Orton*) on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) on introduction, 524.

Macdonald, Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Banking Facilities for Agriculturists, on M. for Sel. Com., 215.
Boundary between B. C. and the N.-W. T. (Ans.) 261.
Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with, in Com. of Sup., 1379.
British Association, Meeting of, in Com. of Sup., 1310.
British Columbia, Agreement with (B. 126) prop. Res. 67; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1175.
B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under, in Com. of Sup., 1378.
Cabinet Representation for B. C. (Ans.) 505.
Calgary, Land Agent for (Ans.) 27.
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 136, 1°*) 1386; 2° m., 1618.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) Ms. for Res. to take precedence, 304, 468; M. for B. to take precedence through all stages, 524; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 568.
Cariboo County Court Judge, Salary of (B. 136) prop. Res., 69; in Com. and 1°* of B., 85.
Cattle Sation, Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge (Ans.) 86; Appointment of, as Sheriff, on M. for O. C., &c., 149.
Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1287, 1289.
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 836-840, 841, 937, 989, 990, 1334-1337, 1466.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1389-1392.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 989, 990.
Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1059.
Concurrence—Geological Survey, 1451; Expenses of Govt. in N. W. T., 1611; Indians (Man. and N. W.) 1610; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1455.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461.
Consolidating Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type for, in Com. of Sup., 1379.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) M. to substitute name on Sel. Com., 655; on M. for Com. of W., 814; in Com., 815-819; on challenge of Vote after div., 821.
County Court Judges' Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 603.
County Judge of Elgin, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1217. *See* "Elgin."
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 93; on M. for Com., 284.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 287, 289-292; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667; on reprint of Amts., 812.
Criminal Laws, Extension to B. C. (B. 132), 2° m., 1581.
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.
Cumberland, Seat for, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Blake*) on Res., 547; (Amt) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 549; (remarks) 564.

Macdonald, Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Dangerous Weapons, Carrying of (Ans.) 458.
Disputed Territory (B. 144) 2° m., 1634; 3° m., 1640.
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 138, 1°*) 1386; 2° m., 1622; in Com., 1623, 1624.
Dominion Lands Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1384, 1423–1427; Income, 1385, 1427–1429, 1435–1438.
Dominion Police, in Com. of Sup., 997; suppl, 1338.
Dual Representation B. 13 (*Mr. Ouimet*) on for M. 2°, 144.
Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry., on M. for Cor., 738.
Electoral Franchise (B. 7, 1°) 31.
Elgin, County Judge of, Charges against, on M. for copies of Pets., 59; (remarks) 967; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1217.
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. (Ans.) 85.
Fabre, Hon. Hector, Retention of Services of (Ans.) 337.
Factory Bill (Ans.) 1242.
Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.
Frontier Police, South-Western Ont. (Ans.) 1054.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1261, conc.; 1451.
Geological Surveys, Mining and Metallurgy, on M. for Sel. Com., 515.
Geological Survey in B.C. (Ans.) 505.
Gold Mining in the N. W., Act relating to (Ans.) 44.
Government Business, C. P. R. Res. (M. to take precedence) 198.
Government Business, Progress of (remarks) 469; (Ms. to take in Thursdays, 625; State of, 1170; Mondays, 1023; Wednesdays, 1549; Saturdays, 1332.
Government Herd in the N. W. (Ans.) 506.
Government Mills in N. W. T., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 199.
Governor General's Commission, &c., on M. for copies, 522.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 890, 895, 896; Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1514, 1543.
Halifax Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders (B. 141) 2° m., 1621.
High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987; (House and Furniture for) 1367.
High Commissioner for Canada (Sir Charles Tupper) Appointment of, on M. for O.C., &c., 55.
High Commissioner to England, on Res. (*Mr. Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1042.
House of Commons, Representation of Territories in, B. 110 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 602.
Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 207.
Hughes, Judge, Charges against, on M. for copies of, 59; (remarks) 967; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1217.
Hunter's Island, Land or Timber Sales on (Ans.) 965, 1054.
Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1410.

Macdonald, Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. (B. 111) M. for leave to introduce, 624, 2° m., 844; M. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 878; in Com. on B., 1423, 3° m., 1446; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1447.
Indians, Annual Grant, in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1269, 1372, 1373, conc., 1450, 1610, 1617.
Indian Act, 1880, Amt. (B. 87, 1°) 260; 2° m., 1063; in Com., 1397–1404; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1653.
Indian Affairs, Rep. of Dept. (presented) 68; in Com. of Sup., 840, 841; suppl., 1336, 1466.
Indian Agent at Penetanguishene (Ans.) 31.
Indian Islands in Lake Ont., on M. for Ret., 87, 88.
Indian Lands, Fort William, Cancellation of Timber Licences, on M. for Ret., 51, 52.
Indian Self-Government (B. 22, 1°) 67; 2° m., 538; in Com., 539–542; 3° m., 625.
Inland Revenue, Minister of, Resignation (Ans.) 505; (correction) 513; (further remarks) 525.
Insolvent Banks, Insurance and Loan Co.'s (B. 145) 2° m., 1645.
Interior, Dept. of, Rep. (presented) 844; in Com. of Sup., 838–840; suppl., 1466.
International Forestry Exhibition (Ans.) 260.
Intoxicating Liquors, Traffic in, Act Amt. B. 102 (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) on Order for 2°, 1290.
Judicial Salaries, Readjustment of, on M. for Cor., 58; (Ans.) 1387.
Judiciary of Manitoba, Additional Appointment to (B. 146) prop. Res., 1422; in Com., 1478; 1°* of B., 1549; 2° m., 1622.
Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, Duties of, Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°*) 1386; 2° m., 1618.
Juvenile Offenders, Reformatory at Halifax for (B. 141) 2° m., 1621.
Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
Land Agents for Assiniboia and Calgary (Ans.) 27.
Land Sales within limits of C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 77.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1002–1006, 1008, 1009, 1340, 1339.
Library of Parliament Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 31; on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 964, 965, 1168; on Second Rep., 1240; on presentation of Third Rep., 1443; Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., &c., 1003.
Licenses for Sale of Liquor in the N. W. T., on M. for Ret., 73.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal (M. to take precedence) 823; on point of Order, 825; (M.) 932; (Ans.) 964.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 143) prop. Res., 1422; in Com., 1476; 2° and M. for Com., 1595; 3° m., 1636; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1637; in Com., 1637.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Commissioners under (Ans.) 458; Inspectors, Payment of (Ans.) 337; Police organization under (Ans.) 505.

Macdonald, Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Lottery Firm at St. Stephen, N. B., on M. for Stmnt. of receipts of P. O., 614.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 621, 757.
Manitoba and Hudson Bay Ry. Land Grant (prop. Res.) 1590; in Com., 1591; Res. ref. to Com. of W. on B., 138.
Manitoba and Hudson Bay Ry., Land Subsidy to (prop. Res.) 1476,
Manitoba Judiciary (B. 146) prop. Res., 1422; in Com., 1478; 1°* of B., 1549; 2° m., 1622.
Manitoba Lands, Settlement of claims by Occupancy (B. 150, 1°*) 1586.
Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to, Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for Com., 68.
Maritime Court for Canada (Ans.) 965.
Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction, B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 462.
McCourt, Daniel, Dismissal of, on M. for Cor., 516.
Messages from His Excellency (presented) 27, 304.
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 836, 837.
Mining Licenses in the N. W., Baker Creek (Ans.) 44.
Mining Regulations for the N. W., on M. for Ret., 512.
Minister of Railways and High Commissionership, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 547; (Amt.) 549.
Ministerial Changes (Explanation) 28, 29.
Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
Moncton Post Office, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1616.
Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1294–1298; Barracks, in Com. of Sup., 1303, 1378.
Mounted Police for B. C. (Ans.) 336.
Niagara Falls Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1303.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1547.
North-West Grievances (Ans.) 766.
North-West Territorial Administration, on M. for Ret., 75.
North-West Territories Act, 1880, Amt. (B. 152, 1°*) 1586, 2° m., 1651.
North-West Territories, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1301.
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 2.
Official Incomes, Taxation of (Ans.) 1054.
Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ans.) 798.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R., confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. for Com., 810 (Ques. of Order) 811; Assent of Crown announced, 896.
Parliamentary Practice, on *Mr. Speaker's* Ruling on Members being called on to Vote, 458.
Pasture Land Leases, on M. for Ret., 73.
Patent Rights, Fraud in Sale of, B. 26 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 460.
Payments on Settlers' Lands (Ans.) 57.
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 988–1002, 1338.
Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1017.
Petroleum in Montmagny and St. Maurice (Ans.) 85.

Macdonald, Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Post Office, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 806.
Prince Leopold, Death of, Resoluton of Condolence to Her Majesty (M.) to consider Mess. from Senate, 1273; M. to conc. in, 1291.
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
Printing Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 31.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004–1006, 1008.
Prisoners, Transfer of, from Gaols (B. 151, 1°*) 1586; 2° m., 1645.
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod (Ans.) 506; on M. for O. C., &c., 619.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) M. to substitute name on Sel. Com., 655; on M. for Com. of W., 814; in Com., 815–819; on challenge of a Vote after div., 821.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1013.
Public Works, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1367, 1616.
Public Works in the different Provinces, Expenditure on, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 162.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1587; in Com., 1588.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1013.
Quebec, Lieut.-Governor's Commission, &c., on M. for copies, 522.
Quebec, Subsidy to (Ans.) 883.
Railway Act, Consolidated, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 460.
Railway Bridge at Quebec (Ans.) 1636.
Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 616.
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1335.
Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1186.
Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1312, 1314; conc., 1455.
Regina, Location of N. W. Capital at, on M. for Cor., &c., 38.
Registration of Deeds and Instruments in the N. W. (Res.) 1635.
Repatriation of Canadians (Ans.) 965.
Returns, Imperfect, *re* High Commissioner (remarks) 460; in reference to Timber Leases, 766.
Richardson, H., Rental allowance, in Com. of Sup., 1379.
Robertson, John, Claims of, on M. for Ret., 615.
Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, in Com. of Sup., 1374.
Select Standing Committees (m.) 2; M. for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 28; Lists presented, 29, conc. in, 31.
Self-Government among Indians (B. 22, 1°) 67; 2° m., 538; in Com., 539–542; 3° m., 625.
Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1339.
Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 764; on M. for 3°, 1293.

Macdonald, Sir John A.—*Continued.*

Speech from the Throne, consideration of (m.) 2.

Speedy Trials, Felonies and Misdemeanours, Extension to Man. (B. 133) 2° m., 1581.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1492, 1501, 1503; on Amt. (*Mr. Auger* to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1564–1568.

St. Patrick's Day, on M. for Adjournment, 884.

Statutes, Consolidation of, Appointment of a French Canadian (Ans.) 73.

Summary Convictions, &c., Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°*) 1386; 2° m., 1618.

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice, 994–997.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, Care of) 1088; (Criminal Statistics) 1090.

Civil Government: Agriculture, 1337; Civil Service Board, 989, 990; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987; Indian Affairs, 840, 841, suppl., 1336, 1466; Interior, 838–840, suppl., 1466; Militia, 836, 837; Privy Council Office, 1334; Railways and Canals, 1335.

Dominion Lands—Capital (Examination of Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1423–1427; *Income* (Outside Service) 1427–1429, 1435–1438; (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.

Dominion Police, 997, suppl, 1338.

Geological Survey, 1261, conc., 1451.

Immigration (Salaries, &c.,) 1410.

Indians: Annual Grant (B. C.) 1266, suppl., 1372, conc.; 1617; (Man. and N.W.) 1269, conc., 1456, 1610, suppl., 1373; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1263; (P. E. I.) 1266.

Legislation: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Sessional Indemnities) 1002, suppl., 1339. Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003; (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1004–1006, 1008; (Works on America) 1009.

Miscellaneous (Allan, W. F, Allowance in lieu of Board, &c.) 1381; (Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with) 1379; (British Association Meeting) 1310; (B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under) 1378; (Consolidating Statutes) 1302; (Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type, &c.) 1379; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1303, suppl., 1378; (Niagara Falls Commission) 1303; (N. W. T., Expenses of Govt. in) 1301; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) 1312, 1314, conc., 1455; (Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings) 1374; (Richardson, H., Rental allowance) 1379.

North-West Mounted Police (Pay of Force, &c.) 1294–1298.

Penitentiaries (B. C.) 1002, suppl., 1338; (Dorchester) 1000; (Kingston) 998; (Man.) 1001, suppl., 1338; (St. Vincent de Paul) 999.

Pensions (Compensation in lieu of land) 1017.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Moncton Post Office, &c.) 1616; Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367.

Quarantine (Cattle Stations) 1010; (Public Health) 1013; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.

Supply Farm No. 20, Sale of (Ans.) 27; on M. for Ret., 45, 47; (Ans.) 285.

Supply Farm on Pincher Creek, Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 200; on M. for O.C., &c., 617.

Timber Lands in N.W., Sale of (Ans.) 73; on M. for Ret., 90.

Timber Licenses, Cancellation of, on M. for Ret., 51, 52.

Macdonald, Sir John A.—*Continued.*

Town Reserves on line of C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 75, 77.

Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.

United States Deserters, Arrest of, on M. for Ret., 86.

Volunteers, Surviving, of 1837-38, on M. to ascertain number, &c., 89.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1059; in Com., 1243.

Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against, on M. for Rep., 605.

Wilkinson, J. A., Promise of Appointment to (Ans.) 1054.

Wyandotte Indians, Distribution of moneys to (Ans.) 967.

Mackenzie, Hon. A., *East York*

Adelaide, Scow, in Com. of Sup., 1365; conc., 1616.

Administrator of the Govt. of the N. W. T., on M. for O. C., &c., 518.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com on Res., 1244.

Analysts, Public, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1244.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence, 304; on M. for 2°, 534.

C. P. R., Station Accommodation on the, conc., 1449.

Canals, Capital, 1617; Income, 1462, conc., 1463, 1614.

Central Ontario Ry. B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175.

Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 833–838, 1334, 1336; conc., 1458.

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1391, 1394.

Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 1336; conc., 1458.

Collection of Revenues, conc., 1457.

Concurrence—C. P. R. (Station Accommodation) 1449; Civil Service Board, 1458; Culling Timber, 1458; Customs, 1457; Fishing Bounty (Distribution of) 1617; Geological Survey, 1451; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 1616; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; Intoxicating Liquors Act (Expenses in putting Act in force) 1453; Indians (Man. and N. W.) 1610; *Jennie Graham*, (Schooner) 1462, 1613; Legal Advisers (Payment to) 1617; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1463; Moncton Post Office (N.B.) 1616; *Newfield* (Cost of Working) 1458; Page, John (Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1617; Perley, H. F. (Services on St. Peter's Canal) 1460; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1459, 1612.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 1322; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593.

Mackenzie, Hon. A.—*Continued.*
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 817, 819.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of Amts., 812.
Culling Timber, conc., 1458.
Customs, conc., 1457.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1105; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to Fifth Rep. of Com., 1272.
Dominion Lands, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1437.
Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry., on M. for Cor., 738; on M. for 3° of B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1131.
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., 1304.
Fisheries, Distribution of Fishing Bounty, conc., 1617.
Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1361.
Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1061.
Fort MacLeod Public Buildings at, on M. for O.C., &c., 6?0.
Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1129.
Geological Survey, conc., 1451
Government Dredge for Man., Building of (Ques.) 210.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 891*; on M. for Com., 978; Amts. made by Sen., on Ques. of Priv., 1512.
Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1218, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1362, 1365; conc., 1616.
High Commissioner for Canada (Sir Charles Tupper) Appointment of, on M. for O. C., &c., 55.
High Commissioner, House and Furniture for, in Com. of Sup, 1367; conc., 1615.
Hudson Bay, Expedition to, conc., 1617.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 844, 865.
Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1403.
Indians (Man. and N.W.) conc., 1610.
Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
Insolvent Banks, Insurance and Loan Co.'s, &c. B. 145 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1645.
Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 838.
Intoxicating Liquors Act, Expense of putting Act into operation, conc., 1453.
Kamloops to Spencer's Bridge, B.C., Mail Service (M. for Ret. ?) 1126.
Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
Legal Advisers, Payment of, conc., 1617.
Legislation, on Com. of Sup., 1340, 1459; conc., 1612.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Joint Com., 1167.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1599; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1637.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal (Ques. of Order) 824.

Mackenzie, Hon. A.—*Continued.*
London Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for Com., 1515; in Com., 1516.
Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1463.
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 833–837.
Moncton Post Office, N.B., conc., 1616.
Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1297; Barracks, in Com. of Sup., 1303.
Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry Co.'s incorp. Act. Amt. B. 80 (*Mr. Bell*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1176.
Newfield, Cost of Working, conc., 1458.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) 1546.
North-West Territories, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1301; conc., 1611.
North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1156.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on Ques. of Order, 811.
Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, conc., 1617.
Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal, conc., 1460.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803, 806.
Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1277.
Printing of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1108; Seventh Rep. (Ques. of Order) 1321.
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
Public Buildings of the Dom., on M. for Ret., 41.
Public Works, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1218, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1362, 1365, 1366–1367; conc., 1616.
Quotations from newspapers, Incorrect, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.
Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 617.
Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1449, 1648.
Registration of Deeds and Instruments in the N.W., on Res., 1635.
Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1459, 1612.
Returns, on production of (remarks) 1128.
Robertson, John, Claims of, on M. for Ret., 615.
St Andrews and *Jennie Graham*, Schooners, conc., 1462, 1613.
St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1494.
Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1648.
Sovereign Fire Ins. Co., Winding-up (B. 94, 1**) 304.
Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1301.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1494, 1498, 1499; on Amt to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1553.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Welland (Page, John, Payment to as Arbitrator) conc., 1617; St. Peter's (Perley, H. F., Services of) conc., 1460. *Income:* Beauharnois (Marchand, L. W., Professional

Mackenzie, Hon. A.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Services) conc., 1463. Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) conc., 1462, 1613.

Civil Government: Civil Service Board, 1336, conc., 1458; Interior, 838; Militia, 833–837; Privy Council Office, 1334.

Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, conc., 1458; Customs, conc., 1457.

Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1437.

Fisheries (Fishing Bounty, Distribution of) conc., 1617.

Geological Survey, conc., 1451.

Indians (Man. and N.W.) conc., 1610.

Legislation: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1459, 1612.

Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c) 1304; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) conc., 1617; (Intoxicating Liquors Act, Expense of putting Act into operation) conc., 1453; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Legal Advisers, Payment of) conc., 1617; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1303; (*Newfield*, Cost of Working) conc., 1458; (N.W. T., Expenses of Govt in) 1301, conc., 1611.

Mounted Police (Pay of Force, &c.) 1297.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) conc., 1616. Harbours and Rivers (Man., Scow *Adelaide*) 1365, conc., 1616; (N.B.) 1221, conc., 1616; (N.S.) 1218; (Ont.) 1224; (Quebec) 1223; (Repairs, &c.) 1362. Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367, conc., 1615; (Infantry Schools) 1366. Telegraphs, 1366.

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) 1648; (Station Accommodation) conc., 1449.

Steamship Subventions (France and Quebec) 1301.

Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 1366.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1059.

Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against, on M. for Rep., 605.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. B. 131 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. to read and receive Pet., 1202.

Macmaster, Mr. D., *Glengarry*

Address, The (moved) 3.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 818.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291.

Eastern Ry. Co. of Canada consolidation (B. 63, 1°*) 162.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 953.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 745.

River St. Clair Tunnel Co. incorp. (B. 62, 1°*) 162.

Macmillan, Mr. D., *East Middlesex*

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 812.

Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to M. that B. pass, 837.

Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of, B 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) in Com., 889.

Provincial Bank incorp. (B. 39, 1°*) 83.

River Thames, Surveys of (M. for Reps., &c.*) 1199.

Macmillan, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 765.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Drill Instruction) 1096.

McCallum, Mr. L., *Monck*

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 609.

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe*

Carriers by Land (B. 4, 1°*) 27.

Commercial Bank of Man. incorp. (B. 42, 1°*) 89.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1578–1581; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1594; (Amt.) 1594.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. and Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1514.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1595; in Com., 1597–1602; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1636; in Com., 1637; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1653.

Methodist Churches Union (B. 11, 1°*) 40.

Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts, 1547.

Railway Commissioners for Canada (B. 8, 1°*) 31.

Titles to Land, Transfer of (B. 16, 1°*) 43.

McCraney, Mr. W., *Halton*

Intoxicating Liquors Imported and Duties Paid (M. for Ret.*) 67.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1636.

Morpeth Harbour, Construction of Works at (Ques.) 1054.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1118.

Rideau Hall, Expenditure on, since Confederation, all services (M. for Ret.*) 1201.

St. Lawrence Canals, Expenditure on, since Confederation (M. for Ret.*) 1201.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Russian Leather Permeator) 1165.

Welland Canal, old and new works, Expenditure on since Confederation (M. for Ret.*) 1201.

McDonald, Mr. W., *Cape Breton*

Credit of Canada, Decrying of, by Mr. Potter (M. for Cor.) 763.

Railway Matters in N. S. (M. for Cor.*) 65.

Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 617.

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou*

Ocean Mutual Marine Ins. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 20, 1°*) 67.

Pictou Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 35, 1°*) 83.

Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (steel, ingots, &c.) 730.

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., *King's, P.E.I.*
Concurrence—Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1453.
Peake's, Station at, on P. E. I. Ry. (Ques.) 261.
Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1278.
Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 63.
St. Peter's Harbour Breakwater, Contract for (M. for copy*) 1200.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1238.
Miscellaneous (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) conc., 1453.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P. E. I.) 1220.

McIsaac, Mr. A., *Antigonish*
Antigonish Public Works, Expenditure on (M. for Stmnt.*) 66.
Bounty to Fishermen, Payment of (Ques.) 655.
Great American and European Short Line Ry. (Ques.) 57.
Preventive Officer at Morristown (M. for Cor.*) 140.
Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1490.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1190; Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 1218.

McLelan, Hon. A. W., *Colchester*
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1055; in Com. of Sup., 842; suppl., 1337.
Agriculture, Industrial, &c., Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.
Archives, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.
Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour (Ans.) 604.
Bounty to Fishermen (Ans.) 603, 655.
Census of Canada, Second Vol. (presented) 1322.
Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1091.
Certificates of Masters' and Mates' Act, non-enforcement of (Ans.) 85.
Certificates of Masters and Mates Act, 1874, Amt. (B. 116) M. for Com. on. Res., 763; in Com. and 1°* of B., 763; 2° m., 1057.
Certificates of Masters and Mates, Refusal of Board of Examiners to grant (Ans.) 1444.
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 842, 1337, 1467, 1471.
Colchester Reef Lighthouse (Ans.) 86, 199.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.
Concurrence—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 1440; Customs, 1456, 1464; Fishing Bounty (Distribution of) 1617; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; Imports and Exports of Fish (Tables respecting) 1464; Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, 1443.
Corbett, John, Employment of (Ans.) 199.

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—*Continued.*
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.
Customs, Examination of Baggage at St. Vincent (Ans.) 1444.
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1454, 1456.
Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093.
Eathenware, in Com. on W. & M., 701.
Fishery Act Amt., Petitions praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 300.
Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 603,655; Distribution of, in Com. of Sup., 1369; conc., 1617.
Fishery Overseer for Digby County (Ans.) 89.
Georgian Bay, Survey of, Steamer for, in Com. of Sup., 1374.
Glendon, Steamer to replace, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Goose Island, N. S., Lighthouse on (Ans.) 655.
Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1605.
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094; conc., 1440.
Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1379, 1607; conc., 1617.
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1404–1414.
Imports and Exports of Fish, Tables respecting, conc., 1464.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 611, 613.
International Fisheries Exhibition, on M. for Reps., 82; outstanding Claims, in Com. of Sup., 1374.
Lakes Huron and Superior, Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 1303.
Life-boat at Wellington, Ont., Cost of (Ans.) 603.
Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1229.
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1232–1234; conc., 1443.
Marine and Fisheries Dept. (B. 149, 1°*) 1386.
Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 260; in Com. of Sup., 842; suppl., 1467, 1471.
Masters' and Mates' Certificates, B. C., on M. for Ret., 606.
Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 1229.
Meterological Observations, in Com. of Sup., 1255.
Navigable Rivers, Obstructions in, in Com. of Sup., 1232.
Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1227, 1229, 1232, 1369.
Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ans.) 966.
Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1234, 1238.
Patent Record, in Com. of Sup., 1089.
Pictou Cattle Disease (Quarantine) in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Pilots for and above Harbour of Quebec, Acts respecting (Ans.) 655.
Port Rowan Life-saving Station, on M. for Cor., 521.

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—*Continued.*
Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 61, 63.
Princess Louise, Steamer, on M. for copy of Contract, &c., 36.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1014.
Public Works, Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1357.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010–1014.
Returns, Production of (remarks) 1128.
Sanitary Journals, Subsidies to (Ans.) 1387.
School of Navigation at Quebec (Ans.) 141; on M. for Cor., 202.
Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 1254, 1255.
Seamen's Act, 1863, and Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act, 1874, Amt. (B. 116) M. for Com. on Res., 763; in Com. and 1°* of B., 763; 2° m., 1057.
Shipwrecks, Enquiries into (B. 117) M. for Com. on Res., 763; in Com. and 1°* of B., 764; 2° m. and in Com., 1131; 3° m., 1170, 1293.
Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. (Ans.) 269.
Sick and Destressed Mariners Act Amt. (B. 129) prop. Res. and 1°* of B., 1126; 2° m., 1360.
Sick and Distressed Mariners, Exemption of Fishing Vessels from payment to Fund (Ans.) 199.
Signal Stations, in Com. of Sup., 1234.
Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. (B. 121) M. for Com. on Res., and Res. in Com., 765; 1°* of B., 766; 2° m. and in Com., 1059.
Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1245.
Steamboat Inspector's Rep. (Ans.) 460.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics) 1095; (Archives, Care of) 1088; (Census, revote) 1091; (Criminal Statistics) 1090; (Dominion Exhibition) 1093; (Health Statistics) 1094, conc., 1440; (*Patent Record*) 1089.
Civil Government: Agriculture, 842, suppl., 1337; Marine and Fisheries, 842, suppl., 1467, 1471.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1316; conc., 1456, 1464
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty, Distribution of) 1369, conc., 1617; (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234, 1238.
Immigration, 1404–1414.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Agencies, Rents, &c.) 1232; (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, Construction, &c.) 1233, conc., 1443; (Lighthouse-keepers, Salaries, &c.) 1232; (Signal Stations) 1234.
Miscellaneous (Imports and Exports of Fish, Tables respecting) conc., 1464; (International Fishery Exhibition, outstanding Claims) 1374; (Georgian Bay, Survey of, Steamer for) 1374; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 1303; (Hudson Bay Expedition to) 1379, suppl., 1607, conc., 1617.
Ocean and River Service (*Glendon*, Steamer to replace) 1227; (Government Steamers) 1227; (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229; (Masters and Mates, Examination of) 1229; (Obstructions in Navigable Rivers) 1232; (Water and River Police) 1232, suppl., 1369.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1357; Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 1605.
Quarantine (Pictou Cattle Disease) 1010; (Public Health) 1010–1014; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Observations) 1255; (Observatories) 1254.
Steamboat Inspection, 1255.

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—*Continued.*
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 722.
Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Water and River Police, in Com. of Sup., 1232; suppl., 1369.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 701.
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1243.
Weller's Bay, Ont., Range Lights (Ans.) 336.
Wellington, Ont., Life-boat House (Ans.) 336.
Wilkinson, J. A., Payments to (Ans.) 1055.

McMillan, Mr. H., *Vaudreuil*
Vaudreuil and Prescott Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 23, 1°*) 71.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 322.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1594.
Dangerous Weapons, Carrying of (Ques.) 453.
Hearn, James, Superannuation of, on Ms. for Cor., 1111, 1289.
Immigration Agents, Salaries and Expenses (M. for Ret.) 303.
Improvement Fund, Money due Township of Wallace (Ques.) 200
Intercol. Ry. Claims Commissioners, Services of &c. (M. for Ret.) 303; (Ques.) 1387.
Intercol. Ry., Coal carried by (M. for Ret.) 65.
Judges, Equalization of Salaries of (Ques.) 40.
Printing and Advertising, Cost of (M. for Ret.) 303.
Scott Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) in Com. of Sup., 1383.
Section B, Arbitrators or Commissioners on (Ques.) 1386.
Senate, Expenditure in connection with (M. for Ret.*), 1200.
Superannuation Fund (M. for Ret.) 65.
Returns, Production of (Ques.) 1128.
SUPPLY:
Legislation (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007.
Ways and Means—conc., 778.

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 426.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 607.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 760.
SUPPLY:
Indian Affairs: Annual Grant (B. C.) 1267.
Lighthouses and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, Construction, &c.) 1234.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1021.
Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1380.

Massue, Mr. L. H., *Richelieu*
Agricultural Fertilizers (B. 38) Res. in Com. and 1°* of B., 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294.
Bank Returns, Inspection of (Ques.) 44, 1444.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 751.

Methot, Mr. F. X. O., *Nicolet*
Resignation as Member tendered, 1108.

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell*
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1137; in Com., 1246 1248.
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 997.
Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1337.
America, Works on, in Com. of Sup,, 1009.
Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1020.
Archives, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1089.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 108 9, 1092, 1095.
Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.
Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1376.
Ca' als, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1092.
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 833, 836–840, 988–990, 1337.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1390, 1392.
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 988–990.
Coal, Sale and Delivery of, Bill 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1260.
Concurrence—Indians (Man. and N. W.) 1450, 1610; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1612.
Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 815, 817, 818.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of Amts., 812.
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1089.
Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 553.
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1622.
Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1384, 1385, 1425, 1428, 1433.
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 703.
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1304.
Fishery Exhibition, outstanding Claims, in Com. of Sup., 1374.
Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1062.
Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1262.

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Government Business, on M. to take Mondays, 1023; Measures abandoned (remarks) 1653.
Governor General's Secretary's Office, in Com. of Sup., 833.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 896.
Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1219, 1224.
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.
High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987; (House and Furniture for) conc., 1615.
High Commissioner to England (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1039–1041.
Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1380.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 855, 861; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 1447.
Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1063; in Com., 1400–1403.
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 840.
Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 838–840.
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1267, 1269, 1373; conc., 1450, 1610.
Intercol. Ry., Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1260.
Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1003, 1005, 1009, 1339; conc., 1612.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 964, 1168; in Com. of Sup., 1003.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596; in Com., 1600; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1636; in Com., 1637; (Amt.) 1640.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of (Ques.) 964.
Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Com. Sup., 1607.
Manitoba Judiciary B. 146 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1622.
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1020, 1163.
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 836.
Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.
Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1295.
North-West Council, Constitution of (M. for Stmnt.*) 1200.
North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1135.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 898.
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1000, 1002.
Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1017.
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1003.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005, 1009.
Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod, on M. for O. C., &c., 620.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014.

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1192, 1219, 1224.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1587.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1014.
Quotations from newspapers, Incorrect, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.
Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 617.
Railways, conc., 1650.
Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1188.
Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1612.
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.
Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 837.
Section B., Award of Arbitrators, conc., 1650.
Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339.
Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 3°, 1170, 1293.
Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1300.
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Vice Admiralty Courts) 997.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, Care of) 1089: (Census, revote,) 1092, (Criminal Statistics) 1089; (Health Statistics) 1095.
Canals—Capital: Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) 1051.
Civil Government: Agriculture, 1337; Civil Service Board, 988–990; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 833; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987; Indian Affairs, 840; Interior, 838–840; Militia, 836; Secretary of State's Office, 837.
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1260.
Dominion Lands—Capital (Examination of Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1425. *Income* (Outside Service) 1428, 1433; (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.
Geological Survey, 1262.
Indians: Annual Grant (B. C.) 1267; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1263; (Man. and N.W.) 1269, suppl., 1373, conc., 1450, 1610.
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1612; (Sessional Indemnities) 1339. Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003; (Printing, Papers, &c.) 1005, 1009; (Works on America) 1009.
Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1019, 1020; (Royal Military College) 1163.
Miscellaneous (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1376; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1304; (Fishery Exhibition, outstanding Claims) 1374; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1380; Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1607.
North West Mounted Police (Pay of Force, &c.) 1295.
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 1002; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1000.
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1017.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1192. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 1219; (Ont.) 1224.
Quarantine (Public Health) 1014.
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) conc., 1650.
Steamship Subventions (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1300.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W & M., 718.
Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1061.
Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1017.

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Vice-Admiralty Courts, in Com. of Sup., 997.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 703; (molasses) 734.

Mitchell, Hon. P., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Adjournment of the House, on M. (remarks) 514.
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1172.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 497; on M. for 2° (Personal Explanation) 528; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 567.
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1208, 1211.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1577; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.
Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 842.
Customs Officers in Northumberland County, on M. for Ret., 466.
Dominion Employés in B. C., on M. for Stmnt., 514.
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 700, 703.
Eastern Extension Ry., acquisition of, B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 882.
Fishery Act Amt., Petitions praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 301.
Fortin, Mr., Services of (remarks) 809.
Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1504.
General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1395.
Government Business, State of (remarks) 1170.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 892, 978; (remarks) on prop. Govt. B. to amend., 1608, 1635.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Stockholders (M. for Stmnt.*) 1200.
Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 977.
Intercol. Ry. (Repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1258.
Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 839.
Jack Head River Timber Limits (M. for Cor.*) 1201.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on point of Order, 824.
Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1472.
Naval Station at Esquimalt, on M. for Ret., 516.
New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 54 (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) on M. for 2°, 504.
Nova Scotia Ry. Agreement B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 882.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Haggart*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) to M. for 3°, 859.
Parkdale Village and G. T. R. legalization of Agreement B. 82 (*Mr. Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 504.
Private Bills, Presentation of, on M. to extend time, 1359.

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*
Point Escuminac Breakwater (M. for Papers) 514.
Question of Privilege *re* Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. (remarks) 1511–1515.
Returns, Imperfect (remarks) 1128.
San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (*Mr. Royal*) on M. for 2°, 505.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1504, 1506, 1507; in Com., 1625.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs, 842; Interior, 839; Marine and Fisheries, 1472.
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1258.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 700, 703.
White, Mr. (Hastings) on Personal Explanation (remarks) 1241.

Moffatt, Mr. R., *Restigouche*
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 695.

Montplaisir, Mr. H., *Champlain*
Intercol. Ry., Passes on (M. for Stmnt.*) 1201.

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York*
Disallowance of Provincial Acts (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 42.
Fishing in Ontario Waters, Regulations (M. for Ret.) 71.
Canadian Pacific Ry. and Construction Co., on Ms. (*Mr. Blake*) for Rets. (Amts.) 221, 225.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s Shareholders (M. for Stmnt.) 513.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 409.
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1208.
Concurrence—Geological Survey, 1451; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 1610.
Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 52, 1°*) 131; 2° m., 460; B. withdn., 986; on B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1577–1581; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.
Geological Survey, conc., 1451.
Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on M. for Com. (Amt) 977.
High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) in Com. of Sup., 1368; (Contingencies) conc., 1610.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1636.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against (M. for copies, &c.) 295; M. wthdn., 506; (M. for copies, &c.) 621; (speech) 738; (correction) 749; (reply) 761.
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1161.
Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161.
Patent Rights, Fraud in Sale of (B. 26, 1°) 71; 2° m., 145; ref. to Sel. Com., 145; Rep. from Sel. Com., 230; 3° m., 460.
Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.
Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1355, 1368.
Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation (M. for Stmnt.) 616.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1486.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner, Contingencies) conc., 1610.
Geological Survey, conc., 1451.
Militia (Contingencies, &c.) 1158; (Military Properties, Care of) 1161.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1355. Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1368.

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka*
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1251.
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 453.
Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1165.
Clothing, &c., Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1021.
Concurrence—Military Properties, Care of, 1441.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461; on B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580.
Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1196; Drill Pay, &c., 1199.
Fishery Act Amt., Pets. praying for (M. to ref. to Sel. Com.) 299, 303.
Gravenhurst-Callander Ry. (Ques.) 604.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 874.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 608.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 751.
Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161; conc., 1441.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.
Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources of Land, on M. for Ret., 972.
SUPPLY:
Militia (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Clothing, &c.) 1021; (Contingencies, &c.) 1158; (Drill Instruction) 1096; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1099; (Military Properties, Care of) 1161, conc., 1441; (Royal Military College) 1163.

Ouimet, Mr. J. A., *Laval*

Ballot Box, New Model (M. for Sel. Com.) 800.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 1621.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 94.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb., 812.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1107.

Dual Representation Repeal (B. 13, 1°*) 40; 2° m., 144.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1595, 1638.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 963; (Amt. to Amt.) 963.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 760.

Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 135.

North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec (Ques.) 1388.

Personal Explanation respecting article in Toronto *Mail*, 456.

St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 1494.

Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment of (M. for Cor.) 150.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1494.

Orton, Mr. G. T., *Centre Wellington*

Agricultural Banking and Loaning Provision (B. 105, 1°) 524.

Banking Facilities for Agriculturists (M. for Sel. Com.) 210; (Res.) 763.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 343.

Dominion Lands, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1430.

Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 699, 702.

Fairford River, Man., Improvements (M. for Reps.) 208; (Explanation) 210.

Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.

Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094.

Hudson Bay and Straits, Exploratory Expedition to (Ques.) 132.

Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 206.

Question of Privilege, on Mr. Sykes' letter in Regina *Leader* (remarks) 1582.

San Francisco and Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (*Mr. Royal*) M. to withdr., 1169.

Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act. Amt. B. 81 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.

Supply Farm No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Health Statistics) 1094.

Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1430.

Orton, Mr. G. T.—*Continued.*

United States Customs Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret., 520.

Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 699, 702.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. B. 131 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. to read and receive Pet., 1202; on M. for 2° of B., 1281.

Paint, Mr. H. N., *Richmond, N.S.*

Customs Officers in Richmond County, on M. for Ret. 465.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 610.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1575.

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 1371; (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1236.

Legislation (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009.

Militia (Drill Instruction) 1097; (Royal Military College) 1164.

Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1381.

Ocean and River Service (*Glendon*, Steamer to replace) 1228; (Life-boats, Harbours, &c.) 1230; (Obstructions in Navigable Rivers) 1232.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1191.

Patterson, Mr. J. C., *North Essex*

Amherstburg Custom House and Post Office (M. for Reps.) 297.

Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.

Coal Oil Barrels, Seizure of, at Sandwich, &c. (M. for Papers) 298.

Customs Dept. at Windsor, Employment of Officers (M. for Cor.) 508.

Duart, Postmaster a , on M. for Ret., 509.

Ferries (B. 115, 1°) 736.

Frontier Police, South-Western Ont. (Ques.) 1054.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) in Com. (Amt.) 978.

Harbour in Essex County (M. for Ret.) 506.

Kingsville Harbour Works, on M. for Ret., 216.

Leamington, Post Office at, on M. for Cor., 801; on withdrl. of Stmnt. reflecting on a Member, 802.

Maritime Court for Canada (Ques.) 965.

Pajot Farm, Claim of Indian Dept. to (M. for Ret.*) 1201.

Wyandotte Indians, Distribution of moneys to (Ques.) 966.

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant*

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1253.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s Funded Debt (Ques.) 337.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 395; on M. for 2° of B., 532; on M. for Com., 538.

Clothing, Militia, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1021, 1022.

Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1091.

Paterson, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Customs Act, 1883, Amt. B. 123 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 1060.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1108.
Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1094.
Dominion Lands (Outside Service) in Com. of Sup., 1438.
Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export (M. for copies of Claims) 38.
Grinding in Bond, on M. for O. C., &c., 53.
Great Britain and Germany, Treaty between, respecting Immigrants, on M. for copies of Despatches, &c., 800.
Immigration to Manitoba and the N.W., Agreement between Govt. and C. P. R. (M. for Cor.) 83.
Immigrants, Applications for Services of (M. for Ret.) 510.
Immigration and Emigration (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1063–1071.
Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1399–1404.
Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 539; in Com., 539–542; on M. for 3°, 625.
Leamington, Post Office at, on M. for Cor., 802.
Maritime Court of Ont. Extension of Jurisdiction B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 462.
Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 802.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1008.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 731, 732.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census, revote) 1091; Dominion Exhibition, 1094.
Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1438.
Indian Affairs: Annual Grant (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1264, (B.C.) 1266.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1008.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1021, 1022.
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1016.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1197.
Quarantine, 1010.
Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 641; in Com.: on Res. 2 (sugars, syrups, &c.) 731, 732; (Molasses) 734.
Wheat and Flour Importations (M. for Ret.) 38.

Platt, Mr. J. M., *Prince Edward*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 437.
Central Ontario Ry. (B. 73, 1°*) 198; M. for Com., 1175; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202, 1212.
Indian Islands in Lake Ont. (M. for Ret.) 87.
Life-boat at Wellington, Cost of (Ques.) 603.
Life-saving Stations, Life-boats, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1199; in Com. of Sup., 1232.

Platt, Mr. J. M.—*Continued.*
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1233.
Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014.
Public Health Officers (M. for Ret.) 88.
Return, Missing, *re* Mail Service in P. E. County (remarks) 459.
SUPPLY:
Quarantine (Public Health) 1014.
Canals—Capital: Murray, 1051.
Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 1230.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c.) 1232; (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c., Maintenance) 1233.
Weller's Bay Range Lights (Ques.) 336.
Wellington Life-boat House (Ques.) 336.

Pope, Hon. J. H., *Compton*
Canadian Immigration (Ans.) 44.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 483.
Census, remaining Volume (Ans.) 72, 766.
Emigrant Buildings at Lévis, on M. for Cor., 90.
High Commissioner on Emigration, on M. for Ret., 49; Letter and Cablegrams to, on Immigration, on M. for copies, 799.
Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer, Duties and Salary of, Vancouver Island (Ans.) 336.
Manitoba, Persons entering by rail, on M. for Stmnt., 49, 50.
Patent Rights, Fraud in Sale of, B. 26 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 145.
Port of Landing for European Immigrants (Ans.) 89.
Public Health Officers, on M. for Ret., 88.

Reid, Mr. J., *Caribou*
Boundary between B. C. and the N. W. T. (Ques.) 261.
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1037; (Amt.) 1038.

Rinfret, Mr. C. J., *Lotbinière*
Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1074.
Lotbinière, Construction of Wharf at (Ques.) 1054.
Mail Service in the County of Lotbinière (M. for Papers, &c.) 296.
St. Gilles, Daily Mail for (Ques.) 73.
Talbot, Achille, Employment and Salary of (Ques.) 966.

Riopel, Mr. L. J., *Bonaventure*
School of Navigation, Que., on M. for Cor., 201.

Robertson, Mr. A., *West Hastings*
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1497.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 748.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1497.

Robertson, Mr. T., *Hamilton*
Chinese Immigration into B.C., Prohibition of, on Amt. (*Mr. Allen*) to Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) M. to adjn. deb., 1285.
Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice (B. 97, 1°*) 457.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in (B. 96, 1°*) 457.
Criminal Cases, Procedure in, Duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions (B. 98, 1°*) 457.
Speedy Trial of Persons charged with Felonies, &c., Acts Amt. (B. 99, 1°*) 457.
SUPPLY:
Legislation (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003.

Robertson, Mr. T., *Shelburne*
Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour (Ques.) 603.
Bounty to Fishermen, Names, &c., of those who received same (M. for Stmnt.*) 67; (Ques.) 603.
Intoxicating Liquors, Traffic in, Act Amt. (B. 102, 1°*) 504; Order for 2° allowed to stand, 1290.
Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ques.) 965.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic (Amt.) to prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1123.
Scott Act in Cumberland Co. (Ques.) 736.
Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. (Ques.) 269.
SUPPLY:
Steamship Subventions (Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth) 1298.
Upper Wood Harbour, Wharf and Bridge at (M. for Ret.*) 1199.

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar*
Alberta Bridge Co. incorp. (B. 76, 1°*) 198.
Bank of Winnipeg incorp. (B. 29, 1°*) 83.
Calgary Omnibus, Tramway and Transfer Co. (B. 78, 1°*) 198.
Calgary Waterworks Co. incorp. (B. 77, 1°*) 198.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 404.
Manitoba South-Western Colonization Ry. Co. (B. 75, 1°*) 198.
Ranchers' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 74, 1°*) 198.

Royal, Mr. J., *Provencher*
Alberta Bridge Co. incorp. B. 76 (*Mr. Ross*) 2° m., 504.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1105.
Hudson Bay, Navigation of (M. for Sel. Com.) 203.
San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 231; 2° m., 505.
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 1308.

Rykert, Mr. J. C., *Lincoln*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 359.
Commercial Cable Co. (B. 19, 1°*) 67.
Welland Ry. and G. T. R. Transfer authorization (B. 44, 1°*) 89; 2° m, 271.

Scott, Mr. T., *Winnipeg*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 493.

Scriver, Mr. J. C., *Huntingdon*
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 1621.
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1103; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) Fifth Rep., 1271.
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 699.
Library of Parliament, First Rep. of Joint Com., Ms. to conc. in, 964, 1167; Second Rep., 1240; Third Rep. (presented) 1443; M. to conc., 1476.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598.
Newspaper Correspondence, on Personal Explanation (*Mr. Ouimet*) 457.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1123.
United States Customs Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret., 520.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 699.
White, Mr. (Hastings) on Personal Explanation (remarks) 1241.

Shakespeare, Mr. N., *Victoria, B.C.*
British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1028; on receiving Rep. of Com., 1039; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1172.
Cabinet Representation for B. C. (Ques.) 505.
Chinese Immigration (M. for Cor.) 616; Prohibition of into B. C. (Res.) 975; on M. to adjn. deb., 1287.
Gas Inspection in B. C. (Ques.) 506.
Geological Survey in B. C. (Ques.) 505.
Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1399.
Indian Troubles at Metlakatla and Dept. of Indian Affairs (M. for Cor.*) 83.
SUPPLY:
Militia (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164.

Small, Mr. J., *East Toronto*
Civil Service Acts Amt. (Ques.) 655.
Northern and North-Western Junction Ry. Co. (B. 59, 1°*) 141.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 57, 1°*) 141; on Sen. Amts., 1546.
Toronto Esplanade and Harbour Accommodation (B 60, 1°*) 141.

Smyth, Mr. H., *Kent*
Huron and Erie Ry. Co. (B. 85, 1°*) 260.

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant*
Blackeby, A. H., Employment of (Ques.) 966.
Canadian Express Co., Transport Requisitions on Militia Dept. (M. for copies*) 523.
Fishery Regulations, Fines imposed under, and Receipts (M. for Ret.*) 1201.
Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe, Payments to (M. for Stmnt.*) 66.
Militia, Returns respecting (remarks) 1127.
Militia Tents, Manufacture of (Ques.) 505.
Ministerial Expenses to England and elsewhere (M. for Ret.*) 66.
Moccasins, Purchase of, by Militia Dept. (M. for Cor.*) 624.
Rivers and Streams, Rental of, Sums received on account of (M. for Ret.*) 1201.
SUPPLY:
Militia (Contingencies) 1343.
Miscellaneous (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1375; (Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type, &c.) 1379.
Tents, Purchase of, by Militia Dept. (M. for Cor.*) 624.

Speaker, Mr. (HON. GEO. A. KIRKPATRICK) *Frontenac*
Accountant, Receipts and Disbursements (presented) 31.
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114: on Ques. of Order (*ruling*) 1246.
Albert Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.
Banking Facilites for Agriculturists, Provision B. 105: on Ques. of Order on introduction, 524; on M. for Com. on Res., 763.
Berthier Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 1443.
Blake's, Mr., Speech on the Orange B.: on Ques. of Priv., 1544, 1545.
Bothwell Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 524.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan Res.: Member requested not to use unparliamentary language, 342; on reference to Member sitting by the grace of others, 448; on Members being called on to vote, 454; flat contradictions restrained, 484; unparliamentary language, 532.
Chinese Immigration into B. C.: on Ques. of Priv., 977.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12: on objection taken by Member who introd. B. moving its 2°, 80.
Controverted Elections: Judges Reps. (read) 1, 337, 524, 735, 1321, 1443.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in B. 3: on Member speaking twice, 97.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6: on an Amt. to 3°, 668; on name of Member being omitted from div. on B., 709; on reprint of Amts., 812; unparliamentary language checked, 813.
Cumberland, Seat for: on using offensive words in debate, 561.
Debates, Official Rep.: on Amt. to ref. Fifth Rep. back to Com., 1271.

Speaker, THE.—*Continued.*
Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contracts B. 12: on hearing question read from the gallery and subsequent withdrawal from seat (*ruling*) 824.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21: on Amt. to passing of B., 978; on Ques. of Priv., respecting Amts. made by Sen. (*ruling*) 1515.
Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65: on Ques. of Procedure, 977.
Huron, West, Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.
Kent Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1; Notification of Return of Member elect, 198.
Leamington, Post Office at: Member requested to withdraw certain Stmnts., 802; reference to former deb. checked, 807.
Lennox Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.
Library of Parliament: Rep. of Librarian (presented) 2; on M. to conc. in First Rep., 964, 1167, 1169; on Second Rep., 1240; on presentation of Third Rep., 1443.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143: on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to repeal (*ruling*) 1640.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal: on M. to take precedence, Ques. of Order, no notice having been given (*ruling*) 825.
Luard, Major-Gen, on M. for Complaints against, 295.
Lunenburg Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.
Megantic Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (*read*) 1321.
Messages from His Excellency (read) 27, 56, 145, 304, 1240, 1439, 1576.
Middlesex, West, Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.
Montcalm Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 337.
New Members, Return of (announcement) 1, 198.
Nicolet, Vacancy in the Representation, Warrant issued, 1126.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57: on Sen. Amts (rule read) 1547.
North-West Grievances, Personal allusions checked, 1152.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32: on promotion of B. by Member who is paid Solicitor of Co. (*ruling*) 810, 811; on M. to change the name of mover (*ruling*) 843; on Ques. of Priv., 857.
Orange, Loyal, Association B. 93: Personal allusions checked, 920; Member requested to withdraw unparliamentary language, 923.
Parliamentary Practice: respecting Member being called on to Vote, 458.
Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, B. 18: on M. (*Mr. Amyot*) to discharge Order referring B. to Sel. Com. on Banking and Commerce, 131.
Prince Leopod, the late, Resolution of Condolence to Her Majesty, Mess. from Senate (announcement) 1273.
Printing of Parliament: on M. to adopt Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1109.

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic: on Amt. to prop. Res., 1233.
Prorogation, Letter from His Excellency's Secretary (read) 1652.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134: on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1445; (*ruling*) 1536.
Quotations from newspapers, Incorrect: on Ques. of Priv., 1582.
Receipts and Disbursements of Accountant, House of Commons (presented) 31.
Return, Missing, *re* P. E. County Mail Service (explanation) 459.
Royal Assent to C. P. R. Loan B. (announcement) 664.
Secretary, His Excellency's, Letter from, respecting Royal assent to C. P. R. Loan B. (read) 655.
Sick and Distressed Mariners' Fund: on Member confining himself to Ques., 217.
Simcoe, South, Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.
Soulanges Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 735.
Speech from the Throne (Rep.) 2.
St. Patrick's Day: on M. for adjournment, 885.
Vacancies: Notification of, 1, 1126; 1321
Warants issued for new Elections (announcements) 1, 1126, 1321.
[*See*, "KIRKPATRICK Mr.," 1126; also "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," and "PROCEDURE."]

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey*
Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. 1246.
Banking Facilities for Agriculturists, on M. for Sel. Com., 213.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res, 432.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1389.
Debates, Official Rep., in Com. of Sup., 1341.
Dominion Lands (Outside Service) in Com. of Sup., 1435.
Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1237, 1372.
Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 608.
Newspaper Mail Service, Delays in Transmission (M. for Cor.) 216.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1548.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 928.
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014.
Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.
Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources of Land, on M. for Ret., 971.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1435.
Fisheries (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237; (Fishing Bounty) 1372.
Immigration: Salaries, &c., 1418.
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1006; (Publishing Debates) 1341.
Public Works—Income; Buildings (Repairs, &c.) 1199.
Quarantine (Public Health) 1014.
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1243, 1249.

Sutherland, Mr. H., *Selkirk*
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1623.
Examiner Under Dom. Lands Act at Brandon (Ques.) 1109.
Public Buildings at Brandon, Erection of (Ques.) 1110.
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Manitoba) 1001.

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford*
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1572.

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-William, *Halifax*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 326.
Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 829, 830.
Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1058.
Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1130.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 897.
Halifax Steam Navigation Co. incorp. (B. 24, 1°*) 71.
Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.
Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1058.
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, amounts paid under, on M. for Stmnt., 269.
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management, 829, 830.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 686; in Com.: on Res. 2 (molasses) 734.

Tassé, Mr. J., *Ottawa City*
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) 1392.
Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1501.
Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of (B. 95, 1°*) 304; M. for Com., 889.
Repatriation of Canadians (Ques.) 965.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1501; on Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1559–1561.

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds*
Customs Officer at Gananoque, on M. for Ret, 465.
Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Ry. Co. (B. 58, 1°*) 141.
Gananoque, Post Office at (correction) 802.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 904.
Rideau Canal, Extension of (M. for Cor.*) 1201.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 693.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (steel, needles, &c.) 730.

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N.B.*
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593.
Customs Officers in York County, on M. for Ret., 466.
Ways and Means—conc., 790.

Thompson, Mr. D., *Haldimand*
Letter Postage Rates, Amt. of Existing Law (Ques.) 89.
Library of Parliament, First Rep. of Joint Com., on M. to conc. in (Ques.) 964.
SUPPLY:
Militia (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1160; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1160; (Military Properties, Care of) 1162
Public Works—Income: (Buildings, Repairs, &c.) 1199.

Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard, *St. John, N.B.*
America, Works on, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
Auditor General's Office, in Com. of Sup., 841.
Auditor-General's Rep. (presented) 27.
Bank Returns, Inspection of (Ans.) 44, 1444.
Benefit Mutual Insurance Societies (Ans.) 337.
Blackeby, A. H., Employment of (Ans.) 966.
Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1375.
Bounty on Manufactures of Iron, on M. for O. C., &c., 70.
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1621.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ans.) 71; Deposit of Securities (Ans.) 72; Funded Debt (Ans.) 337.
Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1608; conc., 1618.
Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1604.
Chloride of Zinc, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 734.
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 832, 833, 839, 841, 843, 987, 1333, 1336, 1602; conc., 1440, 1610.
Clothing, &c., Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1020.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1457.
Commercial Treaties, negotiations, on M. for O. C., &c., 58.
Concurrence—Customs, 1457; High Commissioner (Contingencies, &c.) 1610; Legal Advisers (Payment to) 1617; Page, John (Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1617;

Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard—*Continued.*
Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1454; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1459, 1612.
Confederation, Historical Painting, in Com. of Sup., 1310.
Customs, conc., 1457.
Customs, Tariff of Duties of (B. 142, 1°*) 1443.
Debates, Official Rep., in Com. of Sup., 1002.
Departmental Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 843.
Disallowance of Provincial Acts, on M. for copies of O.C. &c., 42.
Dominion Exhibition (Ans.) 1215.
Dunsville, Waste Weir at, in Com. of Sup., 1608.
Estimates, The, 1884-85: Mess. from His Ex., 145; ref. to Com. of Sup., 145; Suppl. Est., 1883 84, 1240; Suppl. Est., 1884 85, 1439; Further Suppl. Est., 1884-85, 1576.
Exchange Bank of Canada, on M. for Stmnt., 35; on Res. censuring Govt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 159; Security for advance to (Ans.) 199; Ogilvie & Bantin, Securieies for, 261, 337.
Examiner under Dom. Lands Act at Brandon (Ans.) 1109.
Factories, definition of offences against persons employed in (B. 106, 1°) 524.
Factory B. and Manufacturers' Association, on M. for Ret., 82.
Flag Treaty, between U. S. and Spain (remarks) 1361.
Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 841.
Finance Minister's Mission to England, on M. for Papers, 87.
General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1395.
Governor General's Secretary's Office, in Com. of Sup., 832.
Grain, Tariff on, Readjustment of (Ans.) 336.
Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1222.
High Commissioner (Removal Expenses) in Com. of Sup., 1336; (Contingencies) conc., 1440, 1610.
Immigration, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1602.
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1602.
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1608.
Iron, Bounties on Manufactures of, on M. for O. C., &c., 70.
Insurance, Superintendance of, in Com. of Sup., 1423.
Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 839.
Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) in Com. of Sup., 833.
Land Improvement Fund Money due Township of Wallace (Ans.) 200.
Land Improvement Fund, Ont. (Ans.) 1215.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1002–1004, 1008, 1009, 1602, 1627.
Lévis Graving Dock, further advance towards completion (prop. Res.) 1516.
Library of Parliament, on presentation of Third Rep., 1443; Salaries, &c., in Com of Sup., 1003, 1602.
Life Annuities, Sale of (Ans.) 199.

Tilley, Sir Leonard—*Continued.*
Life Insurance Co.'s, Co operative, &c. (B. 118) M. for Com. on Res., 764; in Com. and 1°* of B., 765.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) M. for Com., 1595.
Loans, Redemption of Small (B. 156) prop. Res. 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°* of B. 1610.
Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1617.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1298-1301; conc., 1453.
Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to (B. 36) prop. Res. 43; M. for Com., 68; in Com., 69; conc. in and 1°* of B., 85.
Messages from His Excellency (presented) 145, 1240, 1439, 1576.
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1020.
Mission School at Fort William, in Com. of Sup., 1608,
Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.
Newfoundland Prohibition Duty (Ans.) 1214.
Newfoundland, Trade with (remarks) 1361.
Ogilvie and Buntin, Messrs., as Security for Exchange Bank (Ans.) 261, 337.
Ontario and Quebec Accounts with Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 72, 73.
Ontario Land Improvement Fund (Ans) 1215.
Ontario's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ans.) 199.
Optional Subjects, on conc., wthdn., 1602.
Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1608; conc., 1618.
Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1336.
Printing of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1108.
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004, 1008; conc., 1440.
Printing Vocabularies of Indian Dialects, in Com. of Sup., 1608.
Private Bills, Presentation of, on M. to extend time, 1360.
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 833; suppl. 1333, 1336.
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1124.
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment (B. 154) prop. Res. 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1°* of B. 1610.
Public Accounts (presented) 27.
Public Buildings at Brandon, Erection of (Ans.) 1110.
Public Debt of the Dominion (Ans.) 736.
Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1326.
Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1193, 1222, 1362, 1604.
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Quebec's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ans.) 199.
Quebec Tidal Dock, further advance towards completion (prop. Res.) 1516.

Tilley, Sir Leonard—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 843.
Redemption of Small Loans (B. 156) prop. Res., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°* of B., 1610.
Refund of Duties in P. E. I., 1312; conc., 1454.
Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1459.
Returns, Imperfect, *re* High Commissioner (remarks) 460.
Returns, Preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 1381.
Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 1602.
Senate, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1627.
Stationery Office, in Com. of Sup., 987.
Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 728; Rolled, &c., 730; Needles, &c., 730.
Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment (B. 154) prop. Res., 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1°* of B., 1610.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1496.
Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 731-733.
SUPPLY:
Res. for Com., 28; Mss. for Com., 825, 987, 1039, 1063, 1138, 1176, 1215, 1245, 1294, 1322, 1361, 1404, 1423, 1465, 1602, 1626.
Canals—Capital: Welland (Page, John, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1608, conc., 1618. *Income:* Welland (Waste Weir at Dunsville) 1608.
Civil Government: Auditor General's Office, 841; Departmental Contingencies, 843; Finance and Treasury Board, 841; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832; High Commissioner (Removal Expenses) 1336, (Contingencies) conc., 1440 1610; Immigration, 1602; Indian Affairs, 1602; Interior, 839; Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) 833; Post Office, 1336; Privy Council Office, 833, suppl., 1333, 1336; Railways and Canals, 843; Secretary of State's Office, 1602; Stationery Office, 987.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, conc., 1457.
Indians: B.C. (Printing Vocabularies of Dialects) 1603; Ont. and Que. (Mission School at Fort William) 1608.
Insurance, Superintendence of (Expenses, &c.) 1423.
Legislation: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1002; (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1459. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 1627, Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003, suppl., 1602; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1004, 1008, conc., 1440; (Works on America) 1009.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1299, conc., 1453; (France and Quebec) 1300; (Grand Manan, N.B. and Mainland) 1298; (Halifax and St. John *viâ* Yarmouth) 1298; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1301.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1020.
Miscellaneous (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1375; (Confederation, Historical Painting) 1310; (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1617; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I.) 1312, conc., 1454; (Returns, Preparation, of) 1381.
Public Works—Capital (N.B., Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1604; *Income:* Buildings (N.B.) 1193; (Repairs, &c.) 1362. Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 1222.
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.
Unprovided Items: Vide Auditor Gen's. Rep., 1383.
Supply (B. 155) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 1651.
Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Unprovided Items, in Com. of Sup., 1383.
Ways and Means—Res. for Com., 28; Budget Speech 569. [For Debate *see* "WAYS AND MEANS."] In Com.: on Res. 1 (Free List) 653. On Res. 2 (steel,

Tilley, Sir Leonard—*Continued.*
ingots, &c.) 728; (steel, rolled, &c.) 730; (steel, needles, &c.) 730; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 731–734; (molasses) 734; (zinc, chloride, &c.) 734. On Res. 3, 735. On Res. 4, 735. On conc., 770. Res. rep. from Com., 1651; *see Supply Bill.*
Zinc, Chloride, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 734.

Trow, Mr. J., *South Perth*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 484.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1581.
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) Mr. Fortin's vote (Ques. of Order) 821.
Government Herd in the N. W. (Ques.) 506.
Medicine Hat and Fort MacLeod Mail Service (Ques.) 506.
Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod (Ques.) 506.
Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources, on M. for Ret., 970.
SUPPLY:
Legislation (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1036.
Quarantine, 1011.

Tupper, Mr. C. H., *Pictou*
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 1474.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2° (Amt. 6 m. h.) 93; on M. for Com., 271.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 292.
Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co. (B. 89, 1°*) 285.
Molasses, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 734.
Montreal and European Short Line Ry. Co. *See* B. 89.
Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr Davies*) 1279.
Privileges and Elections, Com. on, withdrawal from serving, 569.
Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339.
Spring Hill and Parrsborough Coal and Ry. Co. winding-up and transfer (B. 47, 1°*) 131.
Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 729.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Indemnities) 1339.
Administration of Justice (Statutory increase to Geo. Duval, Précis Writer, Supreme Court) 1474.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res 2 (steel, ingots, &c.) 729; (molasses, &c.) 734. On conc, 769.

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, *Cumberland*
Accommodation at St. John, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.
Annapolis and Digby Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.
Aylmer and Pembroke Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 1497.

Tupper, Sir Charles—*Continued.*
Beauce Junction and International Boundary Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1491.
Beauharnois Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1353, 1354; conc., 1463.
Bogart and Bridgewater Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1502.
Bridge over Red River at Emerson, in Com. of Sup., 1348.
British Association Meeting, in Com. of Sup., 1310.
British Columbia, Agreement with (B. 126) prop. Res. 67; M. for Com., 1023; on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 1032; Res. in Com. and 1°* of B., 1039; in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171.
C. P. R. Bridge over Red River at Emerson, in Com. of Sup., 1348.
——— British Columbia, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1048.
——— Cost of (Ans.) 603.
——— Cash Deposit with Govt. (Ans.) 72.
——— Guarantee, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 56.
——— Guarantee to Co., further Cor. respecting (Ans.) 72.
——— Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1348.
——— Lake Superior and Nipissing Divisions, Cost of (Ans.) 458.
——— Loan (B. 101) prop. Res., 84; M. for Com. on Res. (statement) 98–113; (remarks) 182; on Amt. (*Mr. Vail.*) 6 m. h, 419–424; in Com., 454–456; M. to conc. in Res., 469; (1°* of B.) 503; 2° m., 525, 529; M. for Com., 535; M. to recom., 567; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 568.
——— on Ms. (*Mr. Blake*) for further information, 220, 221, 225, 228.
——— Payments to Co. on account of Floating Debt (Ans.) 1054.
——— Payments to Co. on Construction Contract and Subsidy Accounts (Ans.) 1055.
——— Postal Subsidy to Co. (Ans.) 72.
——— Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1046, 1048.
——— Rumours of inadequacy of arrangements (Ans.) 1273.
——— Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1646.
——— Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
——— Smith & Ripley, Georgian Bay Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1349.
——— Station accommodation, in Com. of Sup., 1049; conc., 1449.
——— Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1049.
——— Steamers from Owen Sound (Ans.) 458.
——— Summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, Cost of (Ans.) 458.

Tupper, Sir Charles—*Continued.*
C. P. R. Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger, 1349; conc., 1460.
Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1050–1053, 1350–1354; conc., 1460–1463, 1612.
Caraquet and Shippigan Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. 1510.
Carillon Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1052, 1351.
Central Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1510.
Claims arising out of construction (Intercol Ry.) Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1628.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1256, 1261; conc., 1449.
Compensation for Injuries (P. E. I. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1347.
Concurrence—C. P. R. (Station Accommodation) 1450; Collection of Revenues (Intercol. Ry.) 1449; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner), 1461, 1612; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1463; Perley, H. F. (Services on St. Peter's Canal) 1460; Temple Thomas (Patent Flanger) 1560; Welland Canal (Unpaid Laborers) 1460.
Construction Account (Intercol. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. to wthdr. B., 987.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 135, 1°) 1322; 2° m., 1576; in Com., 1577–1580; 3° m., 1591; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) 1592; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1594.
Cornwall and Perth Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1507.
Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1053.
Dalhousie Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
D'Anjou, Joseph, Claim of (Ans.) 798.
Derby Station and Indiantown Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1511.
Eastern Extension Ry., acquisition of, B. 125 (prop. Res.) 825; M. for Com. on Res., 878; in Com., 882; conc. in and 1°* of B., 987; 3° m., 1131.
Elevator at Halifax (Ans.) 603.
Elgin Road Station, L'Islet (Ans.) 199.
Erie and Huron Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1507.
Exchange Bank Notes, Instructions to Intercolonial Ry. Officers respecting (Ans.) 1055.
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1305.
Falconer, James, land damages (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1346.
Ferguson, William, purchase of land (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1347.
Fredericton and Miramichi Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1503.
Galops Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Gatineau Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1499.
Grand Piles and Lake des Isles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.

Tupper, Sir Charles—*Continued.*
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 895; on M. for Com., 977; in Com., 978; Amts. made by Sen., on Ques. of Priv., 1513.
Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal (Ans.) 1187.
Gravenhurst-Callander Ry. (Ans.) 604; on M. for copies of Cor., 41.
Great American and European Short Line Ry. (Ans.) 57.
Great Northern Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1508.
Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.
Halifax St. Ry. Co. *vs.* The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on Ques. of Procedure, 977.
High Commissioner, House and Furniture for, in Com. of Sup., 1367; conc., 1615.
Holden, Clara S., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1352.
Hopewell and Alma Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1405–1409, 1415.
Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1405-1409, 1415.
Inspecting Engineers (C.P.R.) Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1348.
I. C. R., Accommodation at St. John, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.
——— Claims arising out of construction, Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1628.
——— Claims Commissioners, Payment of (Ans) 1187.
——— Claims for Losses on (Ans.) 655.
——— Construction Account, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
——— Dalhousie Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
——— Falconer, James, land damages, in Com. of Sup., 1346.
——— Ferry or Bridge at Quebec (Ans.) 86.
——— Ferguson, William, purchase of land, in Com. of Sup., 1347.
——— Halifax Street Ry. Co. *vs.* The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
——— Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.
——— MacDonell, Alex., Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1346.
——— Miscellaneous, not provided for, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
——— New Brunswick, Refund to Govt. of, in Com. of Sup., 1627.
——— Office at Quebec (Ans.) 86.
——— Rivière du Loup Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
——— Rochette, Fabien, for land, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
——— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1345.

Tupper, Sir Charles—*Continued.*
I. C. R., Tariff between Quebec and St. Charles (Ans.) 260.
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1496.
Jacques Cartier Union Ry. and North Shore Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1508.
Jennie Graham, Schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1612.
Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1499.
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1508.
Lachine Canal, jurisdiction of wharfingers (Ans.) 1187.
Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
Lake Simon and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1503.
Lavoie, Geo., Claim of (Ans.) 797.
Lislois, C. J., Claim of, before Dom. Arbitrators (Ans.) 261, 965.
Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills, Land Damages, in Com. of Sup., 1354.
MacDonell, Alex., Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1346.
Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1463.
Message from His Excellency (presented) 56.
Metapediac and Paspebiac Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1510.
Miscellaneous (Intercol. Ry.) not provided for, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
Mississippi and Renfrew Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1508.
Miramichi Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1503.
Montreal and Western Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1503.
Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Napanee and Tamworth Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1502.
New Brunswick, Expenditure by Govt. of (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1627.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1546.
North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1147, 1152, 1156.
Ontario and Pacific Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1507.
Oxford and Sydney or Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1490.
Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1351.
Peake's, Station at, on P. E. I. Ry. (Ans.) 261.
Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1496

Tupper, Sir Charles—*Continued.*
Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1046–1048.
Prince Edward Island Ry., Salaries of Employés, on M. for Stmnt., 298; Payment of Labourers on (Ans.) 965; in Com. of Sup., 1347.
Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1219, 1221, 1367; conc., 1615.
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1491.
Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River (Welland) in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Railway Crossings on roads or streets, Level (Ans.) 1273.
Railways and Canals, Rep. (presented) 43.
Railways, in Com. of Sup. (C. P. R.) 1046–1049, 1348, 1350, conc., 1460, 1646; (Intercol. Ry.) 1049, 1050, 1344–1347, 1627, 1628; (P. E. I.) 1347.
Rapide Plat Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Repairs, &c. (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1256, conc., 1449; (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1261.
Returns, Imperfect (Explanations) 198, 1128.
Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1354.
River St. Clair Tunnel Co.'s incorp B. 66 (*Mr. Macmaster*) on M. for Com., 603.
Rivière du Loup Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
Rochette, Fabien, for land (Intercol. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Rolling Stock (P. E. I. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1347.
Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1646.
Section B, further sums for Contractors, on M. for Estimate, 77; Arbitrators or Commissioners (Ans.) 1386.
Short Line Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1486.
Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
Skiffington, Mr., Employment of (Ans.) 603.
Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.
St. Andrew's and Lachute Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.
St. Andrews, Schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1612.
St. Charles Branch (Ans.) 260; in Com. of Sup., 1049, suppl., 1345.
Ste. Anne's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1052.
St. Jérôme and New Glasgow Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1508.
St. Lawrence River and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1492.
St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for Stmnt., 268.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization (B. 147) prop. Res., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486–1492, 1496–

Tupper, Sir Charles—*Continued.*

1511; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; 1°* of B., 1576; 2° m., 1624; in Com., 1624–1626; M. to recom., 1640.

Superannuation Contributions, Refund of (Ans.) 285.

SUPPLY:

Canals, Capital: Carillon (Dam and Approaches) 1052; (Page, John, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1351; Cornwall, 1050; Lachine, 1050; Murray, 1051; St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1051; Ste. Anne's, 1052; Trent River Nav. (Locks &c.) 1051; Welland, 1051; (Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River) 1051; (Unpaid Labourers) 1350, conc., 1460; St. Peters' (Perley, H. F., services on) 1350, conc., 1460; Tay, 1053; Williamsburg (Clara S. Holden, Compensation to) 1352; (Lock at Rapide Plat Canal) 1051; (Galops Canal) 1051. *Income;* Beauharnois (Marchand, L. W., Professional Services) 1353, conc., 1463; Cornwall (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053; Miscellaneous, 1053; Rideau (Land damages between Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills) 1354; Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352, conc., 1461, 1612.

Collection of Revenues—Railways: Repairs, &c. (Intercol. Ry.) 1256, conc., 1449; (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1261. Canals: Maintenance, &c. (Salaries, &c. Canal Officers) 1261.

Immigration, (Salaries, &c.) 1405–1409, 1415.

Miscellaneous (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 1305; (British Association Meeting) 1310.

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 1221; (N.S.) 1219. Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1307; conc., 1615.

Railways, Capital: C. P. R. (Bridge over Red River at Emerson) 1348; (British Columbia, revote) 1048; (Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c.,) 1348; (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1046–1048; (Section B., Award of Arbitrators) 1630, conc., 1646; Sifton & Ward (Red River and Cross Lake) 1350; (Smith & Ripley, Georgian Bay Branch) 1349; (Station Accommodation) 1049, conc., 1449; (Subsidy) 1049; (Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger) 1349, conc., 1460. Intercol. Ry. (Accommodation at St. John) 1049, suppl., 1344; (Alex. MacDonell, Award of Commissioners) 1346; (Claims arising out of Construction, Award of Commissioners) 1628; (Construction Account) 1345; (Dalhousie Branch) 1344; (Fabien Rochette, for Land) 1345; (Halifax Extension) 1049, suppl., 1344; (Halifax Street Ry. Co. *vs.* The Queen) 1345; (James Falconer, Land damages) 1346; (Miscellaneous, not provided for) 1050; (Refund to Govt. of N. B) 1627; (St. Charles Branch) 1049, suppl., 1345; (William Ferguson, purchase of Land,) 1347. P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1347; (Rolling Stock) 1347.

Surveys chargeable to Capital in Pub. Accts., on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 303.

Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1053.

Temple, Mr. T., M. P., Protest against (Ans.) 1110.

Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger, in Com. of Sup., 1349.

Traverse, Union Station at the (Ans.) 260.

Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1051.

Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C. P. R., on M. for Cor., 42.

Unpaid Laborers on Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.

Wallaceburg and Sarnia Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 1507.

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051, 1350, 1352; conc., 1460, 1461, 1612.

Tupper, Sir Charles—*Continued.*

Welland Ry. and G. T. R. Transfer authorization B. 44 (*Mr. Rykert*) on M. for 2°, 271.

Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal, on M. for Cor., 798.

Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051, 1352.

Wilkinson, J. A., Employment of (Ans.) 966.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. B. (*Mr Cameron, Victoria*) on M. to read and receive Pet., 1202.

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe*

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 927.

Volunteers, Surviving, of 1837–38 (M. to ascertain number, &c.) 89.

Vail, Hon. W. B., *Digby*

A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1164.

Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1020–1022.

Annapolis and Digby Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1509.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. (Amt. 6 m. h.) 415; (speech) 424.

Carpeting, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 696.

Certificates to Masters and Mates and Seamen's Acts Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1057.

Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 826, 828, 829.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 1471.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1258.

Concurrence—Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 1442, 1616 Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, 1443; Militia (Military Properties, Care of) 1441.

County Court Judges, Travelling Expenses (Ques.) 603.

Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1159.

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1365.

Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1097.

Eastern Extension Ry., acqusition of, B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Res. for Com., 879.

Fishery Overseer for Digby County (Ques.) 89.

Fishing Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1369.

Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1361.

Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1605; conc., 1442, 1616.

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1408, 1409.

Ingonish Breakwater, on M. for Ret., 90.

Intercol. Ry., Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1258.

Judicial Salaries, Readjustment of (M. for Cor.) 58.

Lighthouse and Coast Service, conc., 1443.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 761.

Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1471.

Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1160; conc., 1441.

Militia Clothing, Tenders for manufacture of (M. for copies*) 1201.

Vail, Hon. W. B.—*Continued.*
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1020, 1022, 1095, 1097, 1159, 1160, 1164; conc., 1441.
Pine and Spruce Logs, Export Duty on (Ques.) 655.
Public Armouries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1095.
Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1587.
Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1365, 1604, 1605; conc., 1442, 1616.
Schools of Gunnery, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1300.
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for Stmnt., 269.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1509.
Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 733.
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management, 826, 828, 829.
Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries, 1471.
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1258.
Fisheries (Fishing Bounty) 1369.
Immigration (Salaries, &c.) 1408, 1409.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms) 1443.
Militia (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164; (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1020, 1022; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1159; (Drill Instruction) 1097; (Public Armouries, &c.) 1095; (Military Properties, Care of) 1160, conc., 1441.
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1017.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1604; Dredging (Maritime Provs.) 1365; Harbours and Rivers, (N. S.) 1605, conc., 1442, 1616.
Steamship Subventions (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1300.
Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com on W & M., 679.
Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1017.
Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (carpeting, &c.) 696; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 733.

Valin, Mr. P. V., *Montmorency*
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb., 813.
Floating Gas Lights on the St. Lawrence (M. for Cor.) 217.
Lights on the St. Lawrence, north of Island of Orleans (M. for Ret.) 218.
Quebec Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for copies, 523.
School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 201.
St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1495.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1495; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1556.

Vanasse, Mr. F., *Yamaska*
Lavallière Bay, Yamaska River, Explorations on (M. for Rep.*) 820.
St. Francis River, Explorations on (M. for Rep.*) 820.

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York*
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R., confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 859.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 928.
Parkdale Village and G. T. R., legalization of Agreement (B. 82, 1°*) 231; 2° m., 504.

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res. from Com. (Amt.) 469; on M. for Com. on B., 538.
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1623.
Fairford River, Man., Improvements, on M. for Reps., 210.
Hudson Bay, Navigation of (M. for Cor.*) 71; on M. for Sel. Com., 205.
North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1155.
Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81. (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.
Subsidies to Provinces B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1585.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dominion Exhibition) 1094.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 1320.
Dominion Lands—Capital (Examination of Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1425.
Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1429.
Indians (Man. and N. W.) 1373.
Militia: Manitoba (Pay of Force) 1343.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 1198.
Ways and Means—conc., 788.
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1242.

Weldon, Mr. C. W., *St. John, N. B., City and County*
A, B, and C Batteries and Cavalry and Infantry Schools, Officers of, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 808; in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 995.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence (Amt.) 305; on M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 495; (Amt.) 497; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 568.
Carleton, N.B., Post Office (Ques.) 966.
Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1091.
Coal entered Ex-Warehouse (M. for Ret.*) 67.
Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1318.
Consolidated Ry. Act. Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*), 1594.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 280; in Com., 671.

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*
Customs Act, 1883, Amt. B. 123 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 1060.
Derby Station and Indiantown Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1511.
Drawback on Ship-building Materials (M. for copies of Claims*) 67.
Drawback on Sugar (M. for copies of Memorials, &c.*) 67.
Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1505.
Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1057.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.
Glendon, Steamer to replace, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 875.
Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
Inland Revenue Warehouse at St. John (Ques.) 1212.
Intercol. Ry., Casualties, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 79.
Intercol. Ry. Claims Commission, Moneys paid to (M. for O. C., &c.*) 66.
Intercol. Ry., Purchase of Rolling Stock (M. for Ret.*) 66.
Intercol. Ry., Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmnt.*) 66.
Intercol. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1050.
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 965.
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1233.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1597-1599.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 958.
Lottery Firm at St. Stephen (M. for Stmnt. of Receipts of P. O.) 614.
Mail Service in New Brunswick, on M. for Ret., 78.
Meteorological Service at St. John, Expenses, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1200.
Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161.
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1161-1164.
Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1000.
Princess Louise, Steamer (M. for copy of Contract, &c.) 35; Loss of the (M. for Rep. of Capt. Scott, R.N.*) 40; Amount paid J. O'Brien for building (M. for Stmnt.*) 623; Steamer to replace, contracts for (M. for Ret.*) 820.
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1191, 1192, 1366.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1586.
Pullman Cars on Intercol. Ry. (M. for Cor.) 77.

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Railways, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.
Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 764; on M. for 3°, 1170, 1293.
Sick and Distressed Mariners Act. Amt. B. 129 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1360.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1505-1507, 1511; in Com., 1625.
St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
Stone for New Departmental Building (Ques.) 736.
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Vice-Admiralty Courts) 995.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census, revote) 1091.
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures and Gas, 1318.
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance) 1233.
Militia (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery) 1164; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Military Properties, Care of) 1161; (Royal Military College) 1163.
Ocean and River Service (*Glendon*, Steamer to replace) 1227.
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 1000.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 1192; (N. S.) 1191. Miscellaneous (Infantry Schools) 1366.
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.
Railways—Capital: Intercol. Ry. (St. Charles Branch) 1050; (Miscellaneous, not provided for) 1050.
Scientific Institutions (Observatories) 1254.
Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
Vice-Admiralty Courts, in Com. of Sup., 995.
Vice-Admiralty Courts of the Dom. (M. for copies of Imp. despatches*) 65.
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1059; in Com., 1243.
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Wells, Mr. R. M., *East Bruce*
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580; on M. for 3°, 1591; (Amt.) 1592.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co. (B. 46, 1°*) 131.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1587.
Solway, Postmaster at, Appointment of (M. for Ret.*) 1200.

Wheler, Mr. G., *West Ontario*
Tariff on Grain, Readjustment of (Ques.) 336.

White, Mr. J., *East Hastings*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 473.
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175; in Com. (Amt.) 1202, 1211; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1214.
Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 539; in Com., 539.

White, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) that B. pass, 888.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 898-921.
Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*) in Com., 889.
Personal Explanation of remarks in Ry. Committee, 1241.
Prorogation (remarks) 1654.
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 1231.
Ways and Means—conc., 772.

White, Mr. P., *North Renfrew*
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1391, 1422.
Concurrence—Culling Timber, 1457.
Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1594.
Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh (M. for Cor.) 798.
Patent Act, 1872, Amt. (B. 86, 1°*) 260.
Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of (B. 84, 1°*) 260; in Com., 888.
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.
Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources of land, on M. for Ret., 970.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, conc., 1457
Dominion Lands—Income (Outside Service) 1430.
Immigration (Salaries, &c.) 1417.

White, Mr. T., *Cardwell*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 180.
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1212.
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1652.
Debates, Official Rep. of: M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 260; Second Rep. (presented) 704; M. to conc. in, 883; Third and Fourth Reps. (presented) 1022; M. to conc. in Reps., 1100; (remarks) 1102, 1104; Fifth Rep. (presented) 1240; M. to conc. in, 1270; in Com. of Sup., 1340.
General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1394.
Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1084.
Live Stock Insurance Co. incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 141.
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1546.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 902.
Printing of Parliament (Ms.) to conc. in Fifth and Sixth Reps. of Joint Com., 1108; Seventh Rep., 1321, 1359; Eighth Rep., 1543.
Private Bills, Hour for (Ques.) 811; on M. to extend time for presentation, 1359,

White, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) Amt., 1113.
Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1332.
Royal Canadian Insurance Co. (B. 53, 1°*) 141.
St. Clair Frontier Tunnel Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (*Mr. Macmaster*) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1281.
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co. Bondholders (B. 56, 1°*) 141; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1281.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1004, 1007, 1008; (Publishing Debates) 1340.
Miscellaneous (British Association Meeting) 1311.
Unlawful Associations and Oaths (B. 100, 1°) 468.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 625.

Wigle, Mr. L., *South Essex*
Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 807.
Ways and Means—conc., 773.

Williams, Mr. A. T. H., *East Durham*
Langtry *vs.* Dumoulin, Petition (M. to read and receive) 57.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 753.
Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan Act Amt. (B. 61, 1°*) 162.

Wilson, Mr. J. H., *East Elgin*
County Judge of Elgin, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.
Hughes, Judge, Charges against (M. for copies of Pets.) 59; (remarks) 967; (Ques.) 1109; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 46 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. that B. pass, 886, 888.
Port Stanley and Port Burwell as Harbours of Refuge (M. for Ret.) 519.
Port Stanley Harbour Revenue (M. for Stmnt.) 295.
Stayner, Postmaster at (Ques.) 1109.
St. Thomas, Public Buildings at (M. for Ret.) 92.
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229.
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1016.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1194, suppl., 1605. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1225, suppl., 1606.
Quarantine (Cattle Disease) 1011; (Public Health) 1012.
Watson, Chas. T., Services of, and Moneys paid (M. for Stmnt.*) 820.

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville*
Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 279.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 904.

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 376.
Maritime Bank of the Dom., Capital Stock reduction (B. 66, 1°*) 162.

Woodworth, Mr. D. B., *King's, N. S.*
Amero, Roger, Case of (M. for Ret.) 622.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 189.
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 94.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 292.
Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 558; (Personal Explanation) 566.
Intercol. Ry., Coal carried by, on M for Ret., 65.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 759.
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 919.
Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod, on M. for O. C., &c., 621.
Question of Privilege, Mr. Blake's Speech on the Orange B. (remarks) 1544.
Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81 (*Mr. Beaty*) M. for Com., 979.

Woodworth, Mr. D. B.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Immigration; Salaries, &c., 1420.
Public Works—Income (Ont.) 1355.

Wright, Mr. A., *Ottawa County.*
Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., M. to adjn. deb., 799.
Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1499, 1500.
Land Sales within limits of C. P. R and average price realized (M. for Ret.) 77.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 740; (correction) 744.
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for Stmnt., 168.
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1499, 1500.

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Prince Edward Island Ry., Payment of Labourers on (Ques.) 965.
Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 64.
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Refund of Duties paid by Merchants in P. E. I.) conc., 1454.
Temperance Act, 1878, Medical Certificates given under (M. for Ret.*) 1201.

INDEX—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

"A," "B" AND "C" BATTERIES, OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 808; and SCHOOLS OF GUNNERY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1164.

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 1608.

ACCIDENTS ON THE I. C. R.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.

ACCOUNTANT, HOUSE OF COMMONS: Receipts and Disbursements, presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 31.

ACTS, PROVINCIAL, DISALLOWANCE OF, &c.: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH: Moved (*Mr. Macmaster*) 3; sec. (*Mr. Belleau*) 6; reply (*Mr. Blake*) 9; answer (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 20; agreed to, 27; His Ex.'s Reply, 304.

"ADELAIDE," SCOW, LOSS OF: in Com. of Sup, 1365.

ADJOURNMENTS: Ms., Rideau Hall Festivities, 513; Ash Wednesday, 524; St. Patrick's Day, 884; Good Friday, 1476.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 109 (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°, 598; wthdn., 1057.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention of, B. No. 104 (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°*, 655; 2° m., 1132; 2°, 1137; prop. Res. (Public Analysts) 1215; in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; point of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1244; Ruling (*Mr. Speaker*) 1246; in Com., 1246; recom. and 3°*, 1294. (47 *Vic., c.* 34.)

ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS: on M. for 2° of B. (*Mr. Lesage*) 1132; (*Mr. Costigan*) 1137.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, EXPENSES UNDER ACT: in Com. of Sup., 1318.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: Rep. presented, 1321.

ADMINISTRATION OF AFFAIRS IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 994, 1474.

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 2 (*pro forma*).

ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE N. W. TERRITORIES, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.

AGENT AND CONTINGENCIES (PUBLIC WORKS) B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1318.

AGREEMENT WITH B. C.: Mess. from His Ex., 27; prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 67; M. for Com. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1023; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 1026; Deb. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1027; (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1028; (*Mr. Blake*) 1030; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1032; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1034; (*Mr. Reid*) 1037; (*Mr. Homer*) 1037; Amt. neg. 1038; Amt. (*Mr. Reid*) 1038; deb. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1038; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1039; neg., 1039; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1171; deb. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1172; (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1172; (*Mr. Homer*) 1173; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1173; (*Mr. Blake*) 1174; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1175; neg., 1176; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176.

Agricultural Fertilizers, Prevention of Fraud in Manufacture, &c., B. No. 38 (*Mr. Massue*). Res. and 1° of B., 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; in Com. and 3°*, 669. (47 *Vic., c.* 37.)

AGRICULTURAL, INDUSTRIAL, &c., STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup, 1095.

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES AND MECHANICAL ARTS, ESSAYS ON: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Gigault*) 74; Rep. of Com.: Ques., 1387.

AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS AND THE TARIFF, Rep. of Com., Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 1003, 1006-1009.

AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.

AGRICULTURAL LANDS, &c., M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

AGRICULTURE, DEPTL. REP.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 709; presented, 1055; in Com. of Sup., 842, 1337.

AGRICULTURISTS, BANKING FACILITIES FOR: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Orton*) 210; wthdn., 216.

Agriculturists, Banking and Loan Facilities for, provision B. No. 105 (*Mr. Orton*). 1°, 524.

AIDES-DE-CAMP, GOVERNOR GENERAL'S: in Com. of Sup., 832.

Alberta Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 76 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°*, 198; 2°, 504; wthdn.

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co. Incorp. B. No. 34 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 736. (47 *Vic., c.* 86.)

ALBERT CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

ALDRICH, E. P.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1334.

ALLAN, W. F., ALLOWANCE IN LIEU OF BOARD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1381.

ALLISON, Mr. D. W.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

AMERICA, PURCHASE OF WORKS ON: in Com. of Sup., 1009.

AMERO, ROGER, ARREST OF, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 622.

AMHERSTBURG, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LAND SOLD FOR: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Lister*) 83; M. for Reps. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 297.

AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1019.

ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1215.

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.

ANNUAL GRANT TO SUPPLEMENT INDIAN FUND, Ont, Que. and Mar. Provs.: in Com of Sup., 1263.

ANNUITIES, LIFE, SALE OF: Ques (*Mr. Hall*) 199.

APPOINTMENTS, MILITIA DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 833-837.

ANTIGONISH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.

APPRAISERS, CUSTOMS: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 285.

ARBITRATORS ON SECTION B: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 1386; in Com. of Sup., 1630.

ARBITRATORS. *See* "Dominion" and "Official."

ARCHIVES, CARE OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1088.

ARCHIVES, TRANSFER OF TO LIBRARY: Ques (*Mr. Mills*) in Com. of Sup., 1009.

ARMOUR, MR. JUSTICE: Reps. on Lennox, West Middlesex, West Huron, and South Simcoe Controverted Elections, 1

ARTILLERY COMPETITION AT SHOEBURYNESS: (withdrawn) 1166.

ARTS, ACADEMY OF: in Com. of Sup., 1608.

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1088-1095; conc., 1440.

ASH WEDNESDAY: Adjournment for (M.) 524.

Assets (Insolvent Debtors) Distribution of, B. No. 71 (*Mr. Curran*). 1°*, 162.

"ASIA," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

ASSINIBOIA AND CALGARY, LAND AGENTS FOR: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27.

ASSISTANT P.O. INSPECTORS, &c.: prop. Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 1215.

ASSURANCE COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.

Atlantic Mutual Marine Insurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 48 (*Mr. Daly*) 1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 94.)

AUDET, ALPHONSE, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for O.C., &c.* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 841.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S Rep. for 1883: presented, 27.

AUTOMATIC BUOY IN LOCKPORT HARBOUR: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.

AYLMER AND PEMBROKE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1497.

BACON, COL., APPOINTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 833.

BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., CARAQUET to SHIPPIGAN, SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.

BAIN, Mr. J. W.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

BAKER CREEK, N. W., MINING LICENSES ON: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 44.

BANKING AND COMMERCE: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.

BANKING FACILITIES FOR AGRICULTURISTS: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Orton*) 210; wthn., 216.

Banking and Loan Facilities for Agriculturists provision B. No. 105 (*Mr. Orton*). 1°, 524.

Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. B. No. 29 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 1035. (47 *Vic., c.* 49.)

BANK RETURNS, INSPECTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 44, 1444.

BANKS, GOVT. DEPOSITS IN: M. for Stmnt.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

BANKS. *See* respective headings.

BARRY, JAMES, PREPARATION OF TABLES OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF FISH: conc., 1464.

BATTLEFORD AND PEACE RIVER RY. Co. *See* "Souris."

BAYFIELD HARBOUR, DAMAGE TO, BY STORMS: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.

BEAUCE JUNCTION AND INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1491.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

BEAUMONT, EXPROPRIATION OF: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200.

BEEMER, H. J., CLAIM OF, FOR WORK ON GATES, &c., QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Fisher*) 604.

BELLEAU, Mr. J. N.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

Bell Telephone Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 51 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 88.)

BENEFIT MUTUAL INSURANCE SOCIETIES: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 337.

BERTHIER CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1443.

BILL, COMMITMENT OF: Ques. of Procedure, 131.

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 2 (*pro forma*).

BILL (No. 2) To amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting Offences against the Person.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 27; 2° m., 79; 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.

BILL (No. 3) To further amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 27; 2° m., 93; Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) and 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271; in Com., 285, 669; Amt. (*Mr. Bossé*) that Com. rise, 671; agreed to, 671; M. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Carriers by Land—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)
1°*, 27.

BILL (No. 5) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 28; wthdn., 1290.

BILL (No. 6) To provide for the Punishment of Seduction and like Offences.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)
1°*, 28; 2° m., 141; in Com., 286; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to recom., agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) to recom., 666; M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to adjn. deb., 668; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; rsmd., 980; Amt. to Amt (*Mr. Bossé*) 6 m. h., nég. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) neg. and 3°, 980; *killed in Sen.*

BILL (No. 7) Respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 31; wthdn., 1627.

BILL (No. 8) For constituting a Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)
1°*, 31.

BILL (No. 9) To amend the several Acts relating to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 40; 2°*, 57; in Com., 861; 3°*, 886.—(47 *Vic., c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 10) Further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 40; 2°*, 83; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 11) Respecting the Union of certain Methodist Churches therein named.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)
1°*, 40; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Act entitled An Act for the better Prevention of Fraud in relation to Contracts involving the Expenditure of Public Moneys.—(*Mr. Casgrain.*)
1°, 40; Order for 2° read, 80; 2° m., 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; *killed in Com. of W.* 819; M. to restore to Order Paper neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.

BILL (No. 13) To repeal an Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included, or which may hereafter be included, within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada.—(*Mr. Ouimet.*)
1°*, 40; M. for 2° neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144.

BILL (No. 14) To amalgamate the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto and the Toronto Corn Exchange Association.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 43; 2°*, 88; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 15) To limit the Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Appeal.—(*Mr. Landry, Montmagny.*)
1°*, 43.

BILL (No. 16) For the declaration of Titles to land, and to facilitate its Transfer in the Territories of Canada.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)
1°*, 43.

BILL (No. 17) To repeal an Act respecting the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, and the issue of Licenses therefor.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 57.

BILL (No. 18) To incorporate the Pilots serving between Montreal and Quebec.—(*Mr. Amyot.*)
1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; *Preamble not proven.*

BILL (No. 19) To grant certain powers to the Commercial Cable Company.—(*Mr. Rykert.*)
1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 20) To amend the Act incorporating the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(*Mr. Tupper, Pictou.*)
1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Curran.*)
1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; M. for Com. 890; deb. adjd., 897; rsmd., 977; in Com., 978; 3°, 978.—(47 *Vic., c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 22) For conferring certain privileges on the more advanced Bands of the Indians of Canada, with the view of training them for the exercise of Municipal Powers.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 67; 2° m., 538; 2° and in Com., 539; 3°, 625.—(47 *Vic., c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company.—(*Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.*)
1°*, 71; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 736.—(47 *Vic., c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Halifax Steam Navigation Company, limited.—(*Mr. Stairs.*)
1°*, 71; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 580.—(47 *Vic., c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 25) To repeal the Liquor License Act, 1883.—(*Mr. Houde.*)
1°, 71.

BILL (No. 26) For the better Prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Patent Rights.—(*Mr. Mulock.*)
1°, 71; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 145; rep. from Sel. Com., 230; in Com. of W., 285; 3°, 460.—(47 *Vic., c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Halifax Mutual Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(*Mr Daly.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 28) To incorporate the Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580.—(47 *Vic., c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(*Mr. Ross.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 1035.—(47 *Vic., c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 30) To extend to the Dominion of Canada the powers of the corporation called De Nederlandsch-Americansche Land Maalschappij (The Netherlands-American Land Company.—(*Mr. Abbott.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 715.—(47 *Vic., c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 32) To confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(*Mr. Abbott.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; M. for Com., 810; objection (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) Ques. of Priv., 810; M. to substitute name of Mr. Haggart for promoter, agreed to, 843; in Com., 857; 3° m., 859; Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) 859; neg., 860; 3°, 860; B. passed, 886.—(47 *Vic., c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 33) Empowering the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (limited) to construct and operate a railway from Medicine Hat.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°, 84; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 736.—(47 *Vic., c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 736.—(47 *Vic., c.* 86.)

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Pictou Mutual Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(*Mr. McDougald.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 36) To authorize a further advance to the Province of Manitoba in aid of the Public Schools therein.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. prop., 43; in Com., 68; 1°* of B., 85; 2°* and in Com., 542; 3°*, 625.—(47 *Vic., c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 37) To provide for the salary and travelling allowances of the Judge of the County Court of Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 69; in Com. and 1°* of B., 85; 2°* and in Com., 542; 3°*, 625.—(47 *Vic., c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 38) For the prevention of Fraud in the Manufacture and Sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.—(*Mr. Massue.*)
Res. and 1° of B., 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; in Com. of W. and 3°*, 669.—(47 *Vic., c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the Provincial Bank.—(*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex.*)
1°*, 83; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 40) To amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Waddington, and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Hickey.*)
1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 603.—(47 *Vic., c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Saskatoon and Northern Railway Company.—(*Mr. Ferguson, Welland.*)
1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 897.—(47 *Vic., c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 42) To incorporate the Commercial Bank of Manitoba.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)
1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Union Trust Corporation of Canada.—(*Mr. Hesson.*)
1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 44) To authorize the Transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Bergin.*)
1°*, 89; 2°, 271; in Com., 860; recom. and 3°, 886.—(47 *Vic., c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 45) To incorporate the Owen Sound Dry Dock Ship-building and Navigation Company, limited.—(*Mr. Allen.*)
1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580.—(47 *Vic., c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(*Mr. Wells.*)
1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°, 886; on M. that B. pass, Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to recom., 887; neg. on a div. and B. passed, 888; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281.—(47 *Vic., c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 47) Respecting the Winding-up of the Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Coal and Railway Company, and the Sale of the Property thereof to the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*)
1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580.—(47 *Vic., c.* 77.)

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Atlantic Mutual Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(*Mr. Daly.*)
1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 94.)

BILL (No. 49) To incorporate the Nova Scotia Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(*Mr. Daly.*)
1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 92.)

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the International Railway Company.—(*Mr. Hall.*)
1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580.—(47 *Vic., c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 51) To amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 52) Further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(*Mr. Mulock.*)
1°*, 131; 2°, 460; wthdn., 986.

BILL (No. 53) To authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce the number of their Directors.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; *Preamble not proven.*

BILL (No. 54) Relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company, and to the Railways leased to the said Company.—(*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.*)
1°*, 141; 2°, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 1035.—(47 *Vic., c.* 75.)

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Live Stock Insurance Company.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 56) To empower the Bondholders of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company to vote at meetings of the Company.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 141; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 715; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281.—(47 *Vic., c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Small.*)
1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 1175; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1546.—(47 *Vic., c.* 65.)

BILL (No. 58) To incorporate the Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway Company.—(*Mr. Taylor.*)
1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 603.—(47 *Vic., c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.—(*Mr. Small.*)
1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 810.—(47 *Vic., c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 60) To increase the Harbour accommodation of the City of Toronto, to extend the Esplanade, and to provide for the control of the use thereof by Railway Companies.—(*Mr. Small.*)
1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; wthdn.

BILL (No. 61) To amend the Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(*Mr. Williams.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the River St. Clair Tunnel Company.—(*Mr. Macmaster.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 199; M. for Com., 603; in Com. and 3°*, 665; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281.—(47 *Vic. c.* 82.)

BILL (No. 63) To consolidate certain Railway Companies therein mentioned under the name of the Eastern Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Macmaster.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 542; wthdn.

BILL (No. 64) To amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 504.—(47 *Vic., c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 504; Order for Com. of W. dschgd. and ref. back to Ry. Com., 977; in Com. and 3°*, 1175.—(47 *Vic., c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 66) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, and to make other provisions respecting the said Bank.—(*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.*)
1°*, 162; 2°* 199; in Com. and 3°*, 1214.—(47 *Vic., c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 67) Further to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bergin.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 603.—(47 *Vic., c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(*Mr. Gunn.*)
1°*, 162: 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 568.—(47 *Vic., c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the Quebec Railway Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Bossé.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 1035.—(47 *Vic., c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 70) To extend the Jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(*Mr. Allen.*)
1°*, 162; 2° m., 461; deb. adjd., 462.

BILL (No. 71) To provide for the distribution of Assets of Insolvent Debtors.—(*Mr. Curran.*)
1°*, 162.

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(*Mr. Innes.*)
1°*, 198; 2°*, 542; in Com and 3°*, 1035.—(47 *Vic., c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 73) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(*Mr. Platt.*)
1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; M. for Com., 1175; in Com., 1202; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202; neg., 1214; 3° m., 1214; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) and 3°*, 1214.—(47 *Vic., c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 74) To incorporate the Ranchers' Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Ross.*)
1°*, 198; 2°, 271; wthdn.

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)
1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 810.—(47 *Vic., c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the Alberta Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)
1°*, 198; 2°, 504; wthdn.

BILL (No. 77) To incorporate the Calgary Water Works Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)
1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; wthdn.

BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Calgary Omnibus, Tramway and Transfer Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)
1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; wthdn.

BILL (No. 79) For the Equitable Distribution of Insolvents' Estates.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 198.

BILL (No. 80) To amend the Act incorporating the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bell.*)
1°*, 231; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 810; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1176.—(47 *Vic., c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 81) Further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Battleford and Peace River Railway Company.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 231; 2°*, 504; in Com., 979; 3°*, 979.—(47 *Vic., c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 82) To legalize a certain Agreement between the Village of Parkdale and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and other Railway Companies, and for other purposes.—(*Mr. Wallace, York.*)
1°*, 231; 2°, 504; wthdn.

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(*Mr. Royal.*)
1°*, 231; 2°, 505; wthdn., 1169.

BILL (No. 84) To incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac.—(*Mr. White, Renfrew.*)
1°*, 260; 2°*, 504; in Com., 888; 3°*, 889.—(47 *Vic., c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 85) Respecting the Huron and Erie Railway.—(*Mr. Smyth.*)
1°*, 260; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 979.—(47 *Vic., c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 86) Further to amend the Patent Act, 1872.—(*Mr. White, Renfrew.*)
1°*, 260.

BILL (No. 87) Further to amend the Indian Act, 1880.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 260; 2°, 1063; in Com., 1397, 1422; 3°*, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1653.—(47 *Vic., c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Real Estate Loan Company of Canada, limited.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 1035.—(47 *Vic., c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 89) To amend the Act incorporating the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company,

and to change the name thereof to the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company.—(*Mr. Tupper, Pictou.*)
1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 810.—(47 *Vic., c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bossé.*)
1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 979.—(47 *Vic., c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 1214; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1548.—(47 *Vic., c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Traders' Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 304; 2°*, 504; in Com and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of British America.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1° on a div., 304; 2° m., 897; neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931. [For deb. *see* "Orange."]

BILL (No. 94) To empower the Sovereign Fire Insurance Company to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the winding-up of their affairs,—(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)
1°*, 304; 2°*, 542; in Com. and 3°*, 665.—(47 *Vic., c.* 90.)

BILL (No. 95) Relating to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa.—(*Mr. Tassé.*)
1°*, 304; 2°*, 504; in Com., 889; 3° on a div., 890.—(47 *Vic., c.* 104.)

BILL (No. 96) For the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)
1°*, 457.

BILL (No. 97) To amend the Criminal Law, and to declare it a Misdemeanour to leave unguarded and exposed holes, openings, &c., in the ice on any navigable or frequented water.—(*Mr Robertson Hamilton.*)
1°*, 457.

BILL (No. 98) To amend the Law with reference to Procedure in Criminal Cases, and the Duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions in relation to persons charged with Indictable Offences.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*)
1°*, 457.

BILL (No. 99) To consolidate and amend the Acts for the more Speedy Trials of Persons charged with Felonies and Misdemeanours in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)
1°*, 457.

BILL (No. 100) Further to amend Chap. 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)
1° on a div., 468.

BILL (No. 101) To amend the Act intituled An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for other purposes.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 84; M. for Com., 98; Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 359; neg. (Y. 62, N. 132) 414; Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 415; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 418; neg. (Y. 62, N. 137) 454; Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 136) 454; Res. in Com., 454-456; M. to conc. in Res., 469; Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 473; neg. (Y. 49, N. 112) 495; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 497; neg. (Y. 43, N. 104) 503; conc. in and 1° of B., 503; 2° m., 525; agreed to (Y. 111, N. 52) and 2°, 535; in Com., 538; Amt. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 567; recom., 568; M. to conc. in Amt. rep. from Com., Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom. neg. (Y. 58, N. 122) 568; Amts. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom. neg. on same div., 569; 3° on same div. reversed, 569.—(47 *Vic., c.* 1.) [For deb. *see* "Canadian Pacific Railway."]

BILL (No. 102) To amend the Act 41 Victoria, Chapter 16, intituled An Act respecting the Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.—(*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.*)
1°*, 504.

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Liability of Carriers by Land.—(*Mr. Coughlin.*)
1°*, 504.

BILL (No. 104) Further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(*Mr. Ives.*)
1°*, 504.

BILL (No. 105) To provide Banking and Loan Facilities to those engaged in the pursuit of Agriculture.—(*Mr. Orton.*)
1°, 524.

BILL (No. 106) To define certain offences against persons employed in Factories.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
1°, 524; wthdn., 1627.

BILL (No. 107) For the relief of John Graham—(A) *from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Jamieson.*)
1° on a div., 580; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; in Com. on a div., 979; 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 980.—(47 *Vic., c.* 107.)

BILL (No. 108) To amend the Acts respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)
1°*, 598; Res. in Com., 1055; 2° of B., 1056; in Com., 1129; 3°*, 1131.—(47 *Vic., c.* 35.)

BILL (No. 109) To amend and consolidate, as amended, the several Acts relating to the Adulteration of Food and Drugs.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)
1°, 598; wthdn., 1057.

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Representation of the Territories in the House of Commons.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)
1°, 598; 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.

BILL (No. 111) Respecting the Independence of Parliament Act of 1878, 41 Victoria, Chapter 5.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to introd. neg. (Y. 55, N. 101) 624; 1°*, 625; 2° m., 844; deb. rsmd., 861; 2° agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878; ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec. on a div., 878; B. in Com. of W., 1423; 3° m., 1446; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1446; neg. (Y. 58,

N. 117) 1448; Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) neg on same div., 1449; 3° on same div. reversed, 1449.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 112) To Prevent Sunday Excursions.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)
1°*, 655.

BILL (No. 113) To amend the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 88, respecting Copyrights.—(*Mr. Béchard.*)
1°*, 655.

BILL (No. 114) For the Prevention of Adulteration of Food and Drugs.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)
1°*, 655; 2° m., 1132; 2°, 1137; prop. Res. (Public Analysts) 1215; in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; point of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1244; Ruling (*Mr. Speaker*) 1246; in Com., 1246; recom. and 3°*, 1294.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 115) Respecting Ferries.—(*Mr. Patterson, Essex.*)
1°, 736.

BILL (No. 116) To amend An Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, and the Seamen's Act, 1873.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°*, 1175.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 117) To amend the Act respecting Enquiries and Investigations into Shipwrecks and other matters as to the Powers of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. prop., 763; in Com. and 1°* of B., 764; 2° and in Com., 1131; 3° m., 1170; 3°, 1293.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 118) To modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. prop., 764; in Com., and 1°* of B., 765; wthdn., 1652.

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Sale of Coal.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 765; wthdn., 1618.

BILL (No. 120) To amend the Weights and Measures Act of 1879.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 765; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1131, 1242; Order for 3° dschgd., B. recom., amended and 3°*, 1294.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 121) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, by reducing the Fees payable on renewal of Engineers' Licenses.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. prop. and in Com., 765; 1°* of B., 766; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1058.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 122) To amend the Acts 40 Victoria, Chapter 49, and 45 Victoria, chapter 24, being Acts relating to Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in Ontario—(B) *from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 822; 2°, 986; in Com. and 3°*, 1282.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 123) To Amend the Customs Act, 1883.—(*Mr. Bowell.*)
1°, 885; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1060; 3°*, 1129.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 124) Repecting Fortifications and Military Buildings and their Maintenance and Repair.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 965; 2°, 1061; in Com., 1063; 3°*, 1129.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 125) For giving effect to an Agreement therein mentioned between the Government of the Dominion and that of Nova Scotia.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 825; M. for Com., 878; in Com., 883; conc. in and 1°* of B., 987; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1131.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, the Esquimalt Graving Dock, and certain Railway Lands of the Province of British Columbia, granted to the Dominion.
Res. prop., 67; M. for Com., 1023; in Com. and 1°* of B, 1039; 2°* and in Com., 1137; 3° m, 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 6 m. h. neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176; 3°*, 1176.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 6)

BILL (No. 127) To amend the Criminal Law.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 1053.

BILL (No. 128) Further to amend The General Inspection Act, 1874.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)
Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1°* of B., 1056; 2°* and in Com., 1394; 3°*, 1422.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 129) To amend the Act respecting the treatment and relief of Sick and Distressed Mariners.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. prop., and 1°* of B., 1126; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1360.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 130) To amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883.—(*Mr. Chapleau.*)
M. to introd., 1169; 1°*, 1170; 2°*, 1360; Res. (Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c.) in Com., 1360; Res. rep. and B. in Com., 1388, 1422; 3°*, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1652.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 131) To amend an Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 1241; 2°, 1281; in Com. and 3°*, 1386.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 132) To amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 42, intituled An Act to extend to the Province of British Columbia certain of the Criminal Laws now in force in other Provinces of the Dominion—(G) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1320; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°*, 1583.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 133) To amend the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 54, intituled an Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba the Act for the more Speedy Trial, in certain cases,

of Persons charged with Felonies and Misdemeanours, in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec—(F) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1321; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°*, 1583.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 134) Respecting the Public Works of Canada—(H) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
1°*, 1321; 2° m., 1445, 1586; 2° and in Com., 1587; recom. and 3°*, 1609.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 135) Further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and the Acts amending it.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
1°, 1322; 2° m., 1576; 2° and in Com., 1577; 3° m., 1591; recom., 1594; 3°*, 1595.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878—(C) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1386; 2° m., 1618; 2° and in Com., 1619; 3° m., 1621; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621; 3°*, 1621.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 137) Further to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Justices of the Peace out of Session, and in relation to Summary Convictions and Orders—(I) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1386; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1618.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1878—(D) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1386; prop. Res., 1590; 2° and in Com., 1622; 3°*, 1640.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 139) Respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 1386; 2°*, 1465; M. for Com., 1515; in Com. and 3°, 1516.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 140) Respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
1°*, 1386; 2° and in Com., 1602; 3° m., 1609; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609; 3° on same div. reversed, 1609.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 141) Respecting a Reformatory for certain Juvenile Offenders in the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia—(E) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*—; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1621.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

BILL (No. 142) Further to amend the present Tariff of Duties of Customs.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
1°*, 1443; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1621.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 143) To amend the Liquor License Act of 1883.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 1422; in Com., 1476; 1°* of B., 1478; 2° and M. for Com. 1595; in Com., 1597; 3° m., 1636; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. McCraney*) agreed to (Y. 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636; recom., 1637; 3°*, 1640; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1653.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 144) Respecting the Territory in Dispute between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario—(K) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*—; 2° and in Com., 1634; 3°*, 1645.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 145) Further to amend the Act 45 Victoria, Chapter 23, intituled An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations—(J) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*—; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 146) To provide for the Salary and Travelling Allowances of an additional Puisné Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Manitoba.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
Res. prop., 1422; 1°* of B., 1549; 2° and in Com., 1622; recom. and 3°*, 1627.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 147) To authorize certain subsidies and grants for and in respect of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1530; deb. adjd., 1543; rsmd., 1549; Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Res. conc. in (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576; 1°* of B., 1576; 2°* and in Com., 1624; recom. and 3°*, 1640.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 148) To authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of their Tidal Dock.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1581; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1618.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 149) To authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of their Graving Dock.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1581; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1618.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 150) To extend the limitation of time under the Act 43rd Victoria, Chapter 7, intituled: An Act for the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 3—(N) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1586; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1640.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 26)

BILL (No. 151) To authorize the Transfer of Prisoners from one Gaol to another in certain cases—(M) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1586; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 152) To amend the North-West Territories Act, 1880—(L) *from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1586; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1651.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 153) Further to amend the Post Office Act, 1875.—(*Mr. Carling.*)
Not introduced.

BILL (No. 154) To readjust the yearly subsidies to be allowed by Canada to the several Provinces now included in the Dominion.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. prop., 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1°* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645.—(47 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 155) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respec-

tively the 30th June, 1884, and the 30th June, 1885, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service. Res., 1°* of B., 2°* and 3°*, 1651.—(47 *Vic., c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 156) To authorize the raising by way of Loan, of certain moneys required for the Public Service.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)

Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645.—(47 *Vic., c.* 3.)

BILLS ASSENTED TO: 664, 1654.

BLACKEBY, A. H., EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 966.

BLACK ROD, GENTLEMAN USHER: Messages summoning Commons to Senate, 1,664, 1654.

BLANCHET, Hon. J. G. B.: Notification of Resignation (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Board of Ry. Commissioners for Canada B. No. 8 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 31.

Board of Trade, Toronto, and Corn Exchange Association amalg. B. No. 14 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 43; 2°*, 88; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 46.)

BOND, GRINDING IN: M. for O.C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

BONDHOLDERS OF THE ST. L. & O. RY., VOTING AT MEETINGS. *See* B. 56.

BONUSES TO RYS., PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL: Ms. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616; (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.

BOTHWELL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court, 524.

BOUCHER DE LA BRUÈRE, PRINTING CIVIL SERVICE LIST: in Com. of Sup., 1374; conc., 1464.

BOUNDARIES BETWEEN B. C. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 261.

BOUNDARIES, MAN., EXTENSION OF: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.

BOUNDARY, LEGAL EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH: in Com. of Sup., 1379.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, OWNERS OF AND TONNAGE OF VESSELS APPLYING FOR SAME AND REFUSED: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67; Ques., 603; Claims paid (*Mr. Fortin*) 140; Payment of: Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 655.

BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF IRON: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

BOW RIVER TIMBER LANDS, SALE OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.

BRANDON, ERECTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1110.

BRASSARD AND BUSHELL, MESSRS., SERVICES OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.

BRAZIL, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

BREAKWATER, INGONISH, COR. AND ENGINEER'S REPS., &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.

BREAKWATER, POINT ESCUMINAC: M. for Papers (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.

BREAKWATER, ST. PETER'S, P.E.I., CONTRACT FOR: M. for copies* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.

BRIDGE COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION, MEETING IN MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 1310.

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

Arrangement with, B. No. 126. Mess. from His Ex., 27; prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 67; M. for Com. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1023; in Com., and 1°* of B., 1039; 2°* and in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 6m. h., neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176; 3°*, 1176. (47 *Vic., c.* 6.) [For Deb. *see* "Agreement."]

Boundary between, and N.W.T.: Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 261.

Cabinet, Representation: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.

"C" Battery: in Com. of Sup., 1164.

C. P. R. (revote): in Com. of Sup., 1048.

Chinese Immigration, Prohibition of: Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 974; Amt. (*Mr. Allen*) 1285.

County Court Judge. *See* "Cariboo."

Departmental Officers: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.

Differences between, and Dom.: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.

Dry Dock: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Gordon*) 85.

Excise: in Com. of Sup., 1316.

Extension of Criminal Laws to, B. No. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1320; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°*, 1583. (47 *Vic., c.* 41.)

Emigrant Sheds at Victoria: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.

Esquimalt Naval Station: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285; M. for Ret., 515.

Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 1235.

Gas Inspection: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 506.

Geological Survey: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.

Graving Dock at Esquimalt: M. for O. C. (*Mr Baker, Victoria*) 514.

Health Statistics: in Com of Sup., 1095.

Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer, Vancouver Island: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336; Delay in Appointment, 736.

Indians, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1372; conc., 1617.

Indian Troubles at Metlakatla: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.

Lighthouses and Fog-alarms: in Com. of Sup., 1233.

Mail Service: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; Tenders for: (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.

Masters and Mates' Certificates: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606.

Meteorological Observations: in Com. of Sup., 1255.

Mounted Police Force: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.

Naval Brigade and Torpedo Corps: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.

Naval Station at Esquimalt: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285; M. for Ret., 515.

Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1338.

Postmaster at Victoria: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; in Com. of Sup., 1320.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued.*
Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1198, 1319, 1606.
Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1198.
Rifle Associations, Further aid to: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.
School of Gunnery, Fortifications and Militia: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285; in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Sir James Douglas, Steamer, Expenditure on: Ms. for Stmnts.: (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514; Officers and Crew, Rank, Pay, &c., 514; Repairs, &c.; M. for Cor.,* 1200; in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 1256.
Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 1318.
Torpedo Corps and Naval Brigade, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.
Waters, H.M. Ships of War in: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.
Weights and Measures and Gas: in Com. of Sup., 1318.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT, CASES DECIDED UNDER, PUBLICATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1378.

BROOKE, Mr.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1336.

BUDGET, THE: Speech of Finance Minister (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 569. [For Deb. *see* "WAYS AND MEANS."]

BUILDINGS, PUBLIC, COST OF, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 41; in Com. of Sup., 1191-1199, 1335, 1604.

Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 122 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 822; 2°, 986; in Com. and 3°*, 1282. (47 *Vic., c.* 40.)

Building Societies and Trading Corporations, Insolvent Banks, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 145 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*—; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 39.)

BUOY, AUTOMATIC, IN LOCKPORT HARBOUR: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.

BUOYS AND BEACONS, MONTREAL HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1369.

BURLINGTON CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

BURPEE, J. L.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1333.

CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.

Cable, Commercial, Co.'s B. No. 19 (*Mr. Rykert*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 87.)

CALLANDER AND GRAVENHURST RY. SUBSIDY: M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40.

Calgary Omnibus, Tramway and Transfer Co. Incorp. B. No. 78 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; wthdn.

Calgary Water Works Co. Incorp. B. No. 77 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; wthdn.

CALGARY, SUPPLY FARM No. 20, SALE OR LEASE OF: M. for. Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44; Ques. 285.

CAMERON, Mr. D. M.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

CAMERON, Mr. M. C.: Election sustained on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.

CANADA AND WEST INDIES AND BRAZIL SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1299; conc., 1453.

CANADA, G.T.R. DECRYING CREDIT OF: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton*) 762.

CANADA AND ANTWERP SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1301.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1386; 2° m., 1618; 2° and in Com., 1619; 3° m., 1621; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621; 3°*, 1621. (47 *Vic., c.* 31.)

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, further Act Amt. B. No. 104 (*Mr. Ives*). 1°*, 504.

Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 28 (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580. (47 *Vic., c.* 97.)

CANADIAN EXPRESS CO., TRANSPORT OF MILITIA SUPPLIES: M. for copies* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 523.

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 44.

CANADIANS, REPATRIATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 965.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Acquisition by Co. of Stock of other Rys.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
Agreement: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by Co.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
Arbitrations arising out of claims for construction, &c.: M. for copy* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
Atlantic and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Charter: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 223.
Bridge over Red River at Emerson: in Com. of Sup., 1348.
British Columbia, revote: in Com. of Sup., 1048.
Callander, cost to Co. of 40 miles west, and payments to Construction Co. for work done west to Sudbury Junction, &c., Port Arthur eastward, and cost of Algoma Mills Branch: M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Blake*) 219.
Canadian North-West Land Co.'s Stock: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 223.
Cash Deposit with Government: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; as to deposit of Securities, 72.
Cost of: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 603.
Construction Co., Payments to, on account of line from 45 miles east of the Saskatchewan westward; cost to Co. of line from above point to Summit of the Rockies; estimated cost to complete line between Callander and Port Arthur; also between Rocky Mountains and Kamloops: M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Blake*) 220.
Construction Contract and Subsidy Accounts, Payments to Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1055.
Contracts made by Co. for construction: M. for copies* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
Engineers, Inspecting, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1348.
Extension from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec Subsidy: prop. Res., 1444; in Com., 1492.
Floating Debt, Payments to Co. on Account of: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1054.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Continued.*
Funded Debt of Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 337.
Georgian Bay Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1349.
Guarantee by Govt. of interest on Stock of Co.: Mess. from His Ex., 56.
Guarantee to Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; as to further Reps. on same, 72; M. for copies of Cor., &c., 79; Reports, &c., respecting, and modifications of same: M. for copies* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
Immigration to Man. and the N. W., Promotion of, by Co., Amount expended: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 83.
Lake Superior and Nipissing Divisions, Cost of: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 458.
Lands sold within Ry. Belt, Price of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wright*) 77.
Loan, Application for further; contradiction of Stmnt. in *Globe* newspaper (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1321.
Loan B. No. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) prop. Res., 84; M. for Cor. (speech) 98; (*Mr. Blake*) 113; Deb. adjd., 131; rsmd. (*Mr. Ives*) 163; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 173; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 180; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 186; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 189; (*Mr. Davies*) 231; (*Mr. Foster*) 242; (*Mr. Fairbank*) 255; (*Mr. Curran*) 305; (*Mr. Fisher*) 309; (*Mr. Girouard*) 315; (*Mr. Fleming*) 317; (*Mr. Ferguson, Welland*) 320; (*Mr. McMullen*) 322; (*Mr. Stairs*) 326; (*Mr. Landerkin*) 328; (*Mr. Brecken*) 331; (*Mr. Lister*) 337; (*Mr. Orton*) 343; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 347.
Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 359; Deb. (*Mr. Rykert*) 359; (*Mr. Armstrong*) 373; (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*) 376; (*Mr. Charlton*) 379; (*Mr. Dawson*) 392; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 395; (*Mr. Ross*) 404; (*Mr. Mulock*) 409; (*Mr. Laurier*) 411; Amt. neg. (Y. 62, N. 132) 414.
Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 415; (*Mr. Blake*) 415; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 418; Deb. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 419; (*Mr. Vail*) 424; (*Mr. McNeill*) 426; (*Mr. Auger*) 430; (*Mr. Sproule*) 432; (*Mr. Platt*) 437; (*Mr. Houde*) 441; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 442; (*Mr. Homer*) 448; (*Mr. Cook*) 448; (*Mr. O'Brien*) 453; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 62, N. 137) 454; Amt. neg. (Y. 63, N. 136) 454.
Res. in Com., 454–456.
Ms. for Res. to take precedence, 198, 304; Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 107) 304; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 108) 305.
M. that conc. in Res. take precedence, 468.
M. for conc., 469.
Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 469; Deb. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 473; (*Mr. Casey*) 477; (*Mr. Pope*) 483; (*Mr. Trow*) 484; (*Mr. Ferguson, Leeds and Grenville*) 486; (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 491; (*Mr. Scott*) 493; (*Mr. Kirk*) 494; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 494; Amt. neg. (Y. 49, N. 112) 495.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Continued.*
Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 495; Deb. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 497; (*Mr. King*) 498; (*Mr. Daly*) 502; (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 502; Amt. neg. (Y. 43, N. 104) 503.
Res. conc. in, 503.
B. introduced and 1°*, 503; 2° m., 525; (*Mr. Blake*) 525; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 529; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 532; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 534; 2° agreed to (Y. 111, N. 52) and 2°, 535; M. for Com., 535; in Com., 538; recom., 567, 568; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom. neg. (Y. 58, N. 122) 568; Amts. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on same div., 569; 3° on same div. reversed, 569; Royal Assent, 664. (47 *Vic., c.* 1.)
Loan of $4,000,000, prop., Deprtl. Orders, &c.: M. for copies* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.
Location, Maps showing, and Branches: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
Mileage cost of line 615 miles West of Winnipeg to 49 miles East of the Saskatchewan, and contracts for same: M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Blake*) 221.
Moberly and McCallum, Messrs., Memorial of, *re* Bonus to Prince Arthur's Landing and Kaministiquia Ry.: M. for copy* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.
Modification of Arrangement between Co. and Govt.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72.
North American Contracting Co., Instrument of Incorp., &c.: M. for copy* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
North American Contracting Co, Statements concerning: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 222.
Official or Public Memoranda of Co. as to its position, &c.*: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. Lease confirmation B. No. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; M. for Com., 810; objection (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) Ques. of Priv., 810; M. to substitute name of *Mr. Haggart* for promoter, agreed to, 843; in Com., 857; 3° m., 859; Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) 859; neg. and 3°, 860; B. passed, 886. (47 *Vic., c.* 54.)
Payments or advances to Co. on any account: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 1055.
Postal Subsidy: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; M. for Papers, 79.
Postal Subsidies and Transport Services: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River: in Com. of Sup., 1046.
Receipts and Expenditure of Co. for different services: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
Red River and Cross Lake: in Com. of Sup., 1350.
Returns by Co. under the Consolidated Ry. Act: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
Revote: in Com. of Sup., 1048.
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry., Expenditure on by Co.: M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Blake*) 516.
St. Lin Branch or Laurentian Ry., Purchase of, by Co.: (*Mr. Blake*) 223.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Continued.*
Section B, Arbitrators or Commissioners on: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 1386.
Section B, Transfer of Contract: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 77; further sums paid Contractors: M. for Estimate, 77; Award of Arbitrators, &c.: M. for copy,* 1200; in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1646.
Shareholders and Stock held, Names of: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 513.
Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake: in Com. of Sup., 1350.
Smith & Ripley, Georgian Bay Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1349.
South Eastern Ry. Co.'s Securities: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 123.
Speech from the Throne: Reference in, 2.
Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1049; conc., 1449.
Steamers from Owen Sound: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 458.
Stock of Co., Issue of, and price received: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 224.
Subscribed Stock of Co. prior to increase of its Capital: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 1049.
Summit of Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, Cost of: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 458.
Tariff of Rates on: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger: in Com. of Sup., 1460.
Town Reserves along line: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
Union Jacques Cartier Ry., Opening of, to Co. (*Mr. Houde*) 41.

CANALS:
Beauharnois: in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1463.
Carillon, Dam and Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 1052; Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, 1351.
Cornwall, Enlargement of: M. for copies* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
Cornwall: in Com. of Sup., 1050; (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053.
Galops: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Holden, Clara S., Compensation to: in Com. of Sup., 1352.
In Com. of Sup.: 1050–1053, 1350–1354, 1608; conc., 1460–1463, 1612–1617.
Lachine: in Com. of Sup., 1050.
Lachine, Contract for new Basins: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.
Lachine, Wharfingers, Jurisdiction of: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 1387.
Marchand, L. W., Professional Services: in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1463.
Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup. 1053.
Murray: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator: in Com. of Sup., 1351, 1618.
Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.

CANALS—*Continued.*
Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River (Welland): in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Rapide Plat Lock: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Rideau, Land Damages between Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills: in Com. of Sup., 1354.
Ste. Anne's: in Com. of Sup., 1052.
St. Lawrence River and Canals: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
St. Peter's: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 1261.
Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*: in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1612.
Tay: in Com. of Sup., 1053.
Trent River Nav., Locks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Unpaid Labourers (Welland Canal): in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
Welland: in Com. of Sup. 1051.
Williamsburg: in Com. of Sup., 1352.

CARAQUET AND SHIPPIGAN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.

Cariboo County Court Judge Provision B. No. 37 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 69; in Com. and 1°* of B., 85; 2°* and in Com., 542; 3°*, 625. (47 *Vic., c.* 12.)

Carriers by Land B. No. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 27.

Carriers by Land, Liability of, B. No. 103 (*Mr. Coughlin*). 1°*, 504.

CARLETON, N. B., POST OFFICE: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.

CARNIVAL, MONTREAL, ADJOURNMENT FOR: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 83.

CARON, CLOVIS, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1200.

CARTWRIGHT, Hon. Sir R. J.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

CASUALTIES, &c., ON THE INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.

CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1010.

CATTLE TRADE, LIVE, WITH GREAT BRITAIN: M. for O. C. &c.* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.

CAVALRY AND INFANTRY SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 1165.

CENSUS: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72, 766; in Com. of Sup., 1091; Second Vol. presented, 1322.

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (*Mr. Platt*). 1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; M. for Com., 1175; in Com., 1202; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202; neg., 1214; 3° m., 1214; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) 1214; 3°*, 1214. (47 *Vic., c.* 60.)

CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. B.: in Com., Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202; Deb. (*Mr. Platt*) 1203, 1212; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1204, 1210; (*Mr. Bowell*) 1204, 1213; (*Mr. Mulock*) 1208; (*Mr. Colby*) 1208; (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1211; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1211; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1212; neg., 1214; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) 1214.

CENTRAL RY., N.B., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1509.

Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. No. 116 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°*, 1175. (47 *Vic., c.* 19.)

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES ACT, NON-ENFORCEMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606.

CERTIFICATES OF MASTERS AND MATES, REFUSAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS TO GRANT: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1444.

CHABOT, L. & C., PETITIONS TO DOM. ARBITRATORS: M. for copies* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.

CHAPLEAU, S. E. ST. ONGE: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 8; APPOINTMENT OF, AS SHERIFF IN THE N. W.: M. for O. C., &c., 145; FURTHER APPOINTMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 1387.

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 825–832.

CHASTITY, OFFENCES AGAINST. *See* Criminal Law Amt., Bs. Nos. 2 and 6.

CHATEAUVERT, E.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1335.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 616.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION INTO B.C., PROHIBITION OF: Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 974; Deb. (*Mr. Gordon*) 976; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1282; Amt. (*Mr. Allen*) 1285; (*Messrs. Homer, Robertson and Gordon*) 1285; (*Messrs. Barnard, Fairbank, Foster, Wood and Hesson*) 1286; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1287; (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1287; (*Mr. Gordon*) 1288.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 832–843, 987, 988, 1300–1337, 1466–1474, 1627; conc., 1440, 1610.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT.: Ques. (*Mr. Small*) 655.

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. No. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*). M. to introd., 1169; 1°*, 1170; 2°*, 1360; Res. (Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c.) in Com., 1360; rep. and B. in Com., 1388, 1422; 3°*, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1652. (47 *Vic., c.* 15.)

CIVIL SERVICE BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 988, 1336; conc., 1459, 1610.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 43.

CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF CONSTRUCTION (INTERCOL. RY.) PAYMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 1628.

CLAIMS FOR LOSSES ON INTERCOL. RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 655.

CLAIMS OF PROV. OF QUEBEC AGAINST DOM.: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.

CLARK, Mr.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 835.

CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS: in Com. of Sup., 1020, 1343.

CLOTHING FOR THE MILITIA, MANUFACTURE OF, TENDERS: M. for copies* (*Mr. Vail*) 1201.

COAL CARRIED ON INTERCOL. RY. AND BY WATER FROM N. S.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 65.

COAL CARS, INTERCOL. RY., ADDITIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 1627.

COAL COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.

COAL ENTERED EX-WAREHOUSE, FREE OR FOR EXPORT: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.

COAL LANDS IN THE N.W., SALES AND LEASES: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

COAL OIL BARRELS, SEIZURE OF, AT SANDWICH, &c.: M. for Papers (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.

Coal, respecting the Sale of, B. No. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 765; wthdn., 1618.

COKER, Mr. *See* "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."

COLCHESTER REEF LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86, 199.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 1256–1261, 1316–1318, 1382, 1383, 1608; conc., 1453, 1456, 1457, 1458.

COLONIZATION CO.'S *See* respective headings.

COLONIZATION PLANS NOS. 1 AND 2, APPLICATIONS UNDER: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

"COLUMBIA," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

Commercial Bank of Manitoba Incorp. B. No. 42 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 50.)

Commercial Cable Co.'s B. No. 19 (*Mr. Rykert*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 87.)

COMMERCIAL TREATY BETWEEN CANADA AND FOREIGN POWERS: M. for copies of O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

COMMISSIONER OF STANDARDS, ALLOWANCE TO: in Com. of Sup., 1382.

COMMISSION ON INTERCOL. RY. CLAIMS, SITTINGS OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.

COMMISSIONER TO ENGLAND. *See* "HIGH COMMISSIONER."

Commissioners, Railway, Board of, for Canada, B. No. 8 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 31.

COMMISSIONERS UNDER LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 458.

COMMITMENT OF A BILL: Ques. of Procedure, 131.

COMMITTEES, ADDITION OF NAMES TO: 569.

COMMITTEES:

Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Foster*) 74.

Debates, Official Rep.: M. for Com. to Supervise, 28.

Hudson Bay, Navigation of: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Royal*) 203.

Library: M. for Joint Com. to assist *Mr. Speaker*, 31.

Mining and Metallurgy: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Hall*), 515.

Printing: M. for Joint Com. of both Houses, 31.

Select Standing: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 2; M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 28; Lists presented, 29; conc. in, 31.

Commons, House of, Election of Members of, consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 5 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 28; wthdn., 1290.

COMMONS. *See* "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

COMMITTEE ON TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, EXPENSES OF: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.

COMPTROLLER, N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 840.

CONCURRENCE. *See* "SUPPLY."

CONFEDERATION, EXPENDITURE FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.

CONFEDERATION, HISTORICAL PICTURE COMMEMORATING: in Com. of Sup., 1309.

CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE CHARGEABLE TO: Ms. for Rets.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 140, 1209.

CONSOLIDATED STATUTES, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1202; conc., 1453.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*). 1°*, 131; 2°, 460; wthdn., 986.

Consolidated Ry. Act further Act Amt. B. No. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°, 1322; 2° m., 1576; 2° and in Com., 1577; 3° m., 1591; recom., 1594; 3°*, 1595. (47 *Vic., c.* 11.)

CONSOLIDATED RY. ACT, 1879, RY. CO.'S RETURNS UNDER: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATUTES. *See* "Statutes."

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES, APPOINTMENT OF A FRENCH CANADIAN: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 73.

CONSOLIDATED STATUTES, COST OF TYPE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1379; conc., 1464.

CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1344.

CONTINGENCIES, &c., ARTILLERY AND RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1158.

CONTINGENCIES, DEPARTMENTAL: in Com. of Sup., 843.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, Act Amt. B. No. 12 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 40; Order for 2° read., 80; 2° m (*Mr Casgrain*) 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; *killed in Com. of W.*, 819; M. to restore to Order Pap. neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS. *See* "Elections," and respective Districts; also "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

Copyrights Act Amt. B. No. 113 (*Mr. Béchard*). 1°*, 655.

CORBETT, JOHN, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 199.

CORN AND CORN MEAL, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 36.

Corn Exchange Association, Toronto, and Board of Trade amalg. B. No. 14 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 43; 2°*, 88; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 46.)

CORNWALL AND PERTH RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.

COTTON DUCK, DRAWBACK ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kirk*) 624.

COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59. *See* "Hughes."

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 603.

COX, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHEATLEY, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.

CRANE ISLAND, WHARF AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 516; Ques., 736.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, Further Act Amt. B. No. 96 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. No. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 27; 2° m., 93; Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271; in Com., 285, 669; Amt. (*Mr. Bossé*) that Com. rise, agreed to, 671; M. to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.

Criminal Cases, Procedure in, Indictable Offences, B. No. 98 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*), 1°*, 457.

Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 127 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 1053.

Criminal Law Amt., Incest, Punishment of, B. No. 2 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 27; 2° m., 79; 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com. 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c., B. No. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°*, 28; 2° m., 141; in Com., 286; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to recom. agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) to recom., 666; M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to adjn. deb., 668; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; rsmd., 980; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Bossé*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) neg. and 3°, 980; *killed in Sen.*

Criminal Law Amt., unguarded and exposed holes, openings, &c., in the Ice B. No. 97 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

Criminal Laws, Extension to B. C., B. No. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1320.; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°*, 1583. (47 *Vic., c.* 41.)

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1089.

CUBA, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

CULLING TIMBER, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1317; conc., 1457.

CUMBERLAND COAL AND RAILWAY CO. *See* "Spring Hill."

CUMBERLAND, SEAT FOR. *See* "Minister of Railways."

Customs Act, 1883, Amt. B. No. 123 (*Mr. Bowell*). 1°, 885; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1060; 3°*, 1129. (47 *Vic., c.* 29.)

CUSTOMS:

Amherstburg Custom House, Sale of Land for: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Lister*) 83.

Appraisers: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 285.

Brassard and Bushell, Services of, at Windsor: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.

Collector at Napanee: M. for Papers and Cor. (*Mr. Allison, Lennox*) wthdn., 208.

Corn and Corn Meal, Imports and Exports: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson*) 36.

Dept. of: in Com. of Sup., 841.

Drawbacks, Claims for, on Goods manufactured for Export: M. for copies (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.

Examination of Baggage at St. Vincent: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1444.

Excise Duties collected on Intoxicating Liquors Imported: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCraney*) 67.

CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Freight Charges, Duty on: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.

Grinding in Bond: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

Imports, Stmnt. of: M. for Ret. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

Jacques, Jas. H., Appointment of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.

Officials, Increase of, at Ports in Inverness, N. S.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 462.

Port Mulgrave as an Out-port: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 285.

Pine and Spruce Logs, Export Duty on: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 655.

St. Croix Cotton Factory, Importation of Machinery for: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Innes*) 808.

Salaries, &c., of the several Ports: in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.

Windsor Custom House, Appointments in: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.

[*See* "DRAWBACKS."]

DALHOUSIE BRANCH, INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1344.

DANGEROUS WEAPONS, CARRYING OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 458.

D'ANJOU, JOSEPH, CLAIM OF: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 798.

DALTON, Mr., TRANSFER OF: in Com. of Sup., 841.

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REPORTING OF: Com. to Supervise appointed, 28; names added, 43; Translation of: Ques. (*Mr. Lesage*) 86; M. to conc. in First Rep., 260; Second Rep. presented, 704; M. to conc. in, 833; Third and Fourth Reps. presented, 1022; M. to conc. in, 1100; Fifth Rep. presented, 1240; M. to conc. in, 1270; Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. (Y. 61, N. 101) 1271; in Com. of Sup., 1340.

DE BEAUJEAU, Mr. R.: Notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Debtors, Insolvent, Assets of, B. No. 71 (*Mr. Curran*). 1°*, 162.

DEEDS, REGISTRATION OF IN THE N. W.: prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1635.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS, PUBLICATION OF, IN NEWSPAPERS remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 141.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS IN B. C.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.

Department of Marine and Fisheries B. No. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*). 1°*, 1386; 2° and in Com., 1602; 3° m., 1609; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609; 3° on same div. reversed, 1609. (47 *Vic., c.* 18.)

DEPOSITS OF GOVT. MONEY IN BANKS: M. for Stmnt.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

DERBY STATION AND INDIANTOWN (I.C.R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.

DESERTERS FROM U. S. ARMY, ARRESTED ON CANADIAN TERRITORY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86; M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.

DEWDNEY, LIEUT.-GOV., ABSENCE OF: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.

DINGMAN, Mr.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 841.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS, &c.: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.

Disputed Territory, Dom. of Can. and Prov. of Ont., B. No. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*—; 2° and in Com., 1634; 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 24.)

DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 88; on M. for 3° of B. 144 (*Mr. Dawson*) 1640.

Distribution of Insolvents' Estates, B. No. 79 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 198.

DIVISIONS:

British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Homer*) neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*): on M. for Com. on Res., Amt. for Select Com. to enquire into condition of Co. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 359, neg. (Y. 62, N. 132) 414; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Vail*) 415; Amt. to Amt. respecting Subsidies to Provinces (*Mr. Blake*) 418, neg. (Y. 62, N. 137) 454; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Vail*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 136) 454; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. Lines south of C. P. R. in Manitoba (*Mr. Watson*) 473, neg. (Y. 49, N. 112) 495; Amt. restricting Co. as to Terminus (*Mr. Weldon*) 497, neg. (Y. 43, N. 104) 503; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for R. to take precedence (Y. 112, N. 47) 524; M. for 2° carried (Y. 111, N. 52) 535; Amt. pledging Securities and Railways to Govt. as additional security (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 122) 569; Amt., Contracts to be let conditionally and on approval of Govt., neg. on same div., 569; Amt., Expenditure subject to audit of Auditor-Gen., neg. on same div., 569; 3° agreed to on same div. reversed, 569.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, *Amt. B.* 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621.

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) 1214.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*): M. to restore to Order Paper, neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): on M. for 2°, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 86, N. 81) 284; M. to restore to Order Paper (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.

Criminal Law Amt., Incest, &c. B. 2 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): M. for Com. of W., 818; neg. (Y. 65, N. 86) 819.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*): M. to recom. agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; M. to adjn. deb. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980.

Cumberland, Seat for; Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 547; Amt. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 549; carried (Y. 122, N. 57) 566.

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

Debates, Official Rep.: on M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com., Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. (Y. 61, N. 101) 1271.

Dual Representation B. 13 (*Mr. Ouimet*): M. for 2° neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144, 145.

Exchange Bank of Canada: Res. censuring Govt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 161.

Graham, John, Divorce B. 107 (*Mr. Jamieson*): M. for 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; M. for 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 979, 980.

High Commissioner to England: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 95) 1046.

Immigration and Emigration: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 50, N. 101) 1088.

Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*): on M. for leave to introduce, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 101) 624; Main Motion agreed to on same div. reversed, 625; M. for 2° agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878; on M. for 3°, Amt., (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 117) 1448; Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) neg. on same div., 1449; 3° on same div. reversed, 1449.

Liquor License Act, 1883, *Amt. B.* 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. McCraney*) agreed to (Y, 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636.

Liquor License Act, 1883, *Mr. Houde's M. to repeal:* Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for precedence (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) neg. (Y. 70, N. 102) 824; Amt. Ques. of competency of Parlt. to pass Act referred to Supreme Court or Privy Council (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 937; agreed to (Y. 117, N. 63) 963, 964.

Marine and Fisheries Dept. B. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*): on M. for 3°, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609.

Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench: M. for Papers, &c. (*Mr. Laurier*) 133; neg. (Y. 47, N. 89) 140.

North-West Grievances: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) neg. (Y. 57, N. 116) 1157.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*): M. for 2°, neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic: on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) Amt. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 107) 1221; Main Motion, as amended, agreed to (Y. 122, N. 40) 1126.

Privileges and Elections: M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com. agreed to (Y. 107, N. 55) 1291.

Public Expenditure: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.

Reciprocity: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Davies*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 105) 1190.

Section B, C. P. R., Award of Arbitrators to contractors: conc. in. Res. rep. from Com. of Sup. agreed to (Y. 82, N. 34) 1651.

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*): on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1530; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Main Motion agreed to (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576.

Ways and Means: on conc., Amt. respecting duty on Crockery, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 17, N. 39) 797.

Divorce, John Graham, B. No. 107 (*Mr. Jamieson*). 1° on a div., 580; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; in Com. on a div., 979; 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 980. (47 *Vic. c.* 107.)

DOMINION ARBITRATORS, CLAIMS BEFORE: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260, 965.

DOMINION ARBITRATORS, PETS. OF E. GOSSELIN AND L. & C. CHABOT: M. for copies* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28; E. Dorion* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88; M. Leclerc*, 88.

DOMINION EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1093; Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.

DOMINION GRANGE, MEMORIAL OF: M. for copy, &c.* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.

Dominion Lands Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1386; prop. Res. 1590; 2° and in Com., 1622; 3°*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 25.)

DOMINION LANDS:

Agents for Assiniboia and Calgary: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27.

Agricultural, Mineral, Timber and Pasture Lands and Town Sites, Sales since 1881: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Coal Lands, Sale of, in the N.W.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

C. P. R., Homestead and Preemption, South of: M. for O. C.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.

Claims, Settlement of: in Com. of Sup., 1385.

Claims, Settlement of, in Man. B. No. 150 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1586; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 26.)

Colonization Plans, Nos. 1 and 2, Applications under: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Examiner under Act at Brandon: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1109.

Homesteads, Entries for: M. for Rets.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Homestead and Preemption, Withdrawal of Lands from south of main line C. P. R., Settlers and Squatters', Claims, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.

In Com. of Sup., 1384, 1385.

Jack Head River Timber Limits: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.

Lakes Huron and Superior, Region North of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.

Land Companies. *See* respective headings.

Mile Belt, Wthdrl. of Homestead and Preemption Lands within: M. for O. C.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.

Pasture Land Leases, granted in 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

DOMINION LANDS—*Continued.*
Region North of Lake Superior: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.
Regina, Moose Jaw, &c., Town Reserves, Withdrawal of, from Homestead and Preemption: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
Regulations respecting Agricultural, Timber, Pasture, Mineral Lands and Town Sites: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Sales, during 1883, total acres, average price, and amount: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Sales, Purchases and Rebate: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.
Sales, within C. P. R. Belt: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wright*) 77.
Settlers' Lands, Payments on: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.
Settlers' or Squatters' Claims on Town Reserves along line of C. P. R.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75; within Mile Belt,* 79.
Supply Farm No. 20, Fish Creek, Sale of: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27; Ms. for Rets., 44, 48; Ques., 285.
Supply Farm, Pincher Creek: Ques., 200; M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.
Surveys, Man. and N. W. T. in 1883, acres: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Timber Lands or Limits sold since March, 1883, near Bow River: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 73; M. for Ret., 90.
Timber Licenses, Cancellation of, on Indian Reserves: M. for copies of O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
Town Reserves in the N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
Town Site Reservation at Fort MacLeod: M. for O. C. &c.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 624.
Town Sites, Sale of: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
DOMINION RIFLE ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 1159, 1160.
DOMINION POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 997, 1338.
DOMINION, PUBLIC DEBT OF THE: Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 736.
DOMINION EXPENDITURE: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1332; neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.
DOMINION STATUTES, DISTRIBUTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 797.
DOMINION SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200. *See* "Subsidies."
DOMINION STEAMERS:
Inspector's Reps. upon Steamers *St. Lawrence, Prince of Wales* and *Northern Light*: M. for copies (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1227.
O'Brien, Jotham, Contract, &c. for building *Princess Louise*: M. for copy (*Mr. Weldon*) 35; amount paid on same, &c., M. for Stmnt.,* 623.
Princess Louise, Steamer to replace, Tenders, &c., M. for copies* (*Mr. Weldon*) 820.
Scott, Capt. R. M., Rep. of, on loss of *Princess Louise*: M. for copy (*Mr. Weldon*) 40.
Sir James Douglas, Steamer, Expenditure on: Ms. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514; Officers and Crew, Rank, Pay, &c., 514; Repairs, &c., M. for Cor.*, 1200; in Com. of Sup., 1227.
DOMINION STEAMERS—*Continued.*
DONALDSON, MR., APPOINTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 833.
DORION, EUSTACHE, CLAIM OF: M. for copy* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
DRAWBACKS:
Cotton Duck used for Sails, Amounts paid and to whom: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Kirk*) 624.
Goods manufactured for Export, Claims presented: M. for copies (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
Goods required by C. P. R., Claims: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
Shipbuilding Materials, Claims presented: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
Sugar, refined in Canada, Memorial, &c., asking for: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
Wheat, Flour, &c.: M. for copies of Claims (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
DREDGES AND DUMPING SCOWS: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Jackson*) 1201.
DREDGES AND TUG, CONSTRUCTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 603.
DRILL PAY AND INCIDENTAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1098.
DRILL INSTRUCTION, ALLOWANCE FOR: in Com. of Sup., 1096.
DRILL SHED, MONTREAL, CONTRACT FOR REBUILDING: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966; M. for copies, 1201.
DRILL SHEDS AND RIFLE RANGES: in Com. of Sup., 1160.
DRY DOCK, B.C.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
Dual Representation Repeal B. No. 13 (*Mr. Ouimet*). 1°*, 40; M. for 2° neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144.
DUART, POSTMASTER AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 509; Ques., 1053; Complaints against appointment: M. for Pet.,* 1201.
DUCKETT, MRS. EDWARD, REVOTE: in Com. of Sup., 1343.
DUTY ON FREIGHT CHARGES: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
DUVAL, G., PRÉCIS WRITER, SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 1474.
DYKE, MR., EMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1305, 1408.
Eastern Extension Ry., Acquisition of, B. No. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 825; M. for Com., 878; in Com., 883; conc. in and 1°* of B., 987; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1131. (47 *Vic., c.* 5.)
Eastern Railway Co. of Can. B. No. 63 (*Mr. Macmaster*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 542; wthdn.
ELLSWORTH, ARREST OF, BY U. S. SOLDIERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.
ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 603.
ELECTORAL FRANCHISES, ASSIMILATION OF. *See* "Franchise."
Electoral Franchise B. No. 7 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 31.
Election of Members to House of Commons consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 5 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 28; wthdn., 1290.

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED:
Albert: Judge's Rep., 1.
Berthier: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1443.
Bothwell: Judgment of Supreme Court, 524.
Huron, West: Judge's Rep., 1.
Kent Ont.: Judge's Rep., 1; Election and Return of Member, 198.
Lennox: Judge's Rep., 1.
Lunenburg: Judge's Rep., 1.
Megantic: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1321.
Middlesex, West: Judge's Rep., 1.
Montcalm: Judgment of Supreme Court, 337.
Simcoe, South: Judge's Rep., 1.
Soulanges: Judgment of Supreme Court, 735.

ELGIN, COUNTY JUDGE OF: M for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59; remarks, 967; Ques., 1109; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.

ELGIN ROAD STATION, L'ISLET: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 199.

EMIGRANT BUILDING AND QUARANTINE AT LÉVIS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.

EMIGRANT SHEDS AT VICTORIA, B.C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.

EMIGRATION STATISTICS, CANADA AND U. S.: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1199.

ENGLAND, EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF GOVT. IN: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.

ENGINEERS, INSPECTING, C. P. R., SALARIES AND EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1348.

Engineers Licenses, Reduction of Fees, Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 765; 1°* of B. 766; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1058. (47 *Vic., c.* 20.)

"ENTERPRISE," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

ERIE AND HURON RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.

ESCHEAT, MATTERS OF, SHORTHAND WRITERS' NOTES, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 74.

ESPLANADE, EXTENSION. *See* Toronto.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Gordon*) 85.

Esquimalt Graving Dock B. No. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 67; M. for Com., 1023; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1039; 2°* and in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176: 3°*, 1176. (47 *Vic., c.* 6.)

ESSAYS, &c., ON AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.

ESTIMATES, THE: Mess. from His Ex. transmitting same for 1884-85, 145; ref. to Com. of Sup., 145; Suppl. Est., 1883-84, 1240; Suppl. Est., 1884-85, 1439; Further Suppl. Est., 1884-85, 1576.

EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS, PORT OF LANDING OF: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 89.

Evidence, Law of, in Criminal Cases B. No. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 27; 2° m., 93; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271;

Evidence, Law of—*Continued.*
in Com., 285, 669; Amt. that Com. rise, (*Mr. Bossé*) agreed to, 671; M. to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.

Evidence in Criminal Cases, Law of, further Act Amt. B. No. 96 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

EXAMINER UNDER DOM. LANDS ACT AT BRANDON: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1109.

EXCHANGE BANK, GOVT. DEPOSITS IN: M. for Stmnt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 35; Res. censuring Govt. 155; neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 161.

EXCHANGE BANK, SECURITY FOR ADVANCE TO: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 199, 261, 336.

EXCISE OFFICERS AT PERTH AND QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 132.

EXCISE, SALARIES, &c., OF OFFICERS AND INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 1316, 1608.

Excursions, Sunday, Prevention of, B. No. 112 (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°*, 655.

EXHIBITION. *See* respective headings.

EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC WORKS IN EACH OF THE PROVS. SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.

EXPENDITURE, DEPTL., ON SESSIONAL RETURNS: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.

EXPENDITURE, PUBLIC: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1322; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1326; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1328; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1332; neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.

EXPIRING LAWS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.

EXPLORATORY EXPEDITION TO HUDSON BAY AND STRAITS: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 132. *See* "Hudson Bay."

EXPORT DUTY ON PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 655.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, STMNT. OF, distinguishing products of Canada from those of other Countries: Ms. for Rets.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 1200.

EXPORTS, SUMMARY STMNT. OF: M. for Ret.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

EXPRESS CO.'S AGREEMENT WITH INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.

FABRE, HON. HECTOR, RETENTION OF SERVICES: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 337; Salary and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 1203; conc., 1453.

FACTORY ACT AMT.: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.

FACTORY BILL, COR. WITH THE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OR TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL: M. for copies, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.

Factories, definition of Offences against persons employed in, B. No. 106 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°, 524; wthdn., 1627.

FAIRFORD RIVER, LAKE MAN., IMPROVEMENT OF: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.

FALCONER, JAMES, FOR LAND DAMAGES, INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1346.

Felonies and Misdemeanours Law, extension to Manitoba B. No. 133 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1321; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°*, 1583. (47 *Vic., c.* 41.)

Felonies and Misdemeanours, Speedy Trial of, B. No. 99 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

FERGUSON, WM., PURCHASE OF LAND, INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1347.

Ferries, respecting, B. No. 115 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 736.

FERRY OR BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, INTERCOL. RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.

FINANCE MINISTER'S MISSION TO ENG.: M. for Papers (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 86.

FINANCE, DEPT. OF, AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 841.

FISH CREEK, SUPPLY FARM No. 20: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44. *See* "Dominion Lands."

FISHERIES:

Amts. to Fishery Act, Pets. for: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 299.

Award and Claims of P. E. I.: Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1273; Deb. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1277; (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1278; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1279; (*Mr. Hackett*) 1280.

Bounty, Claims paid under: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Fortin*) 140.

Bounty in aid of: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67.

Bounty, Payment of: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603; (*Mr. McIsaac*) 655; Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 1369; conc., 1617.

Exhibition. *See* "International."

In Com. of Sup., 1234, 1369; conc., 1617.

Ogden, Alfred, Employment of: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 798; (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 965.

Overseer for Digby Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 89.

Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1234.

Regulations under Act Prohibiting Fishing in Ont. Waters: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mulock*) 71; Fines under: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 201.

Washington Treaty, Fishery Clauses of the: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Davies*) 1200.

"FITZGERALD," LOSS OF THE BARQUE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.

FLAG TREATY, U. S. AND SPAIN: on M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Vail*) 1361.

FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.

Food and Drugs, Adulteration of, Act Amt. B. No. 109 (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°, 598; wthdn., 1057.

Food and Drugs, Adulteration of, prevention B. No. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°*, 655; 2° m., 1132; 2°, 1137; Res. prop. (Public Analysts) 1215; in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; point of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1244; ruling (*Mr. Speaker*) 1246; in Com., 1246; recom. and 3°*, 1294. (47 *Vic., c.* 34.)

FORESTRY EXHIBITION AT EDINBURGH: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.

Fortifications and Military Buildings, B. No. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°, 965; 2°, 1061; in Com., 1063; 3°*, 1129. (47 *Vic., c.* 17.)

FORTIFICATIONS, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY AND MILITIA, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.

FORT MACLEOD AND MEDICINE HAT MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506.

FORT MACLEOD, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506; M. for O. C., &c.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 619; Town Site Reservation, 624.

FORT SIMPSON, INDIAN TROUBLES: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.

FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, CANCELLATION OF TIMBER LICENSES: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.

FRANCE AND CANADA, POSTAL ORDERS BETWEEN: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 967.

FRANCE AND QUEBEC SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1300.

FRANCE, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O.C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

FRANCHISES, ELECTORAL, ASSIMILATION OF: Reference to in Speech from the Throne, 2.

Franchise, Electoral, B. No. 7 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 31.

Fraud in relation to Public Contracts Act Amt. B. No. 12 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 40; Order for 2° read, 80; 2° m. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; *killed in Com. of W.*, 819; M. to restore to Order Paper neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.

Fraud, Prevention of, in Sale of Agricultural Fertilizers, B. No. 38 (*Mr. Massue*). Res. and 1° of B., 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; in Com. of W. and 3°*, 669. (47 *Vic., c.* 37.)

Fraud, Prevention of, in Sale of Patent Rights B. No. 26 (*Mr. Mulock*). 1°, 71; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 145; in Com. of W., 285; 3°, 460. (47 *Vic., c.* 38.)

FREIGHT CHARGES ON INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Innes*) 807.

FREIGHT CHARGES, DUTY ON: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.

FRENCH REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE: Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 1549.

FRONTIER POLICE, SOUTH-WESTERN ONTARIO: Ques. (*Mr. Haggart*) 1054.

FUNDED DEBT, 1883 (C. P. R. LOAN): Ques. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 337.

GABOURY, J. E., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.

GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1051.

GALT, Mr. JUSTICE: Rep. on Kent Controverted Election, 1.

GALT, Sir A. T., CLAIMS OR ALLOWANCES ON ACCOUNT OF, AS HIGH COMMISSIONER: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.

Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 58 (*Mr. Taylor*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 603. (47 *Vic., c.* 83.)

Gas and Gas Meters, Inspection of, Acts Amt. B. No. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°*, 598; Res. in Com., 1055; 2° of B., 1056; in Com., 1129; 3°*, 1131. (47 *Vic., c.* 35.)

GAS FLOATING LIGHTS BELOW QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Valin*) 217.

GAS INSPECTION IN B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 506.

GAS, NATURAL, IN MONTMAGNY AND ST. MAURICE COUNTIES: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 85.

GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res., 1445; in Com., 1499.

"GAZETTE" (MONTREAL) SUMS PAID TO FROM 1874 to 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1261; conc., 1450.

General Inspection Act further Act Amt. B. No. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1°* of B., 1056; 2°* and in Com., 1394; 3°*, 1422. (47 *Vic., c.* 33.)

GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE CO. *See* "Canada Temperance."

GENTLEMAN USHER. *See* "Black Rod."

GIROUARD, Mr. G. A.: Notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

"GLENDON," STEAMER TO REPLACE: in Com. of Sup., 1227.

"GLOBE" NEWSPAPER: Contradiction of Stmnt. respecting application for further Loan by C. P. R. Co. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1321.

GOLD MINING IN THE N.W., ACT RELATING TO: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 43; M. for Ret., 512.

GOOD FRIDAY: Adjournment for (M.) 1476.

GOODWIN, JAS., CLAIM OF, FOR ERECTING WALL AROUND GROUNDS: Ques. (*Mr. Fleming*) 604; M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.

GOOSE ISLAND, LIGHTHOUSE ON: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.

GOSSELIN, EUGÈNE, PETITION OF, TO DOM. ARBITRATORS: M. for copies* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.

GOVERNMENTAL EXPRESS SYSTEM: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS: C. P. R. Res. precedence, 198; Franchise B., 469; State of, 1170, 1241; Ms. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursdays, 625; Mondays, 1023; Wednesdays, 1549; Saturdays, 1322.

GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN EXCHANGE BANK: M. for Stmnt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 35.

GOVERNMENT DREDGE FOR MANITOBA, BUILDING OF: Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 210.

GOVERNMENT HERD IN THE N. W.: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.

GOVERNMENT LANDS IN RICHELIEU CO., SALE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 1109; M. for Ret., 1126.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES ABANDONED: remarks (*Mr. Mills*) 1653.

GOVERNMENT MILLS IN THE N. W. T., SALE OR LEASE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 199; M. for Ret., 507.

GOVERNMENT MONEY ON DEPOSIT IN BANKS: M. for Stmnt.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANKS: in Com. of Sup., 828.

GOVERNMENT STEAMERS. *See* "Dominion."

GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS ON INTERCOL. RY., ROLLING STOCK BUILT IN: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.

GOVERNOR, DEPUTY: Summoning Commons to Senate and Royal Assent to C. P. R. Loan B., 664.

GOVERNOR GENERAL:

Commons, Summoning of to Senate, 2, 1654.

Speech from the Throne on opening of Parliament, 2; Reply to Address, 304.

Speech from the Throne proroguing Parliament, 1655.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S COMMISSION, OATH, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Casgrain*) 521.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S OATH: M. for copy* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS, PAYMENTS UNDER: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY: Communications from. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 655, 1652.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 832.

Graham, John, Relief B. No. 107 (*Mr Jamieson*). 1° on a div., 580; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; in Com. on a div., 979; 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 980. (47 *Vic., c.* 107.)

GRAND MANAN, N.B., AND MAINLAND MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1298.

GRAND PILES AND LAC DES ISLES RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.

GRAND SOUTHERN RY., CONVEYANCE OF MAILS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. No. 21 (*Mr. Curran*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; M. for Com. of W., 890; deb. adjd., 897; rsmd., 977; in Com. and 3°, 978. (47 *Vic., c.* 52.)

GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.'S B. 21: Deb. on M. for Com. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 890; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 891; (*Mr. Curran*) 891; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 892; (*Mr. Blake*) 894; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 895; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 896; (*Mr. Mills*) 896; (*Mr. Stairs*) 897; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 977; Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1511; remarks, 1608, 1635.

GRAND TRUNK RY. CROSSING IN MONTREAL: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 1387.

GRAND TRUNK RY. STOCKHOLDERS: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1200.

GRANT, Mr., SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 842.

GRAVENHURST AND CALLANDER RY. SUBSIDY: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40; Ques. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 604.

GRAVING DOCK AT ESQUIMALT, PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT OF: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.

Graving Dock at Lévis, further advance B. No. 149 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1581; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1618. (47 *Vic., c.* 10.)

Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co. change of Name B. No. 89 (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 810. (47 *Vic., c.* 89.)

GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Mclsaac*) 57.

Great Northern Ry. Co. B. No. 90 (*Mr. Bossé*). 1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 979. (47 *Vic., c.* 64.)

GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.

GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1053.

GRINDING IN BOND: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

GRIST AND SAW MILL SOUTH OF CALGARY, SALE OR LEASE OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 507.

GUARANTEE BY GOVT. TO C. P. R.: Mess. from His Ex., 56.

Guelph Junction Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 72 (*Mr. Innes*). 1°*, 198; 2°*, 542; in Com. and 3°*, 1035. (47 *Vic., c.* 80.)

GUERIN, Mr., EXPLORATION ON THE YAMASKA RIVER: M. for copies of Rep.* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN *vid* YARMOUTH, SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1298; conc., 1453.

HALIFAX AND ST. PIERRE, SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1301.

HALIFAX, CITY AND COUNTY: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

HALIFAX, ELEVATOR AT: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 603.

HALIFAX EXTENSION, Intercol. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.

Halifax Mutual Marine Insurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 27 (*Mr. Daly*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 93.)

Halifax Steam Navigation Co. Incorp. B. No. 24 (*Mr. Stairs*). 1°*, 71; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 580. (47 *Vic., c.* 98.)

HALIFAX STREET RY. CO. *vs.* THE QUEEN: in Com. of Sup., 1345.

HALL, Mr. (INLAND REVENUE) PROMOTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 841.

HALL, Mr. (INTERIOR): Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 838.

Hamilton and North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 504; Order for Com. of W. dschgd. and ref. back to Ry. Com., 977; in Com. and 3°*, 1175. (47 *Vic., c.* 63.)

HARBOUR ACCOMMODATION. *See* Toronto, and respective headings.

HARBOUR OF REFUGE, PORT STANLEY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.

HAY, U. S. CUSTOMS DUTIES ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.

HEWITT, COL.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 837, 1163.

HERRING, NEWFOUNDLAND, INSPECTION OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.

HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COST OF: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.

HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1094; conc., 1440.

HEALTH OFFICERS, PUBLIC: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 88.

HEARN, JOS., SUPERANNUATION OF: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kirk*) 1110; deb. rsmd., 1289.

H.M. SHIPS OF WAR IN B. C. WATERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.

HIGH COMMISSIONER:

Appointment of present and duties of Min. of Rys. during absence, &c.: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

Claims or Allowances, on account of (Sir A. T. Galt and present Incumbent) payments to, &c.: M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.

Commercial Treaties, Reports of: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 56.

Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 987, 1336; conc., 1440.

House and Furniture for: in Com. of Sup., 1367.

Immigration to Canada, Reports of: M. for copies (*Mr Blake*) 49.

Letter and Cablegrams of Min. of Agriculture, *re* labour in Canada: M. for copies (*Mr Blake*) 799.

Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Mills*) 1639.

[*See* "Minister of Railways."]

HIGGINS, Mr., SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 841.

HODGE *vs.* THE QUEEN, JUDGMENT AND SHORTHAND WRITERS' NOTES BEFORE JUDICIAL COM. OF PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copies* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.

HOLT, E. B.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1334.

HOME FARMS, RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.

HOME OR SUPPLY FARM ON PINCHER CREEK, SALE OF, &C.: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.

HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS SOUTH OF THE C. P. R.: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.

HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS WITHDRAWN FROM THE MILE BELT: M. for O. C.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.

HOMESTEADS, PUBLIC LANDS ENTERED AS: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

HOPEWELL AND ALMA RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Accountant, Receipts and Disbursements of, 31.

Albert Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Berthier Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1443.

Bothwell Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 524.

Catudal, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1475.

Colby, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1339.

Gevernor Gen.'s Secretary: Communications from, read, 655, 1652.

Hour of Meeting: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 376.

Huron, West. Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Kent Elec.: Judge's Rep read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Labrosse, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.

Lennox Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Library of Parliament: Rep. presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 3. *See* "Library."

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
Lunenburg Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
Members Introduced, 1, 27, 200, 335.
Megantic Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1321.
Mitchell, Hon. P., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.
Middlesex, West, Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
Montcalm Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr Speaker*) 337.
New Members, Return of, 1, 200, 335.
Official Rep. *See* "Debates."
Opening: Communication from Gov. Gen. by Black-Rod, 1; Speech from the Throne, 2.
Prorogation: Communication from Gov. Gen's Sec., 1652; Speech from the Throne, 1654.
Receipts and Disbursements of Accountant, 31.
Robertson, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1476.
Royal Assent to Bills, 664, 1654.
Rykert, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.
Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1476.
Select Standing Coms.: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 2. *See* "Committees."
Senate, Summoned to, by Mess., 1, 641, 1654.
Simcoe, South, Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
Soulanges Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 735.
Vacancies, Notification of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
Vail, Hon. Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1339.
Writs of Election, Warrants issued for, 1.
[*See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."]

House of Commons, Election of Members of, consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 5 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 28; wthdn., 1290.

HUDSON BAY AND STRAITS, EXPLORATORY EXPEDITION TO: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 132; in Com. of Sup., 1379, 1607; conc., 1617.

HUDSON BAY, NAVIGATION: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Watson*) 71; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Royal*) 203; Deb. (*Mr. Dawson*) 204; (*Mr. Watson*) 205; (*Mr. Casey*) 206; (*Mr. Orton*) 206; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 207; (*Mr. Blake*) 207; Com. appointed, 208.

HUGHES, D. J. (COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN) CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59; remarks, 967; Ques., 1109; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.

HUNTER'S ISLAND, LAND OR TIMBER SALES: Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 965; (*Mr. Bain*) 1054.

Huron and Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 85 (*Mr. Smyth*). 1°*, 260; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 979. (47 *Vic., c.* 78.)

HURON, SOUTH: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

HURON, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

HUTCHINSON, GEO., ALLOWANCE TO: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.

Ice, unguarded and exposed Openings, &c., Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 97 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

IMMIGRANTS, APPLICATION FOR SERVICES OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 510.

IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN ONT. IN THE YEARS 1879 to 1883, RESPECTIVELY: M. for Ret.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS, NUMBER, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION: Select Standing Com. on, 31.

IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1404–1422, 1602; conc., 1464.

IMMIGRATION, REPS. OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER ON: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 49.

IMMIGRATION: Res. in Amt. to Com. Sup. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1063; Deb. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1071; (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1074; (*Mr. Curran*) 1077; (*Mr. Blake*) 1078; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1084; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1066; neg. (Y. 50, N. 101) 1088.

IMMIGRATION to MAN. AND THE N. W., AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GOVT. AND C. P. R.: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 83.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF WHEAT, FLOUR, &C.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.

IMPORTS, SUMMARY STMNT. OF: M. for Ret.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

IMPROVEMENT FUND, MONEY DUE TOWNSHIP OF WALLACE: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 200.

IMPROVEMENT FUND, LAND, ONTARIO: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1215.

Incest, Punishment of (Criminal Law Amt) B. No. 2 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 27; 2° m., 79 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.

Independence of Parliament Act B. No. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). M. to introd., 624; Amt. *Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 101) 624; 1°*, 625; 2° m., 844; deb. rsmd., 861; 2° agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878; ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec. on a div., 878; B. in Com. of W., 1423; 3° m., 1446; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1466; neg. (Y. 58, N. 117) 1448; Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) neg. on same div., 1449; 3° on same div. reversed, 1449. (47 *Vic., c.* 14.)

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT B. 111: Deb. on M. for 2° (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 844; (*Mr. Girouard*) 850; (*Mr. Lister*) 853; (*Mr. Mills*) 855, 861; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 863; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 865; (*Mr. Beaty*) 865; (*Mr. Davies*) 868; (*Mr. Chapleau*) 872; (*Mr. O'Brien*) 874; (*Mr. Weldon*) 875; (*Mr. Brecken*) 876; agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878.

Indian Act, 1880, further Act Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 260; 2°, 1063; in Com., 1397, 1422; 3°, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1653. (47 *Vic., c.* 27.)

INDIAN HARBOUR AND NEW HARBOUR, N. S.: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

INDIANS:
Agent at Penetanguishine: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 31; Parry Sound, 1548.
Agent's Office, Toronto, Closing of: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cook*) 269; deb. rsmd., 294.
Dept. of: in Com. of Sup., 840, 1336, 1467, 1474.
Deptl. Rep. presented, 68.
In Com. of Sup., 1263-1269, 1372, 1673, 1608; conc., 1450, 1610.
Instruction Farms, Respecting: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.
Islands in Lake Ont.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
Metlakatla and Fort Simpson, B. C., Troubles at: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
Reserves, Fort William, Timber Licenses: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
Self Government, Conferring Municipal Powers on, B. No. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 67; 2° m., 538; 2° and in Com., 539; 3°, 625. (47 *Vic., c.* 28.)
Supplies for Man. and N. W. T., Tenders and Advertisements: M. for copies* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
Troubles in B. C.: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
Wyandottes, Distribution of Moneys to: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 966; Claims to Pajot Farm: M. for Ret.,* 1201.
Indictable Offences Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 98 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.
INLAND REVENUE ACT, NON-ENFORCEMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85.
INLAND REVENUE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 841, 1335.
INLAND REVENUE, RESIGNATION OF MINISTER: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 505; on correction, 513; Explanations asked, 525.
INLAND REVENUE RETS AND STATISTICS: presented, 27.
INLAND REVENUE WAREHOUSE AT ST. JOHN, N.B.: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1214.
INLAND TRANSPORT: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.
Insolvent Banks, Ins. and Loan Co.'s, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 145 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°* —; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 39.)
Insolvent Debtors' Assets, Distribution of, B. No. 71 (*Mr Curran*). 1°*, 162.
Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. No. 79 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 198.
Inspection Act, General, further Act Amt. B. No. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1°* of B., 1056; 2°* and in Com., 1394; 3°*, 1422. (47 *Vic., c.* 33.)
INSPECTION OF BANK RETURNS: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 44, 1444.
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Acts Amt. B. No. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°*, 598; Res. in Com., 1055; 2° of B., 1056; in Com., 1129; 3°*, 1131. (47 *Vic., c.* 35.)
INSPECTION OF NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.
INSPECTION OF P. E. I. STEAMBOATS: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
INSPECTION OF VESSELS ON LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606.
Insurance Act, 1877, Consolidated, modification of Application of B. No. 118 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 764; in Com. and 1°* of B., 765.
INSURANCE COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.
ISLANDS LEASED IN LAKE ONT.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accommodation at St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.
Award of Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 1628.
Casualties, with loss of Life, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.
Claims arising out of Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1628.
Claims for Losses: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 655.
Coal, carried, Tonnage, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mc Mullen*) 65.
Commissioners, Board of, Matters referred: M. for O. C., &c.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
Commissioners appointed to investigate Claims, &c.: M. for O. C.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
Commissioners, Board of, number of Sittings, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
Construction Account: in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Dalhousie Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1344.
Eastern Extension, Claim of N. B.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 736.
Employés on Intercol. Ry. and P. E. I. Ry.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Davies*) 298.
Falconer, James, land damages: in Com. of Sup., 1346.
Ferguson, Wm., purchase of land: in Com. of Sup., 1347.
Ferry or Bridge at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
Freight Charges: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Innes*) 807.
Freight Charges: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Innes*) 807.
Hadlow and Rivière du Loup, Sales of Buildings between, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr Blondeau*) 624.
Halifax St. Ry. Co. *vs.* The Queen: in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Halifax Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.
MacDonell, Alex., Award of Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 1346.
Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup., 1050.
New Brunswick Govt., Refund to: in Com. of Sup., 1627.
Nova Scotia, Ry. matters in, Cor. between Local Govt. and Dept. of Rys. and Canals: M. for copies* (*Mr. McDonald*) 65.
Office at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
Officials, in service of Govt., Salaries, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 298; Names, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Landry Montmagny*) 303.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Continued.*
Passes granted from Jan. 1874 to Jan. 1884: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Montplaisir*) 1201.
Pullman Car and Express Co.'s Agreements: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Right of Way over St. Charles Branch: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.
Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1256; conc., 1449.
Revenue and Expenditure for six months ending 1883: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
Rivière du Loup and Moncton, Mileage between, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 623.
Rivière du Loup Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1344.
Rochette, Fabien, for land: in Com. of Sup., 1345.
Rolling Stock purchased, and built in Govt. Workshops: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
St. Charles Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1345.
St. Charles Branch: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230; Ques., 260.
Tariff between Quebec and St. Charles: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES EXHIBITION, REPS. OF COMMISSIONERS: M. for copies (*Mr. Fortin*) 80.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EXHIBITION: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2; in Com. of Sup., 1369; Outstanding Claims: in Com. of Sup., 1374.

INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY EXHIBITION AT EDINBURGH: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.

International Railway Co.'s B. No. 50 (*Mr. Hall*). 1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

INTERIOR, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 838, 1466.

INTERIOR DEPT.: Rep. presented, 844.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS:
Amt. B. No. 102 (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*). 1°*, 504.
Amt. B. No. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; in Com., 1476; 1°* of B, 1478; 2° and M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1597; 3° m., 1636; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. McCraney*) agreed to (Y. 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636; recom., 1637; 3°*, 1640; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1656. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)
Commissioners under Act: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 458.
Expenditure in putting Act into operation: in Com. of Sup., 1382; conc., 1453.
Imports, Manufactured and Entered for Consumption, Customs and Excise Duties: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCraney*) 67.
Inspectors, Payment of: Ques. (*Mr. Irvine*) 337.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Cor. between Govt. and Local Govts.: M. for copies (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.
Liquor Licenses and Permits in N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.
N. W. T., Importation into: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.
P. E. I., Certificates granted by Medical men under Canada Temperance Act: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.
Privy Council, Judicial Com, Judgment *re* Hodge against The Queen: M. for copy (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
Repeal B. No. 17 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 57.
Repeal B. No. 25 (*Mr. Houde*). 1°*, 71.
Shorthand Writers' Notes: Hodge *vs.* Queen and Russell *vs.* Queen: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
Supreme Court Judgments *re* regulation of Sale: M. for copy (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
[*See* "Liquor and License."]

IRON, BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1496.

ISLE-AUX-NOIX, COMPLETION OF WORKS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 966.

JACK HEAD RIVER TIMBER LIMITS: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.

JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. JUNCTION AND ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION, RY. AND BRIDGE BETWEEN, SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.

JACQUES, JAS. H., APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.

James' Bay and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co. B. No. 31 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 715. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

James' Bay, Perth and Gananoque Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 58 (*Mr. Taylor*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 603. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

"JANE HURLBURT," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

"JANE MILLER," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

JEMSEG, N.B., DREDGING AT: M. for Rep. (*Mr. King*) 295.

"JOSEPHINE KIDD," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

Judge, Puisne, for Court of Queen's Bench, Manitoba, Salary, &c. B. No. 146 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; 1°* of B., 1549; 2° and in Com., 1622; recom. and 3°*, 1627. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

JUDGES, EQUALIZATION OF SALARIES OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 40.

JUDGES, SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 994.

JUDICIAL SALARIES, RE-ADJUSTMENT OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Vail*) 58; Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Missisquoi*) 1387.

JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 883.

JUSTICE, MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 994.

Justices of the Peace out of Session and Indictable Offences B. No. 98 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, Summary Convictions, &c., B. No. 137 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1386; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1618. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

Juvenile Offenders, Reformatory at Halifax for, B. No. 141 (*Sir John A. Macdoaald*). 1°* —; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1621. (47 *Vic., c.* 45.)

KAZUABAZUA AND LE DESERT RY. SUBSIDY: prop Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1499.

KAULBACH, Mr. C. E.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

KEEFLER, Mr. T. T.: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.

KENT (N.B.): Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

KENT (ONT.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1; Election and return of Member, 198; introduced, 200.

KEEWATIN DISTRICT, EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT IN: in Com. of Sup., 1302.

KIMBER, RÉNÉ EDOUARD. *See* "Black Rod."

KING, Mr. JUSTICE: Rep. on Albert Controverted Election, 1.

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B No. 68 (*Mr. Gunn*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 568. (47 *Vic., c.* 59.)

KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 998.

KNIGHT, Mr., APPOINTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 834.

LABOURERS, PAYMENT OF, P.E.I. RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 965.

LABOUR TRADES COUNCIL AND FACTORY BILL: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.

LACHINE CANAL, CONTRACT FOR NEW BASINS: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.

LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1050.

LACHINE CANAL, JURISDICTION OF WHARFINGERS ON: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 1387.

Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 31 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 715. (47 *Vic., c.* 80.)

LAKE ONTARIO, ISLANDS LEASED IN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.

LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, INSPECTION OF VESSELS ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606; Deb. (*Mr. McNeill*) 607; (*Mr. Sproule*) 608; (*Mr. O'Brien*) 608; (*Messrs. Allen, Lister, McCallum* and *Stairs*) 609; (*Messrs. Guillet, Paint* and *Davies*) 610; (*Mr. McLelan*) 611; (*Messrs. Brecken* and *Dawson*) 613.

LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1298; conc., 1452.

LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, REGION NORTH OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.

LAKE SIMON AND LE DESERT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1503.

LAND AGENT FOR ASSINIBOIA AND CALGARY: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27.

LAND AND TOWN RESERVES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

Land Carriers B. No. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 27.

LAND COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.

LAND CLAIMS, SETTLEMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 1385.

LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND, ONT.: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1215.

LAND LEASES, PASTURE, GRANTED IN 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.

LAND REGULATIONS: M. for copies* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

LAND SALES IN THE N. W.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.

LAND SOLD IN 1883, AND PRICE PER ACRE: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

LAND SURVEYED IN MAN. AND N. W. T. IN 1883: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Land Titles, Transfer of, in Territories of Canada, B. No. 16 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 43.

LANDS ENTERED AS HOMESTEADS IN 1883: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Lands, Settlement of Claims to, in Manitoba, by occupancy, B. No. 150. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1586; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 26.)

LANDS, TIMBERED, SOLD IN BOW RIVER COUNTRY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.

LANDRY, Mr. P. A.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

LANSDOWNE, POST OFFICE AT: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 336.

LAVALLIÈRE BAY, EXPLORATIONS: M. for Reps.* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

LAVOIE, GEO., CLAIM OF: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 797.

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. No. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 27; 2 m., 93; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271; in Com., 285, 669; Amt. that Com. rise (*Mr. Bossé*) agreed to, 671; M. to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.

LAW OF EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES, B. 3: on M. for Com., Deb. (*Mr. Tupper*) 271; (*Mr. Landry, Kent*) 274; (*Mr. Lister*) 275; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 277; (*Mr. Bossé*) 278; (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 279; (*Mr. Blake*) 279; (*Mr. Weldon*) 280; (*Mr. Chapleau*) 281; (*Mr. Davies*) 283; (*Mr. Laurier*) 283; (*Sir John A Macdonald*) 284.

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases further Act Amt. B. No. 96 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

LEAMINGTON, ERECTION OF P. O. AT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.

LEAMINGTON HARBOUR: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 506.

LECLERC, MOISE, CLAIM OF: M. for copy* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.

"LE COURIER DE ST. HYACINTHE," PAYMENTS TO, UNDER GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 67.

LEGAL ADVISERS, PAYMENT TO: conc., 1617.

LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1009, 1339, 1475, 1602, 1608, 1627; conc., 1440, 1459, 1611.

LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

LETTER POSTAGE, TWO CENT: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.

LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION IN: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.

LETTER POSTAGE RATES, AMT. OF EXISTING LAW: Ques. (*Mr. Thompson*) 89.

LÉVIS: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

LÉVIS, EMIGRANT BUILDING AND QUARANTINE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.

Lévis Graving Dock, Further advance, B. No. 149 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1581; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1618. (47 *Vic., c.* 10.)

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: Rep. of Librarian presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 3; M. for Joint Com., 31; Ms. (*Mr. Scriver*) to conc. in First Rep., 964, 1167; Second Rep., 1240; Third Rep. presented, 1443; M. to conc. in, 1476; in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1602.

LICENSE ACT, 1883, POLICE ORGANIZATION UNDER: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 505.

LICENSE COMMISSIONERS, QUE., FURNISHING OF BLANK FORMS, &c.: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 966.

LICENSE LAW, REPEAL OF THE. *See* Bs. Nos. 17, 25, 102 and 143; *also* "Intoxicating Liquors."

LICENSES, TIMBER, CANCELLATION OF, ON INDIAN RESERVES: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS' OATHS: M. for copies (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS OF QUEBEC, Commissions, Oaths, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Casgrain*) 522.

LIFE ANNUITIES, SALE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Hall*) 199.

LIFE-BOAT AT WELLINGTON, COST OF: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.

LIFE-SAVING STATION AND CREW AT PORT ROWAN: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS, LIFE-BOATS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199; in Com. of Sup., 1229.

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE, AGENCIES, RENTS AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1232.

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1232–1234, 1369; conc., 1443.

LIGHTHOUSE ON GOOSE ISLAND: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1232.

LIGHTHOUSES AND FOG-ALARMS, CONSTRUCTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1233; conc., 1443.

LIGHTS, FOG-WHISTLES, BUOYS AND BEACONS, &c., MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1233, 1369.

LIGHTS NORTH OF ISLAND OF ORLEANS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND PROV. GOVTS.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, COMMISSIONERS UNDER: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 458.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, EXPENDITURE IN PUTTING ACT INTO OPERATION: in Com. of Sup., 1382; conc., 1453.

LIQUOR LICENSE INSPECTORS, PAYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Irvine*) 337.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal B. No. 17 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 57.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal B. No. 25. (*Mr. Houde*). 1°, 71.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, REPEAL: prop. Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 932; Deb. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 936; Amt., 937; (*Mr. Amyot*) 938; (*Mr. Fleming*) 940; (*Mr. Bossé*) 943; (*Mr. Laurier*) 944; (*Mr. Girouard*) 947; (*Mr. Davies*) 948; *Mr. Macmaster*) 953; (*Mr. Weldon*) 958; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) neg. on a div., 963; Amt. agreed to (Y. 117, N. 63) 963.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. No. 102 (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*). 1°*, 504.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. No. 143. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; in Com., 1476; 1°* of B., 1478; 2° and M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1597; 3° m., 1636; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. McCraney*) agreed to (Y. 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636; recom., 1637; 3°*, 1640; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1656. (47 *Vic., c.* 32.)

LIQUOR LICENSES AND PERMITS IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.

LISLOIS, C. J., CLAIM OF, BEFORE DOMINION ARBITRATORS: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260, 965.

Live Stock Insurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 55 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 96.)

LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1301.

LOANS AUTHORIZED:

Canadian Pacific Railway B. 101.
Lévis Graving Dock B. 149.
Manitoba Public Schools B. 156.
Quebec Tidal Dock B. 148.
Redemption of Small Loans B. 156.

LOAN COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.

Loan, Moneys required for the Public Service, authorization B. No. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 3.)

LOAN, PROPOSED CANADIAN, OF $4,000,000, DEPARTMENTAL ORDERS AND ADVERTISEMENTS: M. for copies* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.

LOCKPORT HARBOUR, AUTOMATIC BUOY IN: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.

LOGS AND LUMBER, MEASUREMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Hall*) 337.

London Life Ins. Co. B. No. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 1386; 2°*, 1465; M. for Com., 1515; in Com. and 3°, 1516. (47 *Vic., c.* 89.)

LONG POINT LIGHTHOUSE, REPAIRS ON: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.

LOTBINIÈRE, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF AT: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1054.

LOTTERY FIRM AT ST. STEPHEN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.

Loyal Orange Association of British America Incorp. B. No. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1° on a div., 304; 2° m., 897; neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931. [For deb. *see* "Orange Association."]

LUARD, MAJOR-GENERAL, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for copies, 621; (*Mr. Mulock*) 738; Deb. (*Mr. Wright*) 740; (*Mr. Haggart*) 743; (*Mr. Macmaster*) 745; (*Mr. Robertson, Hastings*) 748; (*Mr. Coursol*) 749; (*Mr. Guillet*) 750; (*Messrs. Massue, Landry, Montmagny,* and *O'Brien*) 751; (*Messrs. Williams* and *Caron*) 753; (*Mr. Casey*) 754; (*Messrs. Chapleau, Sir Richard Cartwright* and *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 757; (*Messrs. Hesson* and *Woodworth*) 759; (*Messrs. McNeill* and *Ouimet*) 760; (*Mr. Vail*) 761; reply (*Mr. Mulock*) 761.

LUNENBURG CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

MACDONALD, HON. SIR JOHN A.: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition *re* Lennox Electoral District, 1.

MACDONELL & Co., ALEX., AWARD OF, INTERCOL. RY. CLAIMS COMMISSIONERS: in Com. of Sup., 1346.

MACDONELL, J. A.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1355.

MACLEAN, ROGER & Co., AWARD OF REFEREES: in Com. of Sup., 1607.

MCCALLUM, W. A., MEMORIAL OF: M. for copy* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.

MCCOLLUM, E., POSTMASTER AT DUART: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 509; Complaints against appointment: M. for Pet.,* 1201.

MCCOURT, DANIEL, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 516.

MCELHINNEY, CAPT. *See* "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."

MCLAUGHLIN, GEO. E., GRATUITY TO FAMILY OF: In Com. of Sup., 1373.

MCMILLAN, Mr. JOHN: Notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

MAGDALEN ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 1298.

MAIL SERVICE IN B. C.: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; Tenders, &c.* (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.

MAIL SERVICE IN THE COUNTY OF LOTBINIÈRE: M. for Papers, &c. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.

MAIL SERVICE NORTH OF PALMERSTON: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 89.

MAIL SERVICE, SALARIES AND MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup, 1319, 1383; conc., 1458.

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1298–1301; conc., 1452, 1453.

MANITOBA:

Dominion Lands Act, Examiner under, at Brandon: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland*) 1109.

Extension of Boundaries: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.

Extra Militia Force for: in Com. of Sup., 1343.

Fairford River Improvements: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.

Felonies and Misdemeanours, Extension of Law to, B. No. 133 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1321; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°*, 1583. (47 *Vic., c.* 41.)

Indians: Annuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1269, 1373; conc., 1450, 1610.

Jack Head River Timber Limits: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.

MANITOBA—*Continued.*

Lands—Settlement of Claims by Occupancy, B. No. 150 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1586; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 26.)

Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1000, 1338.

Persons leaving and entering for year: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 49.

Public Schools, Aid to, B. No. 36 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 43; in Com., 68; 1°* of B., 85; 2°*, and in Com., 542; 3°*, 625. (47 *Vic., c.* 7.)

Robertson John, Claims of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 614.

Subsidies to: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.

[*See* "DOMINION LANDS," "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Can. Acts Amt. B. No. 64 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 69.)

Manitoba South-Western Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 75 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°*, 198; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 810. (47 *Vic., c.* 73.)

"MANITOULIN," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION AND FACTORY BILL: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.

MAP SHOWING LOCATION OF C. P. R.: M. for copy. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, B. No. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*). 1°*, 1386; 2° and in Com., 1602; 3° m., 1609; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609; 3° on same div. reversed, 1609. (47 *Vic., c.* 18.)

MARINE AND FISHERIES: Rep. presented, 260.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 842, 1467.

MARINE:

Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 604.

Certificates to Masters and Mates, Refusal of Board of Examiners to grant: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1444.

Colchester Reef Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86, 199.

Corbett, John, employment of: Ques. (*Mr. Lister* 199.

Glendon, Steamer to replace: in Com. of Sup., 1227.

Goose Island Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.

Government Steamers. *See* "DOMINION."

Harbours and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 1605.

Hudson Bay, Expedition to: in Com. of Sup., 1379, 1607; conc., 1617. *See* "Hudson Bay."

Lakes Huron and Superior, Inspection of Vessels: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606.

Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1229.

Life-saving Stations, Life-boats, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199.

MARINE—*Continued.*
Lights, Fog Whistles, Buoys and Beacons, &c., maintenance and repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1233, 1369.
Lights north of Island of Orleans: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction of: in Com. of Sup., 1233; conc., 1443.
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1369; conc., 1443.
Masters' and Mates' Certificates, Non-enforcement of Act: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85. *See* "Masters and Mates."
Meteorological Observations: in Com. of Sup., 1255.
Navigation, School of, at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 141; M. for Com. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 1254.
Pilots for and above Quebec, Acts respecting: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 655.
Port Rowan Life-saving Station: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
P.E.I. Steamboats, Inspection of: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59; Ques., 460.
Sick and Distressed Mariners' Act Amt.: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 269; Exemption of Fishing Vessels from payment to Fund: Ques. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 199.
Signal Stations: in Com. of Sup., 1234.
Survey of Georgian Bay, Steamer for: in Com. of Sup., 1374.
Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior: in Com. of Sup., 1303.
Water and River Police: in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1369.
Weller's Bay, Ont., Range Lights: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.
Wellington, Life-boat at, Cost of: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.

Marine, Ocean Mutual, Insurance Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 20 (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 91.)

Mariners, Sick and Distressed, Relief of, B. No. 129 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and 1°* of B., 1126; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1360. (47 *Vic., c.* 21).

Maritime Bank of Dom. of Can. Capital Stock reduction B. No. 66 (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 1214. (47 *Vic., c.* 47.)

MARITIME COURT FOR CANADA: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 965.

Maritime Court of Ontario (extension of jurisdiction) B. No. 70 (*Mr. Allen*). 1°*, 162; 2° m., 461; deb. adjd., 462.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, Act Amt. B. No. 116 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°*, 1175. (47 *Vic., c.* 19.)

MASTERS AND MATES, CERTIFICATES TO, NON-ENFORCEMENT OF ACT: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85; Certificates: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606; Examination of: in Com. of Sup., 1229.

MECHANICAL ARTS AND AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES, ESSAYS ON: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.

MEDICAL CERTIFICATES GRANTED IN P. E. I. UNDER TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.

Medicine Hat, Ry. from, B. No. 33 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°, 84; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 736. (47 *Vic., c.* 74.)

MEGANTIC CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1321.

MELGUND, LORD. *See* "Gov. Gen.'s Sec."

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 27, 200, 335.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:
Address, Reply to, in answer to Speech, 304.
Agreement with B. C., 27.
Estimates, The, for 1884-85, 145; Suppl., 1883-84, 1240; 1884-85, 1439; Further Suppl., 1884-85, 1576.
Guarantee by Govt. to C. P. R., 56.

METAPEDIAC AND PASPEBIAC RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.

METLAKATLA, B. C., INDIAN TROUBLES: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1254.

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, ST. JOHN AND TORONTO: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.

Methodist Churches Union B. No. 11 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 40; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 106.)

METHODIST CHURCH UNION, PETS. AGAINST: M. to read and receive (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 366.

MÈTHOT, Mr., M. P.: Resignation of Seat announced, 1108.

MIALL, E., COMMISSIONER OF STANDARDS, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1382.

MICHAUD AND DUMAIS, SKIFFINGTON *vs.*: M. for copies of Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.

MICHAUD, C., REP. ON EXPLORATION OF RIVER ST. FRANCIS: M. for copy (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

MIDDLESEX, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. 1; Member introduced, 27.

MILE BELT, WITHDRAWAL OF LANDS FROM HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.

MILITIA:
A, B, and C Batteries, Officers and men, &c.: M. for Ret. *Mr.* (*Cameron, Middlesex*) 808; in Com. of Sup., 1164.
Ammunition and Clothing: in Com. of Sup., 1019-1022, 1343.
Armouries, Public: in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1343, 1602.
Artillery, Competition at Shoeburyness: in Com. of Sup., 1166.
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1018.
Branch and District Staff: in Com. of Sup., 1017.
Clothing, Tenders for Manufacture of: M. for copies* (*Mr. Vail*) 1201.
Construction and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1343.

MILITIA—*Continued.*
Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1343.
Deptl. Rep. presented, 98.
Dept. of : in Com. of Sup., 833, 1334 ; conc., 1440.
Dominion Rifle Association : in Com. of Sup., 1602.
Drill Instruction : in Com. of Sup., 1096.
Drill Pay, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1098.
Drill Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1160.
Fortifications and Military Buildings B. No. 114 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°, 965 ; 2° 1061 ; in Com., 1063 ; 3°*, 1129. (47 *Vic., c.* 17.)
Infantry Schools : in Com. of Sup., 1366.
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against : M. for copies, &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 295 ; M. wthdn., 506 ; M. for copies, &c., 621, 738.
Manitoba, Increase of Force in : in Com. of Sup., 1343.
Military Properties, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1160 ; Construction and Repars, 1162, 1602 ; conc., 1440.
Moccasins, Purchase of : M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.
Ordnance, Rifled, Improved : in Com. of Sup., 1166.
Ottawa Rifle Range : in Com. of Sup., 1602.
Regulations and Orders, Printing : in Com. of Sup., 1343.
Returns, Enquiries respecting (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 1127.
Rifle Associations, B. C., Further aid to : Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.
Russian Leather Permeator : in Com. of Sup., 1165.
School of Gunnery, &c., B. C. : Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.
Stores : in Com. of Sup., 1022.
Tents, Manufacture of : Ques. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 505 ; M. for Cor.,* 624.
Veterans of 1812 : in Com. of Sup., 1016.
Volunteers of 1837 : Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 57.
MILLS, Hon. D. : Return of, on Judgment of Supreme Court, 524.
MINERAL LANDS, SALE OF, &c. : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
MINING LICENSES IN THE N. W., BAKER CREEK : Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 44.
MINISTERIAL CHANGES : Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 28, 525.
MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AS HIGH COMMISSIONER : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
MINISTER OF RYS., APPOINTMENT OF, AS HIGH COMMISSIONER : Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Mills*) 1039 ; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1042 ; (*Mr. Blake*) 1043 ; neg. (Y. 51, N. 95) 1046.
MINISTER OF RYS. AND THE HIGH COMMISSIONERSHIP : Ques. of Priv. (*Mr Blake*) 542 ; Res., 547 ; (*Sir. John A. Macdonald*) 547 ; Amt. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 549 ; Deb. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 549 ; (*Mr. Mills*) 553 ; (*Mr. Chapleau*) 554 ; (*Mr. Casey*) 556 ; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 558 ; reply (*Mr. Blake*) 561 ; Amt. agreed to (Y. 122, N. 57) 566.
MINOR REVENUES, DOMINION LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 1318.
MIRAMICHI VALLEY RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445 ; in Com., 1503-1507.
MISCELLANEOUS : in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1203, 1301-1310, 1373-1381, 1607, 1617 ; conc., 1464, 1611, 1617.
MISCELLANEOUS JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 994.
MISCELLANEOUS WORKS, INTERCOL. RY., NOT PROVIDED FOR : in Com. of Sup., 1050.
MISSION SCHOOL AT FORT WILLIAM : in Com. of Sup., 1608.
MISSISSIPPI AND RENFREW RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444 ; in Com., 1508.
MOBERLY, FRANK, MEMORIAL OF : M. for copy* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.
MOCCASINS, PURCHASE OF, BY MILITIA DEPT. : M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.
MONEY ORDER REGULATIONS : M. for copies (*Mr Blake*) 613.
MONEYS PAID BY DOM. TO LOCAL GOVT. OF ONT. : M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Farrow*) 1200.
MONTCALM CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judgment of Supreme Court, 337.
Montreal and European Short Line Ry. Co. B. No. 89 (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°*, 285 ; 2°*, 504 ; in Com. and 3°*, 810. (47 *Vic., c.* 89.)
Montreal and Quebec Pilots Incorp. B. No. 18 (*Mr. Amyot*). 1°*, 67 ; 2°*, 89 ; preamble not proven.
MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO : prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445 ; in Com., 1503.
MONTREAL CARNIVAL, ADJOURNMENT FOR : Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 83.
MONTREAL DRILL SHED, CONTRACT FOR REBUILDING : Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966 ; M. for copies*, 1201.
MONTREAL, G. T. R. RY. CROSSING IN : Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 1387.
MONTREAL POST OFFICE SERVICE : Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 797.
MONTREAL TO ST. JOHN, HALIFAY AND SYDNEY RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444 ; in Com., 1486-1490.
MOOSE JAW, TOWN RESERVE : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
MORPETH HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 132 ; (*Mr. Casey*) 1054.
MORRISTOWN, N.S., PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT : M. for Cor.* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.
MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS, ERECTION OF : in Com. of Sup., 1203, 1378.
MOUNTED POLICE FOR B. C. : Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.
MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES AND TRANSPORT, TENDERS, &c. : M. for copies* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
MOUSSEAU, HON. J. A., APPOINTMENT OF, TO THE BENCH : M. (*Mr. Laurier*) 133 ; Deb. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 135 ; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 137 ; (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 137 ; (*Mr. Girouard*) 139 ; reply (*Mr. Laurier*) 139 ; neg. (Y. 47, N. 89) 140.

MOWAT, Hon. OLIVER, PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1379.

Municipal Self Government for Indians of Canada B. No. 22. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 67; 2° m., 538; 2° and in Com., 539; 3°, 625. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1051.

MUTUAL BENEFIT INS. SOCIETIES: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 337.

MUTUAL MARINE INS. CO.'S. *See* respective headings.

NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT, B. C.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.

NAVAL BRIGADE AND TORPEDO CORPS, B.C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.

NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1502.

NAPANEE, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Papers and Cor. (*Mr. Allison, Lennox*) wthdn., 208.

Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. Bill No. 80 (*Mr. Bell*). 1°*, 231; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 810; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1176. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

"NAPOLEON III." *See* "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."

NAVIGATION COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.

NAVIGATION, SCHOOL OF, AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.

Nederlandsch-Americansche Land Maalschappij B. No. 30 (*Mr. Abbott*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

NELSON RIVER, OBSTRUCTION IN: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.

NEW BRUNSWICK:

Caraquet and Shippigan Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.

Carleton Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.

Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 736.

Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1503.

Grand Southern Ry., Conveyance of Mails: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.

Hopewell and Alma Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.

Inland Revenue Warehouse at St. John: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1212.

Intercol. Ry. between Rivière du Loup and Moncton, Cost of: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 623.

Intercol. Ry. *See* general heading.

Jemseg, Dredging at: M. for copies of Rep. (*Mr. King*) 295.

Kearney and Jacques, Messrs. Appointment of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.

Lottery Firm at St. Stephen: M. for Stmnt. of Receipts of P. O. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.

Mail Service in: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.

Meteorological Service at St. John, Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.

Point Escuminac Breakwater: M. for Papers (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*

"Princess Louise." *See* "DOMINION STEAMERS."

St. Louis and Richibucto Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444.

Stone for new Deptl. Building: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 736.

Sussex and St. John Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1510.

Swan Creek Surveys: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 605.

U. S. Customs Duties on Hay: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.

Vice-Admiralty Courts, Imp. Despatches respecting: M. for copies* (*Mr. Weldon*) 65.

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 54 (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*). 1°*, 141; 2°, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 1035. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

NEW MEMBERS, Return of, 1, 198, 335.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS, DELAY IN TRANSMITTING: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Sproule*) 216.

NEW HARBOUR AND INDIAN HARBOUR, N.S.: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

"NEWFIELD," STEAMER, COST OF WORKING: in Com. of Sup., 1227, 1318; conc., 1458.

NEWFOUNDLAND, PROHIBITIVE DUTY: Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1214.

NEWFOUNDLAND, NEGOTIATIONS WITH: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1653.

NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING, INSPECTION OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.

NIAGARA FALLS COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1203.

Niagara Frontier Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 91 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 1214; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1548. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

NICOLET, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION: Resignation of Member, 1108.

Northern and North-Western Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (*Mr. Small*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 810. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

"NORTHERN LIGHT," REPORT OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

"NORTHERN LIGHT:" in Com. of Sup., 1227.

"NORTHERN QUEEN," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

Northern Ry. Co. of Can. B. No. 57 (*Mr. Small*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 1175; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1546. (47 *Vic*, *c.* 65.)

NORTH AMERIACAN CONTRACTING CO., INSTRUMENT OF INCORP., &C., AND C. P. R. CLAIMS OF SHAREHOLDERS: M. for copies* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.

NORTH SHORE RY., ST. MARTIN'S TO QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 1388.

NORTH-WEST GRIEVANCES: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 766; Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1138; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1147; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1152; (*Mr. Watson*) 1155; (*Mr. Mills*) 1155; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1156; neg. (Y. 57, N. 116) 1157.

NORTH WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION CO. *See* "Medicine Hat Ry."

North-West Territories Act, 1880, Amt. B. No. 152 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1586; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1651. (47 *Vic., c.* 23.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

Amt. to Act referred to in Speech from the Throne, 2.

Administration of Affairs: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

Administrator for, Appointment of: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.

Bow River Timber Limits, Sale of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.

Council, Members of: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Mills*) 1200.

Expenses of Govt. in: in Com. of Sup., 1301; conc., 1617.

Government Herd in: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506; Sale of: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.

Gold Mining, Act relating to: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 43; M. for Ret., 512.

Land Sales in: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.

Liquor Licenses and Permits: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.

Mining Licenses on Baker Creek: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 44.

Mounted Police: in Com. of Sup., 1294.

Registration of Deeds, &c.: prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1635.

Sales and Leases of Lands, Coal: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

Settlers in other Provs.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 49.

Town Site Reservation at Fort MacLeod: M. for O. C., &c.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 624.

[*See* "DOMINION LANDS," "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

NOVA SCOTIA:

Agreement, B. No. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 825; M. for Com., 878; in Com., 883; conc. in and 1°* of B., 987; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1131. (47 *Vic., c.* 5.)

Amero, Roger, Case of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 622.

Antigonish, Public Buildings at, Expenditure on: M. Stmnt.* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.

Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.

Bounty to Fishermen, Names, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67; Ques., 603; Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 655.

Cheticamp Harbour, Dredging: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 967.

Coal Carried on Intercol. Ry. and by Water: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 65.

Coal Imported into the U. S. for Ocean Steamship purposes: M. for copies of Despatches (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

Customs Officials in Inverness: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 462.

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

Digby County, Fishery Overseer for: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 89.

Eastern Extension Ry.: paragraph in Speech from the Throne, 2.

Goose Island Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.

Great American and European Short Line Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 57.

Hearn, James, Superannuation of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Kirk*) 1110.

Ingonish Breakwater, Cor. and Engineer's Reports, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.

Morristown, Preventive Officer at: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.

Mutual Marine Insurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 49 (*Mr. Daly*). 1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 92.)

New Harbour and Indian Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

Ogden, Alfred, Employment of: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 798, 965.

Oyster Pond Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

Port Mulgrave as a sub-port: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 285.

Railways: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Macdonald, Cape Breton*) 65.

Scott Act in Cumberland: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 736; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1548.

Upper Wood Harbour: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1199.

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

OATH OR OATHS TAKEN BY GOV. GEN. AND LIEUT.-GOVS.: M. for copies.* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.

Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 2; (*pro forma*).

O'BRIEN, JOTHAM, AMOUNT PAID TO: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 623.

OBSERVATORIES: in Com. of Sup., 1254.

OBSTRUCTION, REMOVAL OF, IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1232.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1227-1232, 1369.

Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 20 (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 91.)

O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, SUMS PAID TO: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON. *See* Criminal Law Amts.

OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS AND SECRETARIES: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 972.

OFFICIAL INCOMES, TAXATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1054.

OGDEN, ALFRED, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 798; (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 965.

OGILVIE AND BUNTING, Messrs., AS SECURITY FOR EXCHANGE BANK: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 261, 336.

O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 1549.

OMNIBUS Co.'s. *See* respective headings.

ONTARIO:
Accounts with the Dom.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; (*Mr. Hesson*) 73; M. for Stmnts.* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
Amherstburg, Public Buildings, Land sold for: M. for Rets.* (*Mr. Lister*) 83; *Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 297.
Belle River Pier: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
Boundaries between Man. and Ont.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
Britton, Ephraim, Complaints against appointment: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.
Colchester Reef Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86, 199.
Cornwall and Rapide Plat Canals, Tenders for Enlargement: M. for copies* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
Customs Employés at Windsor: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.
Dominion Grange and Farming Legislation: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.
Duart, Postmaster at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 509; Ques., 1053; Complaints against appointment: M. for Ret.,* 1201.
Escheat, Queen and Mercer, Shorthand Writers' Notes: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 74.
Fishing in Ont. Waters, Regulations: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mulock*) 71; Fines under: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 201.
Frontier Police, South-Western Ont.: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1054.
Gravenhurst and Callander Ry. Subsidy: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40; Ques. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 604.
Goodwin, James, Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Fleming*) 604; M. for Rep.* (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.
Harbour in Essex County: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 506.
Hodge *vs.* The Queen, Judgment, &c., respecting: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
Hughes, Judge, Charges against: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59; remarks, 967; Ques. 1109; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.
Hunter's Island, Land or Timber Sales: Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 965; (*Mr. Bain*) 1054.
Immigrants settled in, from 1879 to 1883 respectively: M. for Ret.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
Indian Islands in Lake Ont.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
Kingsville Harbour Works: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86; M. for Ret., 216.
Lake Superior, Region North of: M. for. Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.
Land Improvement Fund: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1215.
Lansdowne Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 336.
Leamington Post Office: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
Life-saving Stations, Life-boats, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199.
Long Point Lighthouse repairs: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 230.

ONTARIO—*Continued.*
Maritime Court (extension of jurisdiction) B. No. 70 (*Mr. Allen*). 1°*, 162; 2° m., 461; deb. adjd., 462.
Morpeth Harbour Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 132; (*Mr. Casey*) 1054.
Ottawa Gas Co., Claims of: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
Pajot Farm and Claim of Indian Dept.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.
Palmerston, North of, Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 89.
Parry Sound P. O., Postal Thefts at: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1109.
Pelee Island, Long Point and Rondeau Lighthouses: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.
Penetanguishene Indian Agent: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 31.
Port Rowan Life-saving Station: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
Port Stanley and Port Burwell as Harbours of Refuge: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.
Port Stanley Harbour Revenue: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.
Provincial Debt to Canada: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 199.
Railway Bonuses given by Townships and Prov. Govts.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.
Rideau Hall, Expenditure on: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
St. Lawrence Canals, Expenditure on: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
St. Thomas, Public Buildings at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 92.
St. Vincent, Examination of Baggage at: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1444.
Solway, Postmaster at: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Wells*) 1200.
Stayner, Postmaster at: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 1109.
Thames and Lake Erie Canal: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797.
Volunteers of 1837-38: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 89.
Waters of, Regulations under Fisheries Act, Prohibiting Fishing: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
Weller's Bay Range Lights: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.
Wellington, Life-boat at: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.
Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
Windsor Post Office, Sale of Stamps at: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
Wyandotte Indians, Distribution of Moneys to: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 966.
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 67 (*Mr. Bergin*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 603. (47 *Vic., c.* 57.)
Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. Co. Lease confirmation B. No. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; M. for Com., 810; objection (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) Ques. of Priv., 810; M. to substitute name of Mr. Haggart for promoter agreed to, 843; in Com., 857; 3° m., 859; Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) 859; neg. and 3°, 860; B. passed, 886. (47 *Vic., c.* 54.)

Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (*Mr. Wells*). 1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°, 886; on M. that B. pass, Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to recom., 887; neg. on a div. and B. passed, 888; Sen. amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT. *See* "Parliament."

Openings in the Ice, Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 97 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 1°*, 457.

Orange Association of British America Incorp. B. No. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1° on a div., 304; 2° m., 897; neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931.

ORANGE, LOYAL, ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH AMERICA B. 93: Deb. on M. for 2° (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 897; (*Mr. Mills*) 898; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 899; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 902; (*Mr. Blake*) 904; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 919; (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 921; (*Mr. Curran*) 923; (*Mr. Farrow*) 924; (*Mr. Beaty*) 925; (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 927; (*Mr. Foster*) 927; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 928; (*Mr. Wallace*) 928; (*Mr. Sproule*) 928; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 929.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF:

ORDER:

Adjournment. Member cannot allude to a subject in an irregular manner under cover of a M. to adjn. (*Mr. Speaker*) 1545.

Banking Facilities for Agriculturists B. 105. On 1°, Ques. by *Mr. Blake* as to initiation of same in Com. of W.: Ans. (*Mr. Speaker*) that Member introduces B. at the risk of having its progress stopped at some subsequent stage, 524. *See* also "PROCEDURE."

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan Res. Unparliamentary language, 342, 532; correction in deb. (*Mr. Foster*) 353; reference to Member having a seat by the grace of others, 448; flat contradictions in deb. restrained (*Mr. Speaker*) 484; personal explanation *re* condemnation of conduct of Liberal press (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 491; personal explanations in deb. in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 493; mover of substantive motion has right of reply (*Mr. Speaker*) 494; allusion to Member as a criminal condemned (*Mr. Speaker*) 532. *See* also "PROCED."

Central Ontario Ry. B. 73. Reference to proceedings of Select Standing Com. objected to (*Mr. Bowell*) 1204. *See* also "PROCED."

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence B. 3. Member can only speak once, except mover of motion, who has the right of reply (*Mr. Speaker*) 97.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c., B. 6. Stmnt. reflecting on Members wthdn., 813.

Debates, Official Rep. Accuracy of Rep. challenged (*Mr. Orton*) *re* quotation from Regina *Leader*: Reference to a past deb. objected to by *Mr. Blake*, 1582; in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 1583.

Fishing Bounty. In Com. of Sup.: Discussion declared out of Order, no subject before Com. on which general question can arise, 1239.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

ORDER—*Continued.*

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against. Accusation of making wrong statements for purpose of deb. contradicted (*Mr. Casey*) 757; Documents read without placing same on Table, 747.

Minister of Rys. and the High Commissionership. Members speaking disrespectfully of each other: Rule read (*Mr. Speaker*) 561; personal explanation can be made after Member has finished his speech, 561.

North-West Grievances. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.: Reference to a Member not having a seat in the House checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 1152.

Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 46. Insinuation of Member repudiated (*Mr. Wilson*) 888.

Orange Incorp. B. 93. Personal allusions in deb. checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 920; unparliamentary language wthdn., 923.

Personal Allusions checked, 920, 1152.

Personal Explanations in Deb. in Order: 493, 1123; can be made after Member has finished speaking, 561.

Post Offices, Erection of. M. for Ret.: Unparliamentary language wthdn., 802; reference to former deb. checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 807.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic. Personal explanation in deb. in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 1123.

St. Patrick's Day. M. to adjn. to a future period not in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 885.

Sick and Distressed Mariners Act. On M. for Ret.: Member requested to confine himself to Ques. (*Mr. Speaker*) 217.

Unparliamentary Language, 342, 532, 802, 813, 888, 922, 923.

Ways and Means. Duties on packages containing crockery, in Com.: Member referring to packages containing flour in Order, 700.

PRIVILEGE:

Contradiction of Stmnt. made by Member in another place (*Mr. Blake*) 1512.

Denial of insinuations by Member *re* newspaper article (*Mr. Blake*) 736.

Departmental Reports. Publication in newspapers before presentation to House: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 141.

Explanation of article in Toronto *Globe* (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1465.

Explanation of paragraph in Montreal *Herald* and other newspapers reflecting on a Member (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1241.

Explanations respecting reports in Toronto *Mail* and Montreal *Gazette*: remarks (*Messrs. Ouimet, Scriver, Blake* and *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 457.

L'Etendard. Inaccurate correspondence: Explanation (*Mr. Bergeron*) 469.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21. Amts. made by Senate: remarks (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1511. *See* also "PROCEDURE."

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*
Luard, Major-General, complaints against. Personal explanations (*Mr. Caron*) 757; (*Mr. Fortin*) 808.
Minister of Rys. and the High Commissionership. Position in House challenged (*Mr. Blake*) 542; Res., 547.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 32. Ques. of Privilege must conclude with a motion (*Mr. Speaker*) 811.
Orange B. 93, *Mr. Blake's* speech on: Accuracy of Rep. challenged (*Mr. Woodworth*) 1544.
Regina Leader. Misquotation: remarks (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.
Returns. Missing and Imperfect: remarks (*Mr. Platt* and others) 459.
Wheat and Flour Equivalents. Ques. misunderstood: explanation (*Mr. Bowell*) 57.
PROCEDURE:
Adulteration of Food and Drugs B. 114. M. for Com. (*Mr. Costigan*) objected to by *Mr. Blake*, the B. containing money clauses should have originated in Com. of W., authorities quoted to sustain objection, 1244; ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that the money clauses should not be considered as part of the B. but should be passed over by the Chairman of the Com., authorities quoted in support of same, 1246.
Banking Facilities for Agriculturists. M. for Com. on Res. objected to by *Mr. Blake*, there being a B. on Order Paper for 2° on same subject: *Mr. Speaker* not prepared to give a decision in the matter, 763. *See* also "ORDER."
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan Res. Members being called on to vote having pecuniary interest in same: Rule read (*Mr. Speaker*) 454; practice defined (*Mr. Speaker*) 458. *See* also "ORDER."
Central Ontario Ry. B. Amt. moved in Com. by *Mr. White*, of *Hastings*, objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Victoria*, no notice having been given: objection sustained by the Chairman, 1202. *See* also "ORDER."
Chinese Immigration into B. C. M. to adjn. deb. on Res. moved (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) through want of knowledge of Parliamentary Practice; Order adjng. deb. asked to be rescinded: remarks (*Mr. Speaker, Mr. Baker* and *Mr. Blake*) 977.
Commitment of a B. M. (*Mr. Amyot*) to dischrg. Order of the House referring B. to a Com.: Practice (*Mr. Speaker*) and Precedent (*Mr. Amyot*) quoted 131.
Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12. Order for 2° being called, change of name of mover suggested (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Member having moved introduction B. must stand in his name; no B. can be moved in name of absent Member, 80.
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c., B. 6. Mover of B. (*Mr. Charlton*) seconding an Amt. to Main Motion objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Victoria*, 666; correction (*Mr. Speaker*) 667.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—*Continued.*
PROCEDURE—*Continued.*
Division List. Member's name having been left out of division on B. 6, same was asked, by *Mr. Hesson*, to be rectified: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) not the practice to alter same, 709.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 Amt. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) to M. that B. pass: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that no Amt. can be moved at this stage, must be obtained in the Senate, 978.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21. Amts. made by the Sen.: remarks (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1511; Practice of Parliament (*Mr. Haggart*) 1512; (*Sir Charles Tupper, Messrs. Mitchell, Cameron, Victoria*, and *Blake*) 1513; (*Messrs. Mackenzie, McCarthy, Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1514: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that in future Amts. made by the Senate must be put on the Order Paper, 1515.
Liquor License Act, 1883, *Mr. Houde's M. to repeal.* M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for same to take precedence on a private day objected to by *Mr. Mackenzie*, no notice having been given, 824; authorities quoted by *Mr. Mackenzie* and objection sustained by *Mr. Speaker*, 825.
Luard, Major-General. Order for Notice of Motion called, and a Member being absent who wanted to speak on it, the same was asked to be allowed to stand: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Notice of Motion after being called cannot stand, except at request of Government, 295. *See* also "ORDER."
Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57. M. (*Mr. Small*) to conc. in Amts. made by the Senate: Rule read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1547.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 32. M. for Com. on B. objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Huron*, the mover (*Mr. Abbott*) being Solicitor of C. P. R. Co., 810: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Member acting as such is ineligible from voting, but he is not restrained from proposing a motion or an amendment, and authorities quoted to sustain same, 811; Rule of English H. of C. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 857.
Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 32. M. (*Mr. Haggart*) to change name of mover objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Huron*, no notice having been given: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) no notice required after B. is introduced, 843.
Printing of Parliament. Sixth Rep. of Com., Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to conc. in, except last paragraph: not usual to adopt a Rep. of a Com. in part, it is generally ref. back to the Com. (*Mr. Speaker*) 1109.
Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134. Remarks by *Mr. Blake* on M. for 2°, as to whether B. ought not to have been initiated by Com. of W., the B. authorizing the disposal of a portion of the Public Domain, 1455: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that B. does not come under class of Bills appropriating any portion of the Public Revenue, 1586.

ORLEANS ISLAND, LIGHTS NORTH OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.

OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445.

Ottawa and St. Lawrence Ry. (Bondholders voting at Meetings) B. No. 56 (*Mr. White, Cardwell.*) 1°*, 141; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 715; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic., c.* 76.)

OTTAWA GAS CO., CLAIM OF, FOR LEAKAGE. Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.

OTTAWA RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 1603.

Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. No. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*). 1°*, 304; 2°*, 504; in Com., 889; 3° on a div., 890. (47 *Vic., c.* 104.)

Ottawa, Waddington and N. Y. Ry. and Bridge Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 40 (*Mr. Hickey*). 1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 603. (47 *Vic., c.* 58.)

Owen Sound Dry Dock, Shipbuilding, and Nav. Co. Incorp. B. No. 45 (*Mr. Allen*). 1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580. (47 *Vic., c.* 99.)

OXFORD STATION AND SYDNEY OR LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1490.

OYSTER POND BREAKWATER, N. S.: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

PAGE, JOHN, PAYMENTS TO, AS ARBITRATOR: in Com. of Sup. 1351, 1608; conc., 1617.

PAJOT FARM AND CLAIM OF INDIAN DEPT.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.

PALMERSTON, NORTH OF, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 89.

Parkdale Village and G. T. R. Co., legalization of Agreement B. No. 82 (*Mr. Wallace, York*). 1°*, 231; 2°, 504; wthdn.

PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE: Members called on to vote (ruling) 458. *See* "ORDER," &c.

PARLIAMENT, 5TH, SECOND SESSION, 1884, 47 VICTORIA: Opening, 1; Speech from the Throne, 2; Bills assented to, 664, 1654; Prorogation, 1654. *See* "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

PARRY SOUND, INDIAN AGENT AT: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 1548.

PASSES OVER INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Montplaisir*) 1201.

PASTURE LANDS, LEASES GRANTED IN 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 73; Sale of, &c., 78.

Patent Act, 1872, further Act Amt. B. No. 86 (*Mr. White Renfrew*). 1°*, 260.

"PATENT RECORD:" in Com. of Sup., 1089.

Patent Rights, Sale of, Prevention of Fraud in, B. No. 26 (*Mr. Mulock*). 1°, 71; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 145; in Com. of W., 285; 3°, 460. (47 *Vic., c.* 38.)

PAYMENTS ON SETTLERS' LANDS: Ques, (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.

PEAKE'S, STATION AT, ON P. E. I. RY.: Ques. (*Mr. McIntyre*) 261.

PELEE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, REPAIRS ON: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.

PENETANGUISHENE, INDIAN AGENT AT: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 31.

PENITENTIARIES BRANCH OF DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 833.

PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 998–1002, 1338.

PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1343.

PERLEY, H. F., SERVICES ON ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.

Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 122 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 822; 2°, 986; in Com. and 3°*, 1282. (47 *Vic., c.* 40.)

PERSONAL EPLANATIONS. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &c.

PERSONS ENTERING AND LEAVING MANITOBA FOR YEAR: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 49.

PERTH AND QUEBEC, EXCISE OFFICERS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 132.

PETROLEUM IN MONTMAGNY AND ST. MAURICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 85.

PICKARD, Mr. JOHN: Notification of Vacancy by decease (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Pictou Mutual Marine Insurance Co., Incorp. B. No. 35 (*Mr. McDougald*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 95.)

PICTOU CATTLE DISEASE: in Com. of Sup., 1010.

PIERS IN P. E. I., PAYMENTS FOR REPAIRS ON: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 1054.

PILOTS FOR AND ABOVE HARBOUR OF QUE., INCORP. ACTS RESPECTING: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 655.

Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, Incorp. B. No. 18 (*Mr. Amyot*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; preamble not proven.

PINCHER CREEK SUPPLY FARM, SALE OR LEASE: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.

PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS, EXPORT DUTY ON: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 655.

PLUMMER, Mr., TRANSFER OF: in Com. of Sup., 841.

POINT ESCUMINAC N. B., BREAKWATER: M. for Papers (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.

POLICE ORGANIZATION UNDER LICENSE ACT: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 505.

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1497.

Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation Incorp. B. No. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*). 1°*, 260; 2°*, 504; in Com., 888; 3°*, 889. (47 *Vic., c.* 105.)

PORPOISE FISHERY AT RIVER OUELLE: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.

PORT OF LANDING FOR EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 89.

PORT MULGRAVE, N. S., AS A SUB-PORT: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 285.

PORT ROWAN, LIFE-SAVING STATION AND CREW AT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.

PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR REVENUE: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.

PORT TOWNSEND AND VICTORIA, B.C., MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.

POST OFFICE:
Carleton, N.B., Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.
Duart, Postmaster at, Complaints against: M. for Pets. (*Mr. Casey*) 509, 1201.
Fort MacLeod and Medicine Hat Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506.
Landsdowne Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 336.
Leamington Post Office, Erection of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
Letter Postage, Reduction in: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.
Letter Rates, Amt. of existing Law: Ques. (*Mr. Thompson*) 89.
Mail Service in B. C.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
Mail Service in Lotbinière County: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.
Mail Service in N. B.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.
Mail Service North of Palmerston: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 89.
Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 1298; conc., 1452.
Money Order Regulations: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 614.
Money Orders, France and Canada: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 967.
Montreal Post Office Service: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 797.
Newspaper Mail Service, Delays in Transmission: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Sproule*) 216.
Offices in operation in the Dom.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.
Parry Sound P. O., Thefts at: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1109.
Postmaster-General's Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 842, 1336, 1627.
Post Office and Finance Depts.: in Com. of Sup., 987.
St. Césaire, Postmaster at, Charges against: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.
St. Clotilde Post Office: Ques: (*Mr. Holton*) 1273.
St. Gilles, Daily Mail for: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 73.
St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.
St. Stephen, N.B., Post Office Receipts: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.
Stamps, Sale of, at Windsor: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
Statistics: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.
Stayner, Postmaster at: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 1109.
Subsidies to C.P.R. Co.: M. for Papers (*Mr. Blake*) 79
Victoria, B.C., Postmaster at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

PRECEDENCE, MS. FOR C. P. R.: Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 198, 304; Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 107) 304; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 108) 305; M., 468; M. for B., 524. *See* "INTOXICATING LIQUORS ACT, *Mr. Houde's* M. TO REPEAL."

PRÉCIS WRITER, SUPREME COURT, STATUTORY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 1474.

PREEMPTION ENTRIES IN 1883: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Prescott and Vaudreuil Railway Co. Incorp. B. No. 23 (*Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil*). 1°*, 71; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 736. (47 *Vic., c.* 84.)

PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT MORRISTOWN, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.

PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING AND KAMINISTIQUIA RY. CO., BONUSES TO: M. for copy of Memorial from Messrs. McCallum and Moberly to His Ex.* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.

PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING TO RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1046.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
Charlottetown Public Building: conc., 1604.
Compensation for Injuries on P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 1347..
Customs Officers: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Brecken*) 466.
Glendon, Steamer to replace: in Com. of Sup., 1227.
Harbours and Rivers: in Com of Sup., 1220; conc., 1443, 1464.
Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1266.
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 1234.
Officers' Salaries, &c., on P. E. I. Ry.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Davies*) 298.
Payment of Labourers on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 965.
Peake's, Station at, on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Mc Intyre*) 261.
Piers, Payments for repairs on: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 1054; M. for copies of O. C., 1169.
Refund of Duties to Merchants: in Com. of Sup., 1312; conc., 1453.
Repairs, &c., on Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 1258.
St. Peter's Breakwater, Contract for: M. for copies* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.
Steamboat Inspector's Rep: Ques. (*Mr Davies*) 460.
Steamboats, Inspection of: M. for copies of Reps. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
Temperance Act, 1878, Medical Certificates under: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.
Wharves and Piers, Inspection of: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 261.
[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE FISHERY AWARD: Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1273; Deb. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1277; (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1278; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1279; (*Mr. Hackett*) 1280.

PRINCE LEOPOLD, THE LATE, RES. OF CONDOLENCE TO H. M.: Mess. from Sen., with Address, 1273; M. to conc. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1291; seconded (*Mr. Blake*) 1292.

"PRINCESS LOUISE," STEAMER, CONTRACT, &C., FOR BUILDING: M. for copies (*Mr. Weldon*) 35; Loss of: Reports of Capt. Scott on, 40; Contract for building, 623; Tenders for Steamer to replace,* 820.

"PRINCESS OF WALES," STEAMER, REP. OF INSPECTORS, &C.: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1009, 1373.
PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT: M. to conc. in Sixth Rep., 408; Seventh Rep., 1321, 1359; Eighth and Ninth Reps., 1543.
PRINTING, PRINTING PAPER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1004; conc., 1440.
PRINTING: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
PRINTING VOCABULARIES OF DIALECTS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.
Prisoners, Transfer from one jail to another, authorization B. No. 151 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1586; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 44.)
PRIVATE BILLS, HOUR FOR: Ques. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 811.
PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
PRIVATE BILLS, PRESENTATION OF: Ms. (*Mr. Coursol*) to extend time, 71; (*Mr. Beaty*) 162, 1240, 1359.
PRIVATE BILLS, RECEPTION OF REPS. OF COMS.: Ms. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to extend time, 932, 1100, 1240, 1359.
PRIVATE BILLS, RECEIVING PETS. FOR: Ms. (*Mr. Beaty*) to extend time, 40.
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30; wthdrl. of name from (*Mr. Tupper*) 569; First Rep, presented, 1270; M. to conc. in agreed to (Y. 107, N. 55) 1291.
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &c.
PRIVY COUNCIL, JUDICIAL COM. OF: Judgment and Shorthand Writer's notes *re* Hodge *vs.* The Queen, and Russell *vs.* The Queen: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 833, 1333, 1336, 1627.
PROCEDURE. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &c.
PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC: Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 656; Sec. (*Mr. Fisher*) 980; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) agreed to, 1113; Deb. (*Mr. Beaty*) 1114; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1116; (*Mr. Jamieson*) 1117; (*Mr. McCraney*) 1118; (*Mr. Foster*) 1119; (*Mr. Kirk*) 1122; (*Mr. Scriver*) 1123; Amt. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 107) 1123; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1124; (*Mr. Irving*) 1125; Main Motion, as amended, agreed to (Y. 122, N. 40) 1126.
PROHIBITIVE DUTY IN NEWFOUNDLAND (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1214.
PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT: Communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1652; His Ex.'s Speech, 1655.
PROVINCIAL ACTS, DISALLOWANCE OF, &c: M. for O. C., (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.
PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL BONUSES TO RYS. SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.
Provincial Bank of Ont. Incorp. B. No. 39 (*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 48.)
PROVINCIAL DEBT, ONTARIO AND QUEBEC, TO CANADA: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 199.
Provincial Subsidies, readjustment of, B. No. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1°* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 4.)
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES UNDER CONFEDERATION ACT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 150.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS FOR 1883: presented, 27.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
PUBLIC ANALYSTS: prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1215.
PUBLIC ARMOURIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1343, 1602.
Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, Act Amt. B. No. 12 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 40; Order for 2° read, 80; 2° m., 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; *killed in Com. of W.*, 819; M. to restore to Order Paper neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.
PUBLIC DEBT OF THE DOMINION: Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 736.
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1322; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1326; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1328; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1332; neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.
PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 1012–1016.
PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 88.
PUBLIC LANDS SURVEYED IN MANITOBA AND N.W.T. IN 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Public Schools, Manitoba, Aid to, B. No. 36 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 43; in Com., 68; 1°* of B., 85; 2°* and in Com., 542; 3°* 625. (47 *Vic., c.* 7.)
Public Service, Moneys required for, authorization B. No. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 3.)
Public Works of Canada, B. No. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°*, 1321; 2° m., 1445, 1586; 2° and in Com., 1587; recom. and 3°*, 1609. (47 *Vic., c.* 17.)
PUBLIC WORKS:
Agent and Contingencies, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1318.
Amherstburg Public Buildings: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 79; M. for Ret., 83; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 297.
Antigonish, Expenditure on Public Buildings: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.
Bayfield Harbour, Ont., Damage to, by Storms: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.
Beemer, H. J., Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Fisher*) 604.
Belle River, Essex County, Ont., Pier in: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
Boularderie Wharf, N. S.: conc., 1618.
Brandon, Erection of Public Buildings: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1110.
Buildings, Cost of, since 1874, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 41.
Cape Tormentine Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Carleton, N. B., Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.
Cheticamp Harbour, N. S., Dredging: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 967.
Crane Island Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 516; Ques., 736.
Deptl. Rep. presented, 27; in Com. of Sup., 843.
Dredges and Tug, Construction of: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*), 603.

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
Dredging at Jemseg : M. for Rep. (*Mr. King*) 295.
Emigrant Sheds at Victoria, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.
Esquimalt Graving Dock: in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Expenditure on, in different Provs., since Confederation: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.
Extra Clerks Charged to: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Lister*) 82.
Fairford River, Man., Improvements: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.
Fortifications and Military Buildings B. No. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°, 965; 2° m., 1061. *See* B.
Fort MacLeod, Public Buildings: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506.
Goodwin, James, Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Fleming*) 604.
Heating Public Buildings, Cost of: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
In Com. of Sup., 1190–1198, 1218–1226, 1354–1366, 1603–1606; conc., 1443, 1458, 1464, 1616, 1618.
Indian Agent's Office, Toronto, closing of: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cook*) 294.
Ingonish Breakwater: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.
Isle-aux-Noix, Completion of Works at: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 966.
Kingsville Harbour Works: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86; M. for Ret., 216.
Lachine Canal, Contracts for new Basins: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.
Leamington Post Office: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
Lotbinière Wharf: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1054.
Moncton Post Office, N.B.: conc., 1616.
Montreal Drill Shed, Contract for Rebuilding: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.
Morpeth Harbour Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 132; (*Mr. McCraney*) 1054.
New Harbour and Indian Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.
Ottawa, Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1190.
Ottawa Gas Co., Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
Oyster Pond Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.
Piers in P. E. I., Payments for Repairs: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 1054; M. for O. C., 1169.
Port Arthur Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Port Stanley Harbour of Refuge: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.
Port Stanley Harbour Revenue: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.
Post Offices and Public Buildings, Erection of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
Public Buildings, Cost of Heating: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
Public Buildings of the Dom.: M. for Ret., 41.
St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.
St. Jean Port Joli Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
St. Thomas, Public Buildings at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 92.
Salaries of Officers, Charged to: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Lister*) 82.
Stone for Deptl. Building: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 736.
Talbot, Achille, Employment and Salary: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 966.
Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1318, 1366.
Thames and Lake Erie Canal: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797.
Wharves and Piers in N. B.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 458.
Wharves and Piers in P. E. I., Inspection of: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 261.
PUBLISHING DEBATES: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1389. [*See* "DEBATES."]
PULLMAN CAR CO.'S AGREEMENT WITH INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.
QUEBEC: *See* ["SUPPLY."]
Accounts and Dom. Government: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 73.
Account with Canada: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; M. for Stmnt.,* 79.
Aylmer and Pembroke Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1497.
Beaumont, Expropriation of: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200.
Beemer, H. J., Claim of, for work on Gates, &c.: Ques. (*Mr. Fisher*) 604.
Caron, Clovis, Complaints against, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1200.
Central Ry. Co. and Intercol. Ry. Arrangements: M. for copies (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.
Central Ry. Co., Subsidy to: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1491.
Claims of Province against Dominion: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.
Crane Island Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 516; Ques., 736.
Culling Timber: in Com. of Sup., 1317.
D'Anjou, Joseph, Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 798.
Dominion Subsidy to Quebec, Readjustment of; M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200.
Dorion and Leclerc, Messrs., Claims of: M. for copies* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.
Elgin Road Station, L'Islet: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 199.
Emigrant Buildings at Lévis, Removal of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.
European Immigrants, Port of Landing: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 89.
Excise Officers at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 132.
Ferry or Bridge at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
Floating Gas Lights on the St. Lawrence: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Valin*) 217.
Gosselin and Chabot, Messrs., Complaints of, against Dom. Arbitrators: M. for copies (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.
Government Lands in Richelieu County, Sale of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 1126.

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal: Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1387.
Intercolonial Ry. Office at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
Kazubazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1499.
Lachine Canal, Contracts for new Basin: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.
Lavallière Bay, Yamaska River, Explorations: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 820.
Lavoie, Geo., Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 797.
Lévis Emigrant Building and Quarantine: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.
Levis Graving Dock. [*See* B. 149.]
Lieut.-Gov.'s Oaths: M. for copies* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79; Commissions, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Casgrain*) 522.
Lights North of Island of Orleans: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
Lotbinière Wharf at: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1054.
Mail Service in Lotbinière County: M. for Papers, &c. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.
Montreal Carnival: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 83.
Montreal Drill Shed, Contract for rebuilding: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966; M. for copies,* 1201.
Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Laurier*) 133.
North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1388.
Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Ry. Co. Subsidy to: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445.
Pilots for and above Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 655.
Porpoise Fishing at River Ouelle: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.
Provincial Claim against Dom.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.
Provincial Debt to Canada: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 199.
Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1193.
Railway Bridge at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Bossé*) 1635.
Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 69 (*Mr. Bossé*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 271; in Com. and 3°*, 1035. (47 *Vic., c.* 78.)
Ry. Subsidy to: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444.
Ste. Anne and St. André, Surveys in: M. for Ret.* (*Mr Blondeau*) 1199.
St. Césaire Postmaster, Charges against: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.
St. Clotilde Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 1273.
St. Francis River Explorations: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 820.
St. Gilles, Daily Mail for: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 73.
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.
St. Jean Port Joli Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.
St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1493.

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
School of Navigation: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
Skiffington *vs.* Michaud and Dumais: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.
Subsidy to: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 883.
Survey Contract No. 10, Transfer of: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Billy*) 1201.
Tidal Dock, further provision B. No. 148 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1581; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1618, (47 *Vic., c.* 9.)
Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C. P. R.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Houde*) 41.
Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Curran*) 798.
Yamaska River, Explorations on: M. for copies of Rep.* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
Quebec and Montreal Pilots Incorp. B. No. 18 (*Mr. Amyot*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 89; preamble not proven.
QUEEN AND MERCER, NOTES AND JUDGMENT OF PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 74.
Queen's Bench, Puisne Judge for, Man., Salary, &c., B. No. 146 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; 1°* of B., 1549; 2° and in Com., 1622; recom. and 3°*, 1627. (47 *Vic., c.* 13.)
RACEWAY BETWEEN FEEDER OF WELLAND CANAL AND CHIPPEWA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
Railway Act, 1879, Consolidated, Amt. B. No. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*). 1°*, 131; 2°, 460; wthdn., 986.
Railway Act, Consolidated, further Act Amt. B. No. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°, 1322; 2° m., 1576; 2° and in Com., 1577; 3° m., 1591; recom., 1594; 3°*, 1595. (47 *Vic., c.* 11.)
RAILWAY BONUSES GRANTED BY MUNICIPALITIES AND PROV. GOVT. OF ONT.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.
RAILWAYS, BONUSES TO, PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.
RAILWAY BRIDGE AT QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Bossé*) 1635.
Railway Commissioners, Court of, for Canada B. No. 8 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 31.
RAILWAY CROSSINGS ON ROADS AND STREETS: Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1273.
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Rep. presented, 43.
RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 843, 1474.
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
RAILWAYS, CAPITAL: in Com. of Sup., C. P. R., 1046–1049, 1348–1350, conc., 1449, 1460; I. C. R., 1049–1050, 1344–1347, 1627–1628; P. E. I. Ry., 1347.
Railways, Subsidies to, authorization B. No. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1530; deb. adjd., 1543; rsmd., 1549; Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Res. conc.

in (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576; 1°* of B., 1576; 2°* and in Com., 1624; recom. and 3°*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 8.) [For Deb. *see* "SUBSIDIES."]

RAILWAYS, SUBSIDIES TO: M. for O. C., &c.* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.

RAILWAYS. *See* respective headings.

Rancher's Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 74 (*Mr Ross*). 1°*, 198; 2°*, 271; wthdn.

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS, &c.; M. for copies* (*Mr Cockburn*) 1200.

Real Estate Loan Co. of Canada B. No. 88 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 285; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 1035. (47 *Vic., c.* 101.)

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE CHARGEABLE TO CONSOLIDATED FUND: M. for Rets.* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 140, 1200.

RECIPROCITY: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Davies*) 1176; Deb. (*Mr. Hackett*) 1182; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1184; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1186; (*Mr. Mills*) 1188; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 1188; (*Messrs. Kirk, Fisher* and *Cameron, Inverness*) 1189; neg. (Y. 60, N. 105) 1190.

"RECORD, PATENT:" in Com. of Sup., 1089.

Redemption of Small Loans Authorization B. No. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 3.)

RED RIVER BRIDGE AT EMERSON: in Com. of Sup., 1348.

RED RIVER, REMOVAL OF SAND BAR AT: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.

REDUCTION IN LETTER POSTAGE: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.

Reformatory at Halifax for Juvenile Offenders B. No. 141 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°* —; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1621. (47 *Vic., c.* 45.)

REFUND OF DUTIES TO MERCHANTS IN P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 1312; conc., 1453.

REFUND OF SUPERANNUATION CONTRIBUTIONS: Ques. (*Mr. Curran*) 285.

REFUND TO GOVT. OF N. B., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1627

REGINA AS CAPITAL OF THE N. W. LOCATION, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 37.

REGINA TOWN RESERVE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

REGION NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS IN THE N. W.: prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1635.

REGULATINNS CONCERNING THE SALE AND MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS: M. for copies (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

REID, W. G., REFUND TO: in Com. of Sup., 1382.

REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS: Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 965.

REPORTS PRESENTED:

Adulteration of Food (*Mr. Costigan*) 1321.

Agriculture (*Mr. McLelan*) 1055.

Auditor General (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 27.

Census of Canada, Vol. 2 (*Mr. McLelan*) 1322.

Indian Affairs (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 68.

Inland Revenue (*Mr. Costigan*) 27.

REPORTS PRESENTED—*Continued.*

Interior (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 814.

Library of Parliament (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.

Marine and Fisheries (*Mr. McLelan*) 260.

Public Accounts (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 27.

Public Works (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 27.

Railways and Canals (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 43.

Trade and Navigation (*Mr. Bowell*) 27.

Weights and Measures (*Mr. Costigan*) 1321.

Representation, Dual, Repeal B. No. 13 (*Mr. Ouimet*). 1°*, 40; M. for 2°, neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144.

Representation of the Territories in the House of Commons, B. No. 110 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 598; 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.

RETURNING OFFICERS, CLAIMS OF: in Com. of Sup., 1339; conc., 1459, 1611.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:

A, B AND C BATTERIES, Officers, &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 808.

ACTS, PROVINCIAL, Disallowance of, &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.

ACCIDENTS ON INTERCOL. RY.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.

ADMINISTRATION OF AFFAIRS in the N.W. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE N. W. T., Appointment of (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES and Mechanical Arts, Essays on (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.

AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, Expenses of Com. on (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.

AGRICULTURAL LANDS, &c.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

AMERO, ROGER, Arrest of, &c. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 622.

AMHERSTBURG CUSTOMS HOUSE and Post Office, Site for (*Mr. Lister*) 83; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 297.

ANTIGONISH PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Expenditure on* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.

ARBITRATORS. *See* "Dominion" and "Official."

AUDET, ALPHONSE, Appointment of* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.

BANKS, GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

BEAUMONT, EXPROPRIATION OF* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200.

BOND, GRINDING IN (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

BONUSES TO RYS., Provincial and Municipal (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.

BONUSES TO RYS., by Municipalities and Provincial Govt. of Ont.* (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, Claims paid* (*Mr. Fortin*) 140.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, Owners of and Tonnage of Vessels applying for same and refused* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67.

BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF IRON (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

BOUNDARIES, MAN., Extension of* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.

BOW RIVER TIMBER LANDS, Sales of (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.

BRASSARD AND BOSHEBS, Messrs. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.

BRAZIL, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

BRITISH COLUMBIA. *See* general heading.

BREAKWATER, INGONISH, Engineers Rep., &c. (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.

BREAKWATER, POINT ESCUMINAC, N. B. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.

BREAKWATER, ST. PETER'S, P.E.I.* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.

BUILDINGS, PUBLIC, Cost of, &c. (*Mr. Lister*) 41.

CALGARY, SUPPLY FARM No. 20 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44.

CALLANDER AND GRAVENHURST Railway Subsidy (*Mr. Cockburn*) 49.

CANADA, G. T. R. decrying Credit of* (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 762.

CANADIAN EXPRESS CO., Transport of Militia Supplies* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 523.

CANADIAN LOAN, proposed, of $4,000,000, Departmental Orders and Advertisements* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY. *See* general heading.

CARON, CLOVIS, Complaints against* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1200.

CATTLE TRADE, LIVE, with Great Britain* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.

CAUSALTIES, &c., on the Intercol. Ry.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

CHABOT, L. and C., Copies of Petitions of, to Dominion Arbitrators* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.
CHAPLEAU, S. E. ST. ONGE, Appointment of as Sheriff in the N.W.T. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 145.
CHINESE IMMIGRATION (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 616.
CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
CLAIMS OF PROV. OF QUEBEC against Dominion* (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.
CLOTHING FOR THE MILITIA, Manufacture of* (*Mr. Vail*) 1201.
COAL OIL BARRELS, Seizure of, at Sandwich, &c. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.
COAL ENTERED EX-WAREHOUSE, Free or for Export* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
COAL LANDS IN THE N. W., Sales and Leases* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
COAL CARRIED ON INTERCOL. RY. and by Steamboat and Sailing Vessel from N. S. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 65.
COLONIZATION PLANS Nos. 1 and 2, Applications under* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
COMMERCIAL TREATIES between Canada and Foreign Powers (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
COMMISSIONER TO ENGLAND. *See* "High Commissioner."
COMMISSION ON INTERCOL RY. CLAIMS, Sittings of (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
COMMITTEE ON TARIFF and Agricultural Interests, Expenses of (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.
CONFEDERATION, EXPENDITURE for Public Works since (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.
CONSOLIDATED FUND, Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 140, 1200.
CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT, 1879, Railway Co.'s Returns under* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
CORN AND CORNMEAL, Imports and Exports (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 83.
CORNWALL CANAL, Enlargement* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
COTTON DUCK, Drawback on* (*Mr. Kirk*) 624.
COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN, Charges against (*Mr. Wilson*) 59.
COX, Mr., POSTMASTER AT WHEATLEY, Charges against (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
CUBA, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES Collected on Intoxicating Liquors imported for Consumption* (*Mr. McCraney*) 67.
CUSTOMS HOUSE AND POST OFFICE at Amherstburg, Sale of Land for* (*Mr. Lister*) 83.
CUSTOMS, COLLECTOR OF, at Napanee (*Mr. Allison, Lennox*) wthdn., 208.
CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, Increase of, at Ports in Inverness, N.S. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 462.
DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS IN B. C. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 414.
DEPOSITS OF GOVT. MONEY in Banks* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
DESERTERS FROM THE U. S. ARMY arrested on Canadian Territory (*Mr. Guillet*) 86; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.
DEWDNEY, LIEUT.-GOV., Absence of (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.
DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS, &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.
DISPUTED TERRITORY* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
DOMINION ARBITRATORS, copies of Petitions of E. Gosselin, L. Chabot, C. Chabot* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28; E. Dorion* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88; M. Leclerc,* 88.
DOMINION LANDS. *See* general heading.
DOMINION SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200.
DOMINION GRANGE, Memorial of* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.
DORION, EUSTACHE, claim of* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.
DRAWBACKS. *See* general heading.
DREDGES AND DUMPING SCOWS* (*Mr. Jackson*) 1201.
DRILL SHED, MONTREAL, Rebuilding of* (*Mr. Bernier*) 1201.
DRY DOCK in B. C.* (*Mr. Blake*) 79; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.
DUART, POSTMASTER AT (*Mr. Casey*) 509; M. for Pet.,* 1201.
DUTY ON FREIGHT CHARGES (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
EIGIN, COUNTY JUDGE OF, Charges against (*Mr. Wilson*) 59.
ELLSWORTH, ARREST OF, by U. S. soldiers (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.
EMIGRATION STATISTICS, Canada and U. S.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1199.
EMIGRANT BUILDING and Quarantine at Lévis (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.
ENGLAND, EXPENSES OF MEMBERS of the Government in* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.
ESCHEAT, MATTERS OF (*Mr. Blake*) 74.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

ESCUMINAC POINT, N. B., BREAKWATER (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, Payment on account of (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.
ESQUIMALT NAVAL STATION (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.
ESSAYS, &c., on Agricultural Industries (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.
EXCHANGE BANK, Govt. Deposits in (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 35.
EXPENDITURE, DEPARTMENTAL, on Sessional Returns (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
EXPENDITURE OF MONEYS for Public Works in each of the Provinces since Confederation (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.
EXPORTS, SUMMARY STATEMENT OF* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, STATEMENT OF, distinguishing products of Canada from those of other countries (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 1200.
EXPRESS CO.'S AGREEMENTS with Intercol. Ry. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.
FACTORY BILL, Cor. with the Manufacturers' Association or Trades and Labour Council, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
FAIRFORD RIVER, Lake Man., Improvement of (*Mr. Orton*) 208.
FINANCE MINISTER'S Mission to England (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 86.
FISH CREEK, Supply Farm No. 20 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44.
FISHERIES, BOUNTY IN AID OF* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67.
FISHERIES ACT, REGULATIONS UNDER, prohibiting Fishing in Ontario Waters (*Mr. Blake*) 71; Fines under* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 201.
FISHERIES EXHIBITION, Reps. of Commissioners (*Mr. Fortin*) 80.
FISHERIES BOUNTY, Claims paid* (*Mr. Fortin*) 140.
FISHERY CLAUSES OF WASHINGTON TREATY* (*Mr. Davies*) 1200.
FISHERY REGULATIONS, FINES UNDER* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 1201.
Fitzgerald Loss of the Barque (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
FLOUR AND WHEAT, Imports and Exports (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38
FORT MACLEOD PUBLIC BUILDINGS (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 619.
FORT MACLEOD TOWN SITE RESERVATION* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 624.
FORT SIMPSON INDIAN TROUBLES* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVES, Cancellation of Timber Licenses on (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
FRANCE, COMMERICAL TREATY WITH (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
FREIGHT CHARGES, DUTY ON (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
FREIGHT CHARGES, INTERCOL. RY. (*Mr. Innes*) 808.
GABOURY, J. E., Charges against* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.
GALT, Sir A. T., Claims or Allowances on account of, as High Commissioner (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
GAS FLOATING LIGHTS below Quebec (*Mr. Valin*) 217.
Gazette (MONTREAL) PRINTING CO., Sums paid to from 1874 to 1883 (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
GOLD MINING IN THE N. W. (*Mr. Lister*) 512.
GOODWIN, JAS., Claim of* (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.
GOSSELIN, EUGENE, Petition of, to Dominion Arbitrators* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS, Payments under* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S OATH* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S COMMISSION, &c. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 521.
GOVERNMENT HERD IN THE N. W. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.
GOVERNMENT MONEY on Dep. in Banks* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
GOVERNMENT DEPS. in Exchange Bank (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 35.
GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS on Intercol. Ry., Rolling Stock built in (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
GOVERNMENT LANDS in Richelieu Co. (*Mr. Amyot*) 1126.
GRAND TRUNK RY. Stockholders* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1200.
GRAND SOUTHERN RY., Conveyance of Mails (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.
GRAVING DOCK AT ESQUIMALT, Payment on account of (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.
GRAVENHURST AND CALLANDER RY. SUBSIDY (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40.
GRINDING IN BOND (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
GRIST AND SAW MILL South of Calgary (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 507.
GUERIN, Mr., Explorations on Yamaska River* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
H. M.'S SHIPS OF WAR in B. C. Waters (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
HAY, U. S. CUSTOMS DUTIES ON (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.
HEALTH OFFICERS, PUBLIC (*Mr. Platt*) 88.
HEARN, JAMES, SUPERANNUATION OF (*Mr. Kirk*) 1110.
HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Cost of (*Mr. Blake*) 83.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

HERRING, NEWFOUNDLAND, Inspection of (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.
HIGH COMMISSIONER. *See* general heading.
HODGE *vs.* THE QUEEN, Judgment of Judicial Committee of Privy Council and Shorthand Writer's Notes* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
HOME FARMS, respecting (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.
HOME OR SUPPLY FARM on Pincher Creek (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.
HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS South of the C. P. R.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS withdrawn from the Mile Belt* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
HOMESTEADS, Public Lands entered as* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
HUDSON BAY, Navigation of* (*Mr. Watson*) 71. *See* "Hudson Bay."
HUGHES, D. J. (County Judge of Elgin) Charges against (*Mr. Wilson*) 59.
HUTCHINSON, GEO., Allowance to* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.
INDIAN AGENT'S OFFICE, TORONTO, Closing of (*Mr. Cook*) 269.
INDIAN INSTRUCTION FARMS, respecting (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.
INDIAN RESERVE, FORT WILLIAM, Timber Licenses (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
INDIAN SUPPLIES FOR MAN. AND N. W.* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
INDIANS AT METLAKATLA AND FORT SIMPSON* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
INDIANS, WYANDOTTES OF ANDERDON* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.
IMMIGRATION, Report of High Commissioner on (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
IMMIGRATION TO MAN. AND THE N.W., Agreement between Govt. and C. P. R.* (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 83.
IMMIGRATION AGENTS, Number, Names, &c. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
IMMIGRANTS, APPLICATION FOR SERVICES (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 510.
IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN ONTARIO in the years 1879 to 1883 respectively* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS of Wheat, Flour, Corn and Cornmeal (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
IMPORTS, SUMMARY STATEMENT OF* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
INGONISH BREAKWATER, Engineer's Reps., &c. (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.
INSPECTION OF NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.
INSPECTION OF P. E. I. STEAMBOATS (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
INSPECTION OF VESSELS on Lakes Huron and Sup. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606.
INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES EXHIBITION, Reps. of Commissioners (*Mr. Fortin*) 80.
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
INTOXICATING LIQUORS. *See* general heading.
ISLANDS LEASED IN LAKE ONTARIO (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
IRON, BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF (*Mr. Blake*) 70.
JACK HEAD RIVER TIMBER LIMITS* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.
JACQUES, JAMES H., Appointment of (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.
JEMSEG, N.B., DREDGING AT (*Mr. King*) 295.
JUDICIAL SALARIES, Readjustment of (*Mr. Vail*) 58.
KAMLOOPS AND SPENCER'S BRIDGE, B.C., Mail Service, Tenders, &c.* (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.
KEARNEY, CHARLES, Appointment of (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.
KINGSVILLE HARBOUR WORKS (*Mr. Lister*) 216; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508
LABOUR TRADES COUNCIL and Factory Bill (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, Region north of (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.
LAKE ONTARIO, Islands leased in (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
LAND LEASES, PASTURE, granted in 1883 (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.
LAND REGULATIONS* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
LAND AND TOWN RESERVES (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
LAND SALES AND REBATES IN THE N.W.* (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.
LANDS SURVEYED IN MAN. AND N. W. T in 1883* (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.
LANDS ENTERED AS HOMESTEADS IN 1883* (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.
LANDS SOLD IN 1883 and price per acre* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
LANDS, TIMBERED, sold in Bow River County (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.
LAVALLIÈRE BAY EXPLORATIONS* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820
LEAMINGTON HARBOUR (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.
LEAMINGTON, ERECTION OF P. O. AT (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
LECLERC, MOISE, Claim of* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.
Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe, Payments to under Gov. Gen.'s Warrants* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 67.
LETTER POSTAGE, Reduction in (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.
LÉVIS EMIGRANT BUILDING AND QUARANTINE (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS' OATHS, &c. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 521.
LIFE-SAVING STATIONS, Life-boats, &c.* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199.
LIFE-SAVING CREW at Port Rowan (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
LIGHTS NORTH OF ISLAND OF ORLEANS (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
LINCENSES, TIMBER, CANCELLATION OF, on Indian Reserves (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
LIQUOR LICENSES AND PERMITS IN THE N.W. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.
LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, Correspondence between Govt. and Provincial Govts. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.
LOAN, PROPOSED CANADIAN, of $4,000,000, Departmental Orders and Advertisements* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.
LONG POINT LIGHTHOUSE, Repairs on* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.
LOTTERY FIRM AT ST. STEPHEN, N. B. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.
LUARD, MAJOR-GENERAL, Complaints against (*Mr. Mulock*) 621, 738.
MCCALLUM, W. A., Memorial of* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.
MCCOLLUM, E., Postmaster at Duart (*Mr. Casey*) 509.
MCCOURT, DANIEL, Dismissal of (*Mr. Blake*) 516.
MAIL SERVICE AT ST. GILES, St. Patrick and St. Sylvester (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.
MAIL SERVICE IN B. C. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; Tenders, &c.* (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.
MANITOBA, SUBSIDIES TO* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
MANITOBA, PERSONS entering and leaving for year* (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION AND FACTORY BILL (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
MAP SHOWING LOCATION OF C. P. R. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
MASTERS AND MATES CERTIFICATES (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606.
MECHANICAL ARTS and Agricultural Industries, Essays on (*Mr. Gigault*) 33
MEDICAL CERTIFICATES granted in P. E. I. under Temperance Act, 1878* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, St. John and Toronto* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1206.
METLAKATLA, B.C., INDIAN TROUBLES* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
MICHAUD AND DUMAIS, Skiffington *vs.* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.
MICHAUD, C., Rep. on Exploration of River St. Francis* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
MILITIA CLOTHING, Manufacture of* (*Mr. Vail*) 1201.
MILITIA. *See* general heading.
MILE BELT, Withdrawal of Lands from Homestead and Preemption* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
MINERAL LANDS, Sale of, &c.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
MINISTER OF RAILWAYS as High Commissioner (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
MOBERLY, FRANK, Memorial of* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.
MOCCASINS, PURCHASE OF, by Militia Dept.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.
MONEY ORDER REGULATIONS (*Mr. Blake*) 613.
MONEYS PAID BY DOM. to Local Govt. of Ont.* (*Mr. Farrow*) 1200.
MONTREAL DRILL SHED, Rebuilding of* (*Mr. Bernier*) 1201.
MOOSE JAW TOWN RESERVE (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
MORRISTOWN, N.S., PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.
MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES and Transport* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
MOUSSEAU, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, as Judge (*Mr. Laurier*) 133.
NAPANEE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS (*Mr. Allison, Lennox*) wthdn., 208.
NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.
NAVIGATION, SCHOOL OF, at Quebec (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
NELSON RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS IN (*Mr. Orton*) 208.
NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS, Delay in transmitting (*Mr. Sproule*) 216.
NEW BRUNSWICK, Mail Service in (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING, Inspection of (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.
NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING Co. and C. P. R.* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
Northern Light, Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
NORTH-WEST, ADMINISTRATION OF AFFAIRS (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, Members of* (*Mr. Mills*) 1200.
NORTH-WEST, SALES AND LEASES OF COAL LANDS (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES and other Provinces, Settlers in (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES, Appointment of Administrator (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

North-West Territories, Liquor Licenses and Permits (*Mr. Blake*) 73.

Nova Scotia Coal imported into the U. S. for Ocean Steamship purposes (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

Nova Scotia Railway* (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 65.

Oath or Oaths taken by Gov. Gen. and Lieut.-Governors* (*Mr. Landry*) 79; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 521.

O'Brien Jothan, Amount paid to on contract (*Mr Weldon*) 623.

O'Connor, Hon. John, Sums paid to (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

Official Arbitrators and Secretaries (*Mr. Blondeau*) 972.

Ontario and Quebec, Accounts with Canada* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

Ontario, Immigrants Settled in since 1879* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.

Ontario. *See* general heading.

Ontario, Waters of, Regulations under Fisheries Act prohibiting Fishing (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

Orleans Island, Lights north of (*Mr. Valin*) 218.

Pajot Farm and Claim of Indian Dept.* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.

Passes over Intercolonial Ry.* (*Mr Montplaisir*) 1201.

Pasture Land: Leases Granted in 1883 (*Mr. Charlton*) 73; Sale of, &c., 78.

Pelee Island Lighthouse, Repairs on* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.

Pincher Creek Supply Farm (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.

Point Escuminac, N. B., Breakwater (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.

Porpoise Fishery at River Ouelle (*Mr Blondeau*) 86.

Port Stanley, Harbour of Refuge (*Mr Wilson*) 519.

Port Rowan, Life-saving Crew at (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.

Port Townsend and Victoria, B.C., Mail Service (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.

Port Stanley Harbour Revenue (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.

Post Offices in operation in the Dominion (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.

Post Offices, Erection of (*Mr. Lister*) 800.

Postage, Letter, Reduction in (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.

Postal Statistics (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.

Postal Subsidies to C. P. R. Co. (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

Postmaster at Victoria, B.C. (*Mr Baker, Victoria*) 605.

Preemption Entries in 1883* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Preventive Officer at Morristown, N.S.* (*Mr McIsaac*) 140.

Prince Arthur's Landing and Kaministiquia Ry. Co., Bonuses to* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.

Prince Edward Island Ry., Names of Officers &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 298.

Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

Princess Louise, Steamer, Contract, &c., for building (*Mr. Weldon*) 35; Loss of: Reports of Capt. Scott on, 40; Contract for Building,* 623; Tenders for Steamer to replace,* 820.

Princess of Wales, Steamer, Rep. of Inspector, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

Privy Council, Judicial Committee of: Judgment and Shorthand Writers Notes *re* Hodge *vs.* The Queen and Russell *vs.* The Queen (*Mr. Blake*) 43.

Provincial Acts, Disallowance of, &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.

Provincial and Municipal Bonuses to Rys. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.

Provincial Subsidies under Confederation Act (*Mr. Ouimet*) 150.

Public Buildings, Antigonish, Expenditure on* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.

Public Buildings, Cost of, &c., since 1874 (*Mr. Lister*) 41.

Public Buildings, Cost of Heating (*Mr. Blake*) 83.

Public Health Officers (*Mr. Platt*, 88.

Public Lands Surveyed in Man. and N. W. T. (*Mr Charlton*) 78.

Public Works, Expenditure on in different Provinces, since Confederation (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.

Public Works, Salaries of Officers charged to (*Mr. Lister*) 82.

Pullman Car Co.'s Agreement with Intercol. Ry. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.

Queen and Mercer, Notes and Judgment of Privy Council (*Mr. Blake*) 74.

Quebec Central Ry. Co.* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.

Quebec, Prov. of, Claims against Dominion (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.

Quebec, Lieut.-Governors' Oaths* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.

Quebec School of Navigation (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.

Quebec. *See* general heading.

Railway Bonuses granted by Municipalities and Provincial Govt. of Ont.* (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

Railways, Bonuses to, Provincial and Municipal (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.

Railways, Subsidies to* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.

Rapide Plat Canal Enlargement* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.

Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 140, 1200.

Red River, Removal of Sand Bar at (*Mr. Orton*) 208.

Reduction in Letter Postage (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.

Regina Town Reserve (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

Regina as Capital of the N. W., Location, &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 37.

Regulations Concerning the Sale and Management of Public Lands* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

Richelieu County, Govt. Lands in* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1126.

Rideau Canal Extension* (*Mr. Taylor*) 1201.

Rideau Canal Water Supply* (*Mr. Bell*) 1200.

Rideau Hall and Grounds, Expenditure on* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.

River Ouelle Porpoise Fishery (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.

Rivers and Streams, Rental of* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 1201.

River St. Francis Explorations* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

River Thames Surveys* (*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex*) 1199.

Robertson, John, Claims of (*Mr. Blake*) 614.

Rolling Stock, Intercolonial Ry., Purchase of* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.

Rondeau Lighthouse, Repairs on* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.

Russell *vs.* The Queen, before Privy Council* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.

Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings of* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.

Salaries. Judicial, Readjustment of (*Mr. Vail*) 58.

Sales and Leases of Coal Lands in the N. W.* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

Sandwich, Seizure of Coal Oil Barrels at (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.

School of Navigation at Quebec (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.

Scott and Fuller, Messrs., Reps. of, *re* Claim for Fencing Parliament Grounds* (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.

Section B., Canadian Pacific Ry. (*Mr. Casey*) 77; Arbitrators' Rep.,* 1200.

Seizures at Ports of Entry and Fines exacted (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

Senate Expenditure* (*Mr. McMullen*) 1200.

Sessional Returns, Expenditure on (*Mr. Blake*) 83.

Settlers in N. W. T. and other Provinces (*Mr. Blake*) 49.

Settlers' or Squatters' Claims on Town Reserves along line of C. P. R. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75; within Mile Belt,* 79.

Shipbuilding Materials, Drawbacks on* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.

Shorthand Writers' Notes, *re* Hodge *vs.* The Queen and Russell *vs.* The Queen, before Privy Council* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.

Sick and Distressed Mariners, Exemption of Fishing Vessels from payment of Duties for relief of (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 216.

Sir James Douglas, Steamer, Expenditure on (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514; Names of Crew, &c., 514; Repairs, &c.,* 1200.

Sinnot, John, Contract with* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.

Skiffington, Detective (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.

Solway, Postmaster at, Appointment* (*Mr. Wells*) 1200.

Spain, Commercial Treaty with (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

Steam Dredges and Dumping Scows* (*Mr. Jackson*) 1201.

St. Francis River Explorations* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

St Césaire, Postmaster at* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.

St. Charles Branch, Expropriation of Beaumont* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200.

St. Charles Branch, Intercol. Ry. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.

St. Croix Cotton Factory, Importations of Machinery (*Mr. Innes*) 808.

St. George Mail Service (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.

St. Giles, St. Patrick and St. Sylvester Mail Service (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.

St. Jean Port Joli, Extension of Wharf at (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.

St. John and Maine Ry., Conveyance of Mails on (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.

St. Lawrence Canals, Expenditure on* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.

St. Lawrence Canals, Rapide Plat and Cornwall, Enlargement* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.

St. Lawrence River, Islands leased in (*Mr. Platt*) 87.

St. Lawrence, Steamer, Inspector's Rep. on Condition of, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

St. Peter's Harbour, P.E.I., Breakwater* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.
St. Stephen and Woodstock Mail Service (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.
St. Stephen's Post Office Receipts (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.
St. Thomas Post Office and Custom House (*Mr. Wilson*) 92.
Ste. Anne and St. André Surveys* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1199.
Sugar, Drawback on* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
Subsidies to Manitoba* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
Subsidies to Provinces under Confederation Act (*Mr Ouimet*) 150.
Subsidies to Railways* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
Subsidy to the Gravenhurst and Callander Railway (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40.
Subsidy to Quebec, Readjustment of* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200.
Superannuation Fund (*Mr. McMullen*) 65.
Superannuation Fund of the Civil Service* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
Superannuation of Jas. Heaan (*Mr. Kirk*) 1110.
Supply Farm No. 20, Fish Creek (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44.
Supply Farm on Pincher Creek (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.
Supreme Court Judgment *re* Sale, &c., of Intoxicating Liquors* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
Survey Contract No. 10* (*Mr. Billy*) 1201.
Survey of Public Lands in Man. and N. W. T. in 1883* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Swan Creek and Lake, Surveys (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 605.
Switzer, Franklin, Arrest of, by U. S. soldiers (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.
Tariff and Agricultural Interests, Expenses, &c., of Com. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.
Tents, Purchase of, by Militia Dept.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.
Temperance Act, 1878, Medical Certificates under, in P. E. I.* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.
Territorial Administration of the N. W. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
Territory, Violation of neutrality by U. S. Troops* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.
Timbered Lands sold in Bow River Country (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.
Timber Lands, Sale of, &c.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Timber Licenses and Permits (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Timber Licenses, Cancellation of, on Indian Reserves (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
Timber Limits on Jack Head River* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.
Town Reserves in the N.W. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
Townsend, Port, and Victoria, B.C., Mail Service (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
Town Sites, Sale of, &c.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
Transport of Wheat through U. S. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
Transport, Requisitions and Vouchers rendered by Canadian Express Co.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 523.
Treaties, Commercial, between Canada and Foreign Powers (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
Treatises, &c., on the Mechanical Arts (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.
Union Jacques Cartier Railway, Opening of (*Mr. Houde*) 41.
Upper Woods Harbour N. S., Wharf and Bridge* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1199.
United States, Commercial Treaty with (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
United States Customs Duties on Hay (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.
United States Customs, Regulations respecting Transport of Wheat (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
United States, N. S. Coal imported into, for Ocean Steamship purposes (*Mr. Blake*) 70.
United States Soldiers in Canada (*Mr. Guillet*) 86; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.
United States, Wheat and Flour importations (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.
Vice-Admiralty Courts, Change of Procedure in* (*Mr. Welden*) 65
Victoria, B.C., City Postmastership (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
Volunteers of 1837 and 1838 (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 89.
Warrants, Gov. Gen.'s, issued to *Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe*, &c. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.
Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses* (*Mr. Davies*) 1200.
Watson, C. T., Payments to, for Services* (*Mr. Wilson*) 820.
Watson, Henry, Arrest of, by U.S. soldiers (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.
Welland Canal, Expenditure on* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
Wheat and Flour Imported from U. S. and Duty collected* (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

Wheat and Flour, Imports and Exports (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against (*Mr. Lister*) 694.
Wheat, Transport of, through U.S. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
Whitcher, W. F, Retirement of* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
Windsor and Walkerville, Seizure of Coal Oil Barrels at (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.
Woodstock and St. Stephen Mail Service (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.
Wyandotte Indians, Claim to Pajot Farm* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.
Yamaska River Explorations* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

Returns, Imperfect: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 198, 459, 671, 1127, 1128.

Returns, Missing, *re* P.E. County Mail Service: remarks (*Mr. Platt*) 459.

Returns, Preparation of, Extra Clerks Services: in Com. of Sup., 1381.

Richardson, H., Allowance for Rent: in Com. of Sup., 1379.

Richey, Mr. M. H.: notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

Richelieu County, Sale of Govt. Lands in: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 1109; M. for Ret.,* 1126.

Rideau Canal Extension: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Taylor*) 1201.

Rideau Canal, Water Supply: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Bell*) 1200.

Rideau Hall and Grounds, Expenditure on: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1200.

Rideau Hall Festivities: Adjournment for (M.) 513.

Rifle Associations, Further Aid to, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.

Rifled Ordnance, Improved: in Com. of Sup., 1166.

Rigby, Mr. Justice: Rep. on Lunenburg Controverted Election, 1.

Rivière du Loup Town Branch, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1344. *See* "Intercol. Ry."

River Ouelle, Porpoise Fishery: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.

River St. Francis Explorations: M. for Rep.* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

Rivers and Streams, Rental of: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 1201.

River Thames Surveys: M. for Reps, &c.* (*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex*) 1199.

Robertson, John, Claims of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 614.

Rochette, Fabien, for Land taken, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1345.

Rolling Stock, Intercol. Ry., Purchase of: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.

Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa B. No. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*). 1°*, 304; 2°*, 504; in Com., 889; 3° on a div., 890. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 104.)

Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac Incorp. B. No. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*). 1°*, 260; 2°*, 504; in Com., 888; 3°*, 889. (47 *Vic.*, *c.* 105.)

Rondeau Lighthouse, Repairs on: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 230.

Ross, Mr. G. W.: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 664, 1654.

Royal Canadian Insurance Co.'s reduction of Directorate B. No. 53 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; preamble not proven.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com of Sup., 1162.

ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS OF: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66; in Com. of Sup., 1374.

RULE, SUSPENSION OF: M. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1241.

RUSSELL *vs.* THE QUEEN, JUDGMENT OF AND SHORTHAND WRITER'S NOTES BEFORE PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copies.* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.

RUSSIAN LEATHER PERMEATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1165.

ST. ANDREW'S AND LACHUTE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.

ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.

ST. CHARLES BRANCH, EXPROPRIATION OF BEAUMONT: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200. *See* "INTERCOLONIAL RY."

St. Clair River Tunnel Co. Incorp. B. No. 62 (*Mr. Macmaster*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 199; M. for Com., 603; in Com., and 3°*, 665; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic., c.* 82.)

ST. CLOTILDE POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 1273.

ST. CROIX COTTON FACTORY, IMPORTATION OF MACHINERY: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Innes*) 808.

ST. FRANCIS RIVER EXPLORATIONS: M. for Rep.* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.

ST. GEORGE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.

ST. GILES, ST. PATRICK AND ST. SYLVESTER MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.

ST. GILES, DAILY MAIL FOR: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 73.

ST. HYACINTHE POST OFFICE, ERECTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.

ST. JEAN PORT JOLI, EXTENSION OF WHARF AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.

ST. JÉROME AND NEW GLASGOW RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.

ST. JOHN AND MAINE RY., CONVEYANCE OF MAILS ON: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.

ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.

ST. JOHN RIVER, BRIDGE ACROSS: in Com. of Sup., 1627.

St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. (Bondholders voting) B. No. 56 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 271; in Com., and 3°*, 715; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic., c.* 76.)

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201; in Com. of Sup., 1051.

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, RAPIDE PLAT AND CORNWALL, TENDER FOR ENLARGEMENT: M. for copies.* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, ISLANDS LEASED IN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.

"ST. LAWRENCE." *See* "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."

ST. LOUIS AND RICHIBUCTO RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.

ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION AND QUEBEC RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1492–1496.

ST. MARTIN'S TO QUEBEC, NORTH SHORE RY. BETWEEN: Ques. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1388.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY: Adjournment for (M.) 884.

ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1053; PERLEY, H. F., SERVICES, 1350; conc., 1460.

ST. PETER'S HARBOUR, P. E. I., BREAKWATER: M. for copy* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.

ST. STEPHEN AND WOODSTOCK MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.

ST. STEPHEN'S POST OFFICE RECEIPTS: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.

ST. THOMAS POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 92; in Com of Sup., 1194.

ST. VINCENT, CUSTOMS EXAMINATION OF BAGGAGE AT: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1444.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 999.

STE. ANNE AND ST. ANDRÉ SURVEYS: M. Ret.* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1199.

STE. ANNE CANAL: in Com. of Sup. 1052.

SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES, HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1627.

SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES, CANAL OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 1261.

SALARIES OF JUDGES, EQUALIZATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 40; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Vail*) 58.

SALE OF POSTAGE STAMPS AT WINDSOR: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.

SALES AND LEASES OF COAL LANDS IN THE N. W.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

SANDWICH, SEIZURE OF COAL OIL BARRELS AT: M. for Papers (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.

San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 33 (*Mr. Royal*). 1°*, 231; 2°, 505; wthdn.

SANITARY JOURNALS, SUBSIDIES TO: Ques. (*Mr. Hickey*) 1387.

SASKATCHEWAN, DIOCESE OF. *See* "SYNOD."

Saskatoon and Northern Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 41 (*Mr. Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 897. (47 *Vic., c.* 85.)

SAVINGS BANKS, GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 828.

SCHOOL OF GUNNERY, FORTIFICATIONS AND MILITIA, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.

SCHOOL OF NAV. AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1254.

SCOTT ACT IN CUMBERLAND CO.: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 736; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1548.

SCOTT AND FULLER, MESSRS., REPORTS OF, *re* CLAIMS FOR FENCING PARLT. GROUNDS: M. for copies* (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.

Seamen's Act, 1873, Amt. B. No. 116 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B, 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°*, 1175. (47 *Vic., c.* 19.)

SECTION B, C. P. R. ARBITRATORS OR COMMISSIONERS ON: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 1386.

SECTION B, C. P. R., AWARD OF ARBITRATORS: in Com. of Sup., 1650; on conc. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1645; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1646; (*Mr. Davies*) 1648; (*Mr. Allison, Hants*) 1649; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1649; (*Mr. Mills*) 1650; conc. in (Y. 82, N. 34) 1651.

SECTION B., C. P. R., TRANSFER OF CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 77; Arbitrators Rep.,* 1200.

SECRETARY OF STATE, DEPT. OF, CHIEF CLERKS IN: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797; in Com. of Sup., 837, 1474.

Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths further Act. Amt. B. No. 100 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1° on a div., 468.

Seduction, &c. (Criminal Law) Amt. B. No. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°*, 28; 2° m., 141; in Com., 286; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to recom., agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) to recom., 666; M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to adjn. deb., 668; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; rsmd., 980; Amt. to Amt. 6 m. h., (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) neg., 980; *killed in Sen.*

SEIZURES AT PORTS OF ENTRY AND FINES EXACTED; M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

SELECT COMMITTEES. *See* "COMMITTEES."

SENATE EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McMullen*) 1200.

SENATE, FRENCH REPRESENTATION IN: Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 1549.

SERGEANT AT ARMS, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1002.

Saskatchewan, South, Valley Railway Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 10 (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°*, 40; 2°*, 88; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 71.)

SESSIONAL INDEMNITIES: in Com. of Sup., 1339, 1475, 1608.

SESSIONAL RETURNS, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.

SETTLERS IN N. W. T. AND OTHER PROVINCES DURING THE YEAR: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 49.

SETTLERS' LANDS PAYMENTS ON: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.

SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' CLAIMS ON TOWN RESERVES ALONG LINE OF C.P.R.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' CLAIMS WITHIN THE MILE BELT: M. for O. C.* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.

SHIPBUILDING COMPANIES. *See* respective headings.

SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, DRAWBACKS ON: M. for copies of Claims* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.

Shipwrecks, Enquiries and Investigations into, Act. Amt. B. No. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., 763; in Com. and 1°* of B., 764; 2° and in Com., 1131; 3° m., 1170; 3°, 1293. (47 *Vic., c.* 22.)

SHORTHAND WRITERS' NOTES *re* HODGE *vs.* THE QUEEN AND RUSSELL *vs.* THE QUEEN, BEFORE PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copies* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS' ACT AMT.: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 269; reference to Notice on Order Paper, 269.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, EXEMPTION OF FISHING VESSELS FROM PAYING DUTIES TO FUND: Ques. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 199; M. for O. C., &c., 216.

Sick and Distressed Mariners, Relief of, B. No. 129. (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and 1°* of B. 1126; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1360. (47 *Vic., c.* 21.)

SIFTON & WARD, RED RIVER AND CROSS LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1350.

SIGNAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1234.

"SIMCOE," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

SIMCOE, SOUTH, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.

SINNOT, JOHN, CONTRACT WITH: M. for copy* (*Mr. Mc Intyre*) 1200.

"SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514; Names, Officers and Crew, &c., 514; Repairs, &c.: M. for Cor.* 1200.

"SIR JAMES DOUGLAS:" in Com. of Sup., 1227.

SKIFFINGTON, DETECTIVE: M. for copies of Reports (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.

SLOGGETT, Mr. *See* "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."

SMITH & RIPLEY (Georgian Bay Branch C. P. R.): in Com. of Sup., 1349.

SMITH, H. H., EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 261, 457.

SMYTH, Mr. HENRY: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1; return of, 198; introduced, 200.

SOLWAY, POSTMASTER AT, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Wells*) 1200.

SOULANGES: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1; Judgment of Supreme Court, 735.

Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 81. (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 231; 2°*, 504; in Com., and 3°*, 979. (47 *Vic., c.* 72.)

Sovereign Fire Ins. Co.'s winding-up B. No. 94 (*Mr. Mackenzie*). 1°*, 304; 2°*, 542; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 90.)

SPAIN AND U. S., FLAG TREATY BETWEEN: on M. for Com. of Sup., (*Mr. Vail*) 1361.

SPAIN, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, 2, 1654. [For the Address, *see* "Address."]

Speedy Trials of Felonies and Misdemeanours in Ont., &c., B. No. 99 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 457.

Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Coal and Ry. Co.'s winding-up B. No. 47 (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°*, 131; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 530. (47 *Vic., c.* 77.)

STAIRS, Mr. J. FITZ-WILLIAM: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.

STANDING ORDERS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.

STATION ACCOMMODATION, C. P. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1049; conc., 1449.

STATIONERY OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 987.

STATISTICS, AGRICULTURAL, INDUSTRIAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1095.

STATISTICS, CRIMINAL: in Com. of Sup., 1089.

STATISTICS, HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 1094; conc., 1440.

STATUTES:
Appointment of a French Canadian: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 73.
Distribution of: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 797.
Expenses in connection with Consolidation: in Com. of Sup., 1202; conc., 1453.
Purchase of Type: in Com. of Sup., 1379; conc., 1464.
Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.
STAYNER, POSTMASTER AT: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 1109.
Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. No. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 765; 1°* of B., 766; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1058. (47 *Vic., c.* 20.)
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1255.
STEAMBOAT INSPECTORS' REP.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 460.
STEAM DREDGE AND DUMPING SCOWS: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Jackson*) 1201.
STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 994.
STONE FOR NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 736.
SUBSIDIES:
Applications by Ry. Co.'s., Names, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 264.
Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 1049.
Grants or Payments to Rys.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.
Gravenhurst and Callander Ry.: M. for copies of Cor. &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40.
Mail Subsidies and Subventions. *See* "SUPPLY."
Manitoba, Grants to, *re* Boundary, Disputed Territory, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
Provincial, Readjustment of, B. No. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1215; M. for Com., 1553; in Com., 1584; 1°* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 4.)
Provincial, under Confederation Act: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 150.
Rys., authorization B. No. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1530; Deb. adjd., 1543; rsmd., 1549; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Res. conc. in (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576; 1°* of B., 1576; 2°* and in Com., 1624; recom. and 3°*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 8.)
RYS.: Prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; speech, 1479; in Com., 1486–1511; on conc., Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1517: Deb. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 1530; (*Mr. Laurier*) 1539; (*Mr. Girouard*) 1549; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; (*Mr. Houde*) 1552; correction (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1553; (*Mr. Girouard*) 1556; (*Mr. Valin*) 1556; (*Mr. Bossé*) 1557; (*Mr. Béchard*) 1558; (*Mr. Tassé*) 1559; (*Mr. Fisher*) 1563; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1564; (*Mr. Blake*) 1568; (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) 1572.
SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*
Sums paid by Can. to Ry. Co.'s under 46 Vic., c. 4: M. for O. C., &c.* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
Rys. under 46 *Vic., c.* 25: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Dupont*) 261; Deb. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 264; (*Mr. Wright*) 268; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 268; (*Mr. Vail*) 269; (*Mr. Stairs*) 269.
Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 883; Readjustment of: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200.
Sanitary Journals: Ques. (*Mr. Hickey*) 1387.
SUGAR, DRAWBACK ON: M. for copies of Memorials, &c.* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
Summary Conviction and duties of Justices of the Peace out of Session further Act Amt. B. No. 137 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1386; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 1618. (47 *Vic., c.* 43.)
"SUMMERSIDE." *See* "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."
Sunday Excursions, Prevention of, B. No. 112 (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°*, 655.
SUPERANNUATION CONTRIBUTIONS, REFUND OF: Ques. (*Mr. Curran*) 285.
SUPERANNUATION FUND OF THE CIVIL SERVICE: M. for Stmnts.* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
SUPERANNUATION FUND: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 65.
SUPPLY:
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]
Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Estimates for 1884-85, 145; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1883-84, 1240; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1884-85, 1439; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting further Suppl. Estimates for 1884-85, 1576.
Res. for Com., 28; in Com., 825, 987; Res. in Amt.: High Commissionership for Canada (*Mr. Mills*) 1039; in Com., 1046; Res. in Amt.: Immigration and Emigration (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1063; in Com., 1088; Res. in Amt.: North-West Grievances (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1138; in Com., 1158; Res. in Amt.: Reciprocity (*Mr. Davies*) 1176; in Com., 1190, 1218, 1254, 1294; Res. in Amt.: Public Expenditure (*Mr. Charlton*) 1322; in Com., 1333, 1361, 1404, 1423, 1466, 1602, 1626.
COMMITTEE:
Administration of Justice:
Duval, G., Précis Writer, Supreme Court, Statutory increase, 1474.
Miscellaneous Justice, 994.
Supreme and County Court Judges, Man., 994.
Supreme Court of Canada, 994.
Travelling Expenses, Stipendiary Magistrates, N. W. T., 994.
Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec, 995.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics, 1095.
Archives, Care of, &c., 1088.
Census, 1091.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Continued.
Criminal Statistics, 1089.
Dominion Exhibition, 1093.
Health Statistics, 1094; conc., 1440.
Patent Record, 1089.
Charges of Management, 825–832.
Civil Government:
Agriculture, Dept. of, 842; suppl., 1337.
Auditor-General's Office, 841.
Civil Service Board, 988; 1336; conc., 1459, 1610.
Contingencies, Departmental, 843.
High Commissioner, 987; 1336; conc., 1440.
Post Office and Finance Depts., 987.
Customs, Dept. of, 841.
Finance, Dept. of, and Treasury Board, 841.
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832.
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 840; suppl., 1336, 1467, 1474.
Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 841; suppl., 1335.
Interior, Dept. of, 838; suppl., 1466.
Justice, Dept. of, 833.
Penitentiaries Branch, 833.
Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, 842; suppl., 1467.
Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 833; suppl., 1334; conc., 1440.
Postmaster-Gen.'s Dept., 842; suppl., 1336, 1627.
Privy Council Office, 833; 1333, 1336, 1627.
Public Works, Dept. of, 843.
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 843; suppl., 1335.
Secretary of State, Dept. of, 837; suppl., 1474.
Stationery Office, 987.
Collection of Revenues:
Adulteration of Food: Expenses under Act, 1318.
Canals—Maintenance and Repairs: Salaries and Contingencies Canal Officers, 1261.
Culling Timber: Montreal and Quebec, 1317; conc., 1457.
Customs: Salaries, &c., of the several Ports, 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.
Excise: Refund to W. G. Reid, 1382; Salaries, &c., of Officers and Inspectors, 1316; suppl., 1608.
Liquor License Act: Expenditure in Putting Act into operation, 1382; conc., 1453.
Minor Revenues: Dominion Lands, 1318.
Post Office: Mail Service, Salaries and Miscellaneous, 1319; conc., 1458; Additional Amount required for year, 1383.
Public Works: Agent and Contingencies, B. C., 1318; Steamer *Newfield*, Cost of working, 1318; conc., 1458; Telegraph Lines, B. C., 1318.
Railways—Repairs, &c.: Intercolonial Ry., 1256; conc., 1449; Prince Edward Island Ry., 1258; Windsor Branch Ry., 1261.
Weights and Measures and Gas: Miall, E., Commissioner of Standards, allowance, 1382.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes, Examination of, 1384.
Dominion Lands—Income:
Settlement of Land Claims, 1385.
Dominion Police, 997; suppl., 1338.
Fisheries:
Fishery Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c., 1234.
Fishing Bounty, Distribution of, Services, 1369; conc., 1617.
International Fishery Exhibition, 1369.
Geological Survey, 1261; conc., 1450.
Immigration, 1404–1422; suppl., 1602; conc., 1464.
Indians:
Annual Grant to Supplement Fund—Ont., Que., and Maritime Provinces, 1263.
British Columbia—Indians generally, Surveys, &c., 1266; suppl., 1372; conc., 1617.
Manitoba and the North-West—Annuities, &c., 1269; suppl., 1373; conc., 1450, 1610.
Mission School at Fort William, 1608.
Prince Edward Island—Indians generally, 1266.
Printing Vocabularies of Dialects, B. C., 1608.
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Claims of Returning Officers, 1339; conc., 1459, 1611.
Publishing Debates, 1002; suppl., 1339.
Salaries and Contingencies (Sergeant at Arms) 1002.
Sessional Indemnities, 1339; suppl., 1475, 1608.
Senate:
Salaries and Contingencies, 1002; suppl., 1627.
Miscellaneous:
Library, Salaries and Contingencies, 1002; suppl., 1602.
Miscellaneous Printing, 1009.
Printing, Printing Paper, &c., 1004; conc., 1440.
Purchase of Works on America, 1009.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 1232.
Buoys and Beacons, Montreal Harbour, 1369.
Lighthouse and Fog-alarms, construction of, 1233; conc., 1443.
Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., 1232.
Lights, Fog-whistles, Buoys and Beacons, &c., Maintenance and Repairs, 1233; suppl., 1369.
Signal Stations, 1234.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and Antwerp, 1301.
Canada and West Indies and Brazil, 1299; conc., 1453.
France and Quebec, 1300.
Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland, 1298.
Halifax and St. John, *vid* Yarmouth, 1298; conc., 1453.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions—Continued.
Halifax and St. Pierre, 1301.
Lakes Huron and Superior, 1298; conc., 1452.
Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax, 1301.
Magdalen Islands, 1298.
United States and Victoria, B.C., 1298.
Militia:
A, B and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c., 1164.
Ammunition, &c., 1019.
Artillery competition at Shoeburyness (wthdn.) 1166.
Cavalry and Infantry Schools, 1165.
Clothing and Great Coats, 1020; suppl., 1343.
Contingencies, &c., Artillery and Rifle Associations, &c., 1158.
Dominion Rifle Association, 1159; suppl., 1602.
Drill Instruction, Allowance for, 1096.
Drill Pay and incidental Expenses, 1098.
Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, 1160.
Manitoba, Extra Militia Force for, 1343.
Military Branch and District Staff, 1017.
Military Stores, 1022.
Military Properties, Maintenance, &c., 1160; Construction and Repairs, 1162; suppl., 1602; conc., 1440.
Militia Regulations and Orders, Printing, &c., 1343.
Ottawa Rifle Range, 1603.
Public Armouries, &c., 1095; suppl., 1343, 1602.
Rifled Ordnance, Improved, 1166.
Royal Military College, 1162.
Russian Leather Permeator, 1165.
Miscellaneous:
Academy of Arts, 1608.
Allan, W. F., Allowance in lieu of Board, &c., 1381.
Barry, James, preparation of Tables of Exports and Imports of Fish, conc., 1464.
B. N. A. Act., Cases decided under, Publication of, 1378.
Boucher de la Bruère, printing Civil Service List, 1374.
Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with, 1379.
British Association Meeting in Montreal, 1310.
Confederation, Historical Picture commemorating, 1309.
Consolidated Statutes, Cost of Type, &c., 1379; conc., 1464.
Consolidated Statutes, Expenses, 1202; conc., 1453.
Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, 1203; conc., 1453.
Hudson Bay, Expedition to by water, 1379; suppl., 1617; conc., 1617.
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Continued.
International Fishery Exhibition, Outstanding Claims, 1374.
Keewatin District, Expenses of Govt. in, 1302.
Legal Advisers, Payment to, conc, 1617.
Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, 1607.
McLaughlin, Geo. E., Gratuity to Family of, 1373.
Mounted Police Barracks, 1203, 1378.
Mowat, Hon. Oliver, Payment for Services, 1379.
Niagara Falls Commission, 1203.
N. W. T., Expenses of Government in, 1301; conc., 1611.
Printing, Miscellaneous, 1373.
Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1312; conc., 1453.
Returns, Preparation of, Extra Clerks' Services, 1381.
Richardson, H., Allowance for Rent, 1379.
Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, 1374.
Survey of Georgian Bay, Steamer for, 1374.
Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior, 1203.
North-West Mounted Police:
Pay of Force, &c., 1294.
Ocean and River Service:
Glendon, Steamer to replace, 1227.
Government Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 1227.
Life-boats, Stations, and Life-preservers, &c., 1229.
Masters and Mates, Examination of, 1229.
Obstructions, Removal of, in Navigable Rivers, 1232.
Water and River Police, 1232; suppl., 1369.
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 1002; suppl., 1338.
Dorchester, 1000.
Kingston, 998.
Manitoba, 1000; suppl., 1338.
St. Vincent de Paul, 999.
Pensions:
Compensation in lieu of Land, 1017.
Duckett, Mrs. Edward (revote) 1343.
Veterans of 1812, 1016.
Public Works—Capital:
Public Buildings:
Ottawa (additional buildings, Wellington St.) 1190.
Public Works:
British Columbia, 1603.
New Brunswick, 1603; conc., 1616.
Port Arthur, 1603; conc., 1616.
Harbours and Rivers:
Cape Tormentine Harbour, conc., 1616.
Public Works—Income:
Buildings, Public:
British Columbia, 1198.
Generally, 1198.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income—Continued.
Manitoba, 1198.
New Brunswick, 1192; suppl., 1604.
Nova Scotia, 1190; suppl., 1604; conc., 1616, 1618.
North-West Territories, 1198.
Ontario, 1193; suppl., 1354, 1605.
Prince Edward Island, 1191; suppl., 1604.
Quebec, 1193; suppl., 1354, 1604.
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 1198; suppl., 1358, 1362.
Dredging, 1225; suppl., 1365.
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia, 1606.
Manitoba (*Adelaide*, Scow) 1365; (Waterhen River) conc., 1616.
New Brunswick, 1221.
Nova Scotia, 1218; suppl., 1605; conc., 1442.
N. W. T. (Saskatchewan River) 1606.
Ontario, 1223; suppl., 1605.
Prince Edward Island, 1220; suppl., 1362; conc., 1443, 1464.
Quebec, 1222; suppl., 3165.
Miscellaneous:
High Commissioner, purchase of House, 1366; conc., 1615.
Monument to Joseph Brant, 1226.
Monument to Sir Geo. E. Cartier, 1226.
National Art Gallery, 1226.
Telegraph Lines, 1226; suppl., 1366.
Quarantine:
Cattle Quarantine, 1010.
Pictou Cattle Disease, 1010.
Public Health, 1012-1016.
Tracadie Lazaretto, 1010.
Railways and Canals—Capital:
Canadian Pacific Railway:
British Columbia (revote) 1048.
Bridge over Red River at Emerson, 1348.
Inspecting Engineers, Salaries and Expenses, 1348.
Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, 1046.
Section B, Award of Arbitrators, 1630.
Sifton & Ward (Red River and Cross Lake) 1350.
Smith & Ripley (Georgian Bay Branch) 1349.
Station Accommodation, 1049; conc., 1449.
Subsidy, 1049.
Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger, 1349; conc., 1460.
Intercolonial Railway:
Bridge across St. John River, 1627.
Claims arising out of Construction, Payment of, 1628.
Coal Cars, additional, 1627.
Construction Account, 1344.
Dalhousie Branch, 1344.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Capital—Continued.
Expenditure on, by Govt. of N. B., 1627.
Falconer, James, for Land damages, 1346.
Ferguson, Wm., purchase of Land, 1347.
Halifax Extension, 1049; suppl., 1344.
Halifax Street Ry. Co. *vs.* The Queen, 1345.
MacDonell & Co., Alex., Award of Commissioners, 1346.
Miscellaneous Works not provided for, 1050.
Rivière du Loup, Town Branch, 1344.
Rochette, Fabien, for Land taken, 1345.
St. Charles Branch, 1049; suppl., 1345.
St. John, increased Accommodation at, 1049; suppl., 1344.
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Compensation for Injuries, 1347.
Rolling Stock, 1347.
Canals:
Carrillon, Dam and Approaches, 1052; (Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1351.
Cornwall, 1050.
Grenville, 1053.
Lachine, 1050.
Murray, 1051.
Ste. Anne, 1052.
St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1051.
St. Peter's, 1053; (Perley, H. F., services) 1350; conc., 1460.
Tay, construction of Works, 1053.
Trent River Nav., Locks, &c., 1051.
Welland, 1051; construction of Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River, 1051; Unpaid Labourers, 1350; conc., 1460; Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, 1608; conc., 1617.
Williamsburg—Lock at Rapide Plat, 1051; Galops Canal, 1051; (Clara S. Holden, Compensation to) 1352.
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Beauharnois (L. W. Marchand, Professional Services) 1353; conc., 1463.
Cornwall—Drain between Town and Canal, 1053.
Miscellaneous, 1053.
Rideau (Land damages between Brewer's Mills and Kingston) 1354.
Welland (Schooners *St. Andrew's* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352; conc., 1461, 1612; suppl. (Waste Weir at Dunsville) 1608.
Scientific Institutions:
Meteorological Observations, &c., 1254.
Observatories, 1254.
Steamboat Inspection:
Expenses in connection with, 1255.
Unprovided Items:
Vide Auditor-General's Rep., 1882-83, page 44, 1383.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
CONCURRENCE:
Arts, Agriculture, and Statistics, 1440.
Barry, James, Preparation of Tables of Imports and Exports of Fish, 1464.
Boucher de la Bruère, Payment for Type, &c., 1464.
Boularderie Wharf, N. S., 1618.
Canada and West Indies and Brazil, Subvention, 1453.
Canadian Pacific Ry., Station Accommodation, 1449.
Cape Tormentine Harbour, 1616.
Civil Service Examiners, Board of, 1459.
Consolidated Statutes, Type for printing, &c., 1464.
Culling Timber, 1457.
Customs, 1456, 1464.
Dominion Statutes, Consolidating, Expenses, &c., 1453.
Excisemen, Increase of Salaries to, 1617.
Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, 1453.
Fishing Bounty, Services in connection with Distribution, 1617.
Geological Survey, 1450.
Halifax and St. John, *vid* Yarmouth, Subvention, 1453.
Harbours and Rivers, N. S., 1442, 1616.
Harbours and Rivers, P. E. I., 1443, 1464.
High Commissioner, Contingencies, &c., 1440, 1610; House and Furniture, 1615.
Hudson Bay Expedition, 1617.
Immigration, 1464.
Indian Dialects, B. C., Printing of, 1617.
Indians, Man. and the N. W., 1450, 1610.
Intercolonial Ry., Collection of Revenues, 1449.
Intoxicating Liquors Act, Traffic in, Expenses under, 1453.
Lakes Huron and Superior, Mail Subsidy, 1452.
Legal Advisers, Payment to, 1617.
Legislation, Claims of Returning Officers, 1459.
Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, 1443.
Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, 1463.
Military Properties, Care of, 1440.
Militia, Dept. of, 1440.
Moncton Post Office, &c., 1616.
Newfield, Steamer, Cost of working, 1458.
N. W. T., Government in, Expenses, 1611.
Page John, Services of, on Welland Canal Arbitration, 1617.
Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal, 1460.
Port Arthur Harbour, 1616.
Post Office, 1458.
Printing Paper and Bookbinding, 1440.
Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1453.
Returning Officers, Claims of, 1611.
St. Andrews and *Jennie Graham*, Schooners, 1461, 1612.
Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger, 1460.
Waterhen River, Man., 1616.
Welland Canal, Chargeable to Income, 1461, 1612.
Welland Canal, Unpaid Labourers' wages on, 1460.

Supply B. No. 155 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res., 1°* of B., 2°*, and 3°*, 1651. (47 *Vic., c.* 2.)
SUPPLY FARM No. 20, FISH CREEK: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27; M. for Ret., 44; Ques., 285.
SUPPLY FARM ON PINCHER CREEK, SALE OR LEASE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 200; M. for O. C., 617.
SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT JUDGES, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 994.
Supreme Court in Appeal, limitation of Jurisdiction of, B. No. 15 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny.*) 1°*, 43.
SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT *re* SALE, &c., OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: M. for copies* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
SUPREME COURT OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 994.
SURVEY CONTRACT No. 10: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Billy*) 1201.
SURVEY OF GEORGIAN BAY, STEAMER FOR: in Com. of Sup., 1374.
SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS IN MAN. AND N. W. T. in 1883: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
SURVEYORS' PLANS AND FIELD NOTES, EXAMINATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1384.
SURVEYS, LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 1203.
SUSSEX AND ST. JOHN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1144; in Com., 1509.
SWAN CREEK AND LAKE, SURVEYS: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 605.
SWITZER, FRANKLIN, ARREST OF, BY U. S. SOLDIERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.
Synod of Diocese of Saskatchewan Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 61 (*Mr. Williams*) 1°*, 162; 2°*, 199; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 103.)
TALBOT, ACHILLE, EMPLOYMENT AND SALARY OF: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 966.
TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, EXPENSES, &c., OF COM.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.
TARIFF, INTERCOL. RY., BETWEEN QUEBEC AND ST. CHARLES: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.
Tariff of Duties of Customs further Act Amt. B. No. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°*, 1443; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1621. (47 *Vic., c.* 30.)
TARIFF ON GRAIN, READJUSTMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Wheler*) 336.
TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION OF WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1053.
TELEGRAPH LINES, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1318.
TELEPHONE Co.'s. *See* respective headings.
Temperance Act, Canada, Amt. B. No. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1386; 2° m., 1618; 2° and in Com., 1619; 3° m., 1621; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621; 3°*, 1621. (47 *Vic., c.* 31.)
TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878, MEDICAL CERTIFICATES IN P. E. I.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.
Temperance, Canada, and General Life Assurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 28 (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 580. (47 *Vic., c.* 97.)

TEMPERANCE. *See* "Intoxicating Liquors."

TEMPLE, Mr. T., M.P., PROTEST AGAINST: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1110.

TEMPLE, THOMAS, PATENT FLANGER: in Com. of Sup., 1349; conc., 1460.

TENTS, MILITIA, MANUFACTURE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 505; Purchase of, by Militia Dept.: M. for Cor.,* 624.

TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

Territories, Representation of the, in the House of Commons B. No. 110 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 598; 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.

Territory in dispute between the Dom. of Can. and Prov. of Ont. B. No. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°* —; 2° and in Com., 1634; 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 24.)

TERRITORY, VIOLATION OF NEUTRALITY BY U. S. TROOPS: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.

THAMES AND LAKE ERIE CANAL: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797.

THORBURN, Dr.: Reference to in Com. of Sup., 839.

Tidal Dock at Quebec, further provision for, B. No. 148 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1581; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1618. (47 *Vic., c.* 9.)

TIMBER LAND, SALE OF, IN THE N. W.: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 73; M. for Ret., 90.

TIMBER LANDS, SALE OF, AND PERMITS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

TIMBERED LANDS SOLD IN BOW RIVER COUNTRY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.

TIMBER LICENSES, CANCELLATION OF, ON INDIAN RESERVES: M. for copies of O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.

TIMBER LIMITS ON JACK HEAD RIVER: M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.

Titles to Land, Transfer of, in Territories of Canada B. No. 16 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 43.

Toronto Board of Trade and Toronto Corn Exchange Association amalg. B. No. 14 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 43; 2°*, 88; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 46.)

Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 9 (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°*, 40; 2°*, 57; in Com., 861; 3°*, 866. (47 *Vic., c.* 66.)

Toronto Harbour and Esplanade B. No. 60 (*Mr. Small*). 1°*, 141; 2°*, 199; wthdn.

TOWNSEND, PORT, AND VICTORIA, B.C., MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.

TOWN RESERVES IN THE N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

TOWN SITES, SALE OF, &c.: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 1010.

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: presented, 27.

Traders ank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 92 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 304; 2°*, 504; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 51.)

TRAMWAY AND TRANSFER Co.'s *See* respective headings.

TRANSLATION OF THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES: Ques. (*Mr. Lesage*) 86.

Transfer of Prisoners from one Gaol to another authorization B. No. 151 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1586; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c.* 44.)

TRANSPORT, REQUISITIONS AND VOUCHERS RENDERED BY CANADIAN EXPRESS Co.: M. for copies* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 523.

TRANSPORT OF WHEAT THROUGH U. S.: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

TRANSPORT. *See* "Inland."

TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 603.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES, STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 994.

TRAVERSE, UNION STATION AT THE: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.

TREASURY BOARD AND FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 841.

TREATIES, COMMERCIAL, BETWEEN CANADA AND FOREIGN POWERS: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

TREATISES, &C., ON THE MECHANICAL ARTS: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.

TRENT RIVER NAV., LOCKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1051.

TRUST Co.'s *See* respective headings.

TUNNEL Co.'s *See* respective headings.

TUPPER, SIR CHARLES. *See* "High Commissioner."

TWO CENT LETTER POSTAGE: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.

TYRWHITT, Mr. R.: Election sustained on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.

UNION JACQUES CARTIER RY., OPENING OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Houde*) 41.

Union of certain Methodist Churches B. No. 11 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 40; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 665. (47 *Vic., c.* 106.)

UNION STATION AT THE TRAVERSE: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.

Union Trust Corporation of Can. Incorp. B. No. 43 (*Mr. Hesson*). 1°*, 89; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 100.)

UNITED STATES AND SPAIN, FLAG TREATY BETWEEN: on M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Vail*) 1361.

UNITED STATES AND VICTORIA, B. C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1298.

UNITED STATES, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS DUTIES ON HAY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS REGULATIONS RESPECTING TRANSPORT OF WHEAT: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

UNITED STATES, N. S. COAL IMPORTED INTO, FOR OCEAN STEAMSHIP PURPOSES: M. for copies of Despatches (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN CANADA: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86; M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.

UNITED STATES WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1383.

UNPAID LABOURERS, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc. 1460.

UPPER WOODS HARBOUR: N.S., WHARF AND BRIDGE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1199.

VACANCIES IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1, 1108.

Vancouver Island Ry. B. No. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 67; M. for Com., 1023; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1039; 2°* and in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176; Amt. 6 m. h., (*Mr. Homer*) neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176; 3°*, 1176. (47 *Vic., c.* 6.)

"VANDERBILT," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Co. Incorp. B. No. 23 (*Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil*). 1°*, 71; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 736. (47 *Vic., c.* 84.)

VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1016.

VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS, CHANGE OF PROCEDURE IN: M. for copies of Imp. Despatches* (*Mr. Weldon*) 65.

VICE-ADMIRALTY COURT, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 995.

VICTORIA, B.C., CITY POSTMASTERSHIP: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837 AND 1838: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 89; Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 57.

"WABUNO," LOSS OF THE. *See* "Lakes Huron and Superior."

WALLACEBURGH AND SARNIA RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.

WALLACE, Mr. JOHN: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1; Certificate of Election and return of, 1.

WALLACE, TOWNSHIP OF, IMPROVEMENT FUND MONEY DUE TO: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 200.

WARRANTS, GOV. GENS'., ISSUED TO *Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe*, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.

WASHINGTON TREATY, TERMINATION OF FISHERY CLAUSES: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Davies*) 1200.

WATER AND RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1369.

WATER WORKS CO.'S *See* respective headings.

WATSON, T. C., PAYMENT TO, FOR SERVICES: M. for Stmnt.* (*Mr. Wilson*) 820.

WATSON, HENRY, ARREST OF, BY U. S. SOLDIERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.

WAYS AND MEANS:

Res. for Com. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 27; The Budget Speech, 569; reply (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 584; Deb. adjd., 598; rsmd. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 625; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 641; Res. 1 in Com., 653; on M. for Com. on Res. 2 (*Mr. Casey*) 672; (*Mr. Benson*) 679; (*Mr. Vail*) 679; (*Mr. Stairs*) 686; (*Mr. Armstrong*) 690; (*Mr. Taylor*) 693; (*Mr. Irvine*) 695; Res. 2 in Com., 695–704; on M. for Com. (*Mr. Charlton*) 709; (*Mr. Dundas*) 717; (*Mr. Mills*) 718; (*Mr. McLelan*) 722; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 727; Res. 2 in Com., 728–734; Res. 3 and 4 in Com., 734, 735; on M. to. conc. in Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 767; (*Mr. Tupper*) 769; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 770; (*Mr. Charlton*) 771; (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 773; (*Mr. Wigle*) 773; (*Mr. McMullen*) 778; (*Mr. Hesson*) 782 (*Mr. Armstrong*) 787; (*Mr. Watson*) 788; (*Mr. Temple*) 790; (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 790; (*Mr. Kirk*) 792; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 17, N. 39) 796; Res. conc. in, 797.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: Rep. presented, 1321.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop., in Com and 1°* of B., 765; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1131, 1242; Order for 3° dschgd., recom., amended, and 3°*, 1294. (47 *Vic., c.* 36.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS, in Com. of Sup., 1382.

WELLAND CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON, SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.

WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1051.

Welland Railway transfer to G. T. R. Co. authorization B. No. 44 (*Mr. Bergin*). 1°*, 89; 2°, 271; in Com., 860; recom. and 3°, 886. (47 *Vic. c.* 53.)

WELLER'S BAY, RANGE LIGHTS: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.

WELLINGTON, LIFE-BOAT HOUSE: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.

WELLINGTON, ONT., LIFE-BOAT AT: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.

WESTERN COUNTIES, ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444.

WHARFINGERS, JURISDICTION OF, ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 1387.

WHARVES AND PIERS IN N. B.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 458.

WHARVES AND PIERS IN P. E. I., INSPECTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 261.

WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.

WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTED FROM U. S. AND DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.

WHEAT, TRANSPORT OF THROUGH U. S.: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

WHEATLEY, POSTMASTER AT, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.

WHITCHER, W. F., COMPLAINTS AGAINST AND RETIREMENT OF: M. for O. C., &c.* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.

WILKINSON, J. A., EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 966.

WILKINSON, J. A., PROMISE OF APPOINTMENT TO: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1054; Payments to, 1055.

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, LOCK AT RAPIDE PLAT: in Com. of Sup., 1051.

WINDSOR AND WALKERVILLE, SEIZURE OF COAL OIL BARRELS AT: M. for Papers (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.

WINDSOR BRANCH RY., REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 1261.

WINDSOR CUSTOM HOUSE, APPOINTMENTS IN: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 261.

WITNESS, DEFENDANT, COMPETENT AS. *See* LAW of Evidence.

Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 131 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 1241; 2°, 1281; in Com. and 3°*, 1386. (47 *Vic. c.* 70.)

Winnipeg Bank Incorp. B. No. 29 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°*, 83; 2°*, 173; in Com. and 3°*, 1035. (47 *Vic., c.* 49.)

WOODSTOCK AND ST. STEPHEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.

WRITS OF ELECTION: Warrants issued for, 1, 1126, 1321.

WYANDOTTE INDIANS AND CLAIMS TO PAJOT FARM: M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.

WYANDOTTE INDIANS, DISTRIBUTION OF MONEYS TO: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 966.

YAMASKA RIVER EXPLORATIONS: M. for Rep.* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820

YORK (N.B.): Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.